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Abstract

Willendorf Readings is an exploration of communication and power in both academic and everyday learning situations. According to poststructuralist modes of discourse analysis, or postlinguistics (T. Threadgold 2000), textual forms and practices along with sociocultural assumptions, may promote identities and motivations that shape the very worlds in which students and educators live. Educators, for example, traditionally engage in discourses that are a telling, when their practice, or praxis, might be better served by engaging in discourses that are an asking. This thesis argues that current hegemonic language in general, and educational language in particular, can disadvantage readers and students.

The study investigates this issue by analysing written and graphic texts, specifically the discourses and agendas of texts that refer to a 25,000-year-old artefact historically known as the Venus of Willendorf. The Willendorf literature is appropriate for such examination in that it has emerged at the interface of widely divergent discourses, and its very name has been critically questioned in recent years. This questioning raises further philosophical linguistic problems within signifiers and acts of naming. Acknowledgment of the role that subjectivities play in meaning-making relates here to educational settings such as those in archaeology, art history, and the visual arts. Power struggles over meaning that arguably impede learning, however, also have a bearing on readers leading literate lives. It is in pursuit of such wider critical-literacy perspectives that this thesis subjects its data-texts to detailed reading, utilising the qualitative-computer-analysis program NVivo 7. The researcher collects these texts from art-education, commercial-product, in-situ, internet, popular-literature, and scientific sources. A special difficulty arises in that the present thesis is itself accountable to the kind of readings and framings applied to the Willendorf texts. The thesis deals with this difficulty by including writing and graphics from this very thesis as one of the data-texts under scrutiny.

The investigation contributes not merely to knowledge in education, but also to new ways of knowing in the current global postmodern context of multimedia technologies. To what feminist poststructuralist researchers have already learned, the thesis adds discursive analytical strategies regarding knowing, with/in the emerging field of postlinguistics. This educational work both takes place in and targets the life-world setting of research as education. By juxtaposing, deconstructing, and re-presenting the data using Foucauldian-informed methods, the thesis moves toward enabling students and educators alike to recognise some of the educational implications of their own actions, or performativity, through language.
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There is always something ludicrous in philosophical discourse when it tries, from the outside, to dictate to others, to tell them where their truth is and how to find it, or when it works up a case against them in the language of naive positivity...

(Foucault 1992: 9)
Exploring the Inter-related Educational Issues of Literacy, Contra-diction & Colonisation

I would like a future for my children in which they can lead productive lives, in a society which is positively engaged with the challenges of its time, and in which despair is, at the least, balanced by hope, difficulty by pleasure. I happen to believe that the possibilities of communication are an essential foundation for that. (Kress 1997: 164)

The possibilities of communication await exploration.

Given current dominant liberal-humanist assumptions (Weedon 1987: 8, 32, 75-85), I pursue various trajectories of concern to education, regarding communication and power, throughout this thesis. These trajectories all intersect at the vitally crucial educational nexus of language and literacy. Three of the most accessible of these trajectories are introduced above in the title of this chapter. These are namely, literacy: ‘the ability to read and write...to use language effectively’ (Delbridge 1997: 1253), contradiction: an ability ‘to speak against’ (Skeat 1993: 116), and colonisation: an ability to ‘become established (in an area)’ (Swannell 1993: 199, eg codification and colonisation, Foucault 1980: 86).
As indicated in the abstract, these trajectories also include considerations such as: that educational language can disadvantage readers and students; the pursuit of wider critical literacy perspectives; recognising educational implications of linguistic actions; making a case for not making a case; and that images, internet texts, and formatting issues are valid modes of study, presentation, and re-presentation. These trajectories relate to the Willendorf literature in that the Willendorf material was an experimental platform for these issues at the level of doctoral research in education. The Willendorf data is important in its own right for pursuing the key additional trajectory that a signifier is not that which it signifies (Weedon 1987). The first chapter section provides a general introduction to the herstory of Willendorf as the object of this research.

Regarding the inter-related educationalist issues of the ability to read, the ability to contradict, and the ability to colonise, I explore in this chapter the role played by existing educational systems within the larger sociocultural environment. In this chapter I argue, and through the course of the thesis I explore, that in learning to read, students and educators are also learning other things, among which are the art of contradiction and the art of colonisation. In the art of contradiction, I argue that students are learning to pay attention to certain paradoxes and to be blind to others. I further put forward the case that the particular lens on contradiction that hegemonic (Weedon 1987: 78-79, 80) liberal humanism (Weedon 1987: 8) provides for students allows the education system to colonise students. I see this colonisation as in addition to, or perhaps even rather than, guiding students to the fulfilment of their own potentials.

In a time when transparency (Strathern 2000), “giving voice,” “dialogue,” “telling and testifying,” and “empowerment” have lost their innocence (Lather 2007: 75), I engage in a questioning in this study of how the educational forum of written text, this reflexive doctoral thesis in particular, promotes learning, and, indeed, what sort of learning that is. I question whether some of the existing assumptions, conventions, and frameworks in place within educationalist forums are optimal in serving all of their purported purposes (Marshall 1996). As a radical poststructural educationalist, I advocate a
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consideration of 'learning to learn differently' (Lather 2007: 75). That is, rather than the ludicrous dictation of telling others where their truth is and how to find it (Foucault 1992: 9), I support the reflexive learning afforded by working to perform educational praxis (Foucault 1980: 108, Lather 1991b: 85, Threadgold 1997: 84).

Why Willendorf

The suggestion has been made that the binary thinking of for/against comes from a masculine perspective, and that a feminine perspective views things differently. This is where I was, exploring the history (and seeking the herstory) of matriarchy in 1998, when the impetus for what became this very research began with this seemingly simple text:

Some scholars argue that the discovery throughout the European continent and the Near East of thousands of stone figures of female goddesses dating from the Paleolithic period...and on indicates that early societies were originally goddess-worshiping, matrifocal civilizations. (Banner 1997)

Curiosity about who these scholars were, what their backgrounds were, and how they spoke when they wrote, fuelled this impetus. From my then already explicitly identified critical literacy perspective, further curiosity initially was not only what these scholars had to say about these unearthed figures, but also how and why they argued for the existence of matrifocal civilisations. Preliminary investigations suggested that the implications intimated in this initial paragraph were merely one voice in a chorus of perspectives on the subject of these figurines.

With my academic background, I understood that I needed a focus through which to analyse these perspectives. Furthermore, within my newly identified poststructuralist perspective, I learned that Foucauldian theory also explicitly
demanded attention to social, historical, and cultural specificity (Weedon 1987: 22, 136). Thus, in the ongoing investigation I selected one of the most highly acclaimed, popular, and well known of these figures to track, map, and analyse these perspectives, one that had already appeared in a card game that I had devised for a linguistics assignment earlier that year (Rosendahl 1998b): the Venus of Willendorf.

![Venus of Willendorf](Image)

**Figure 1.1 The Photograph as a Post/Linguistic Signifier**

At this first photo illustration, I use this caption to problematise the use of photographs as illustrations. This caption endeavours to gesture, not towards what the artefact *is*, but toward the *possibilities* of ideas, ideals, and ideologies it is capable of supporting.

It became clear early on that because the artefact's appearance was so relevant to what it was being used to say, that in addition to a deconstructive critical-literacy approach to the use of words, a deconstructive critical-literacy approach to the use of images was also going to play a major role in this study. Regardless of its caption, the photograph above is likely to be read in classic dominant liberal-humanist fashion (Weedon 1987: 32, 80). That is, it is likely to be read as an illustration of what the text is claiming that the artefact *is*. Within the parameters of a photograph, however, it arguably does the most that it can do to show the postlinguistic leanings of the text it illustrates. I chose this particular photograph because the reflections showing from the glass (of the case which encloses it at the Naturhistorisches Museum in Vienna) begins to
suggest the simulacra which is central to this postlinguistic investigation. These simulacra, or copies without an original, relate to the ‘multiple meanings’ (About English 2007) highlighted via critical literacy. According to poststructuralism, there is no one fixed, true, or original meaning for any given term (Weedon 1987: 19), or for subjectivity (Weedon 1987: 21), only meanings in relation to each other at ‘a constant site of struggle over power’ (Weedon 1987: 32). The bright light illuminating the artefact itself in the centre of the photograph, also visually serves as an analogy of the way in which that upon which we focus is that which readers and viewers see. This tends to be, as I investigate further throughout the course of this thesis, not that which they/we see best, but that which they/we see at all (Heisenberg 1958: 58).

Photographs are problematic for this study in that learned assumptions regarding reading images (Dondis 1973: 2) tend to be positivist (Mitchell, W. J. T. 1994: 5-6), non-existent, devalued, or undervalued (Kress & van Leeuwen 1996: 15-16) and thereby arguably positivist by default. The use of images (ie photographs and other graphics), however, are most problematic in relation to this deconstructive, Foucauldian-informed research in terms of the relationship of such usage to power. There exists, for example, ‘an opposition to the visual media in situations where they form an alternative to writing and can therefore be seen as a potential threat to the present dominance of verbal literacy among elite groups’ (Kress & van Leeuwen 1996: 16). This opposition is evident for example in fine arts degrees in the United States, where the highest award available is not a doctoral degree but a master’s degree (Universities Offering PhD in Art 2007).

In this research I both argue and re-present that current literacy assumptions regarding the use of photographs (as is also the case with current literacy assumptions in the use of words) are problematic for this explicitly postlinguistic text. Nonetheless because of the importance of images for this research, the textuality of this thesis cannot dispense with them altogether as many qualitative research theses can. Photographs thereby appear in numbered figures as poststructuralist juxtapositions and as illustrations throughout the
thesis document; a list of these figures appears in Appendix A. A list of the 384 images used in the study appears in Appendix B.

In terms of furthering the educationalist project of critical literacy (About English 2007; Gee 1997: xvii; Lankshear 1997: 3-5, 40-45, 47, 50-52, 60-62, 90-100, 10-141, 155-160; ReadWriteThink 2007) which this research promotes, the object of inquiry could be any object deemed worthy of discussion. The Willendorf literature, however, is particularly appropriate as an object of poststructural scrutiny in that the artefact to which these texts refer:

- exists as a physical object, which adds to a sense of tangibility or connection to physical experience
- was created at a time far removed from our present lived experience, which has the potential (for better or worse) to add to a student's sense of objectivity
- has emerged relatively recently via word and image in an amazingly wide range of sources, and is thereby found at the interface of widely divergent discourses
- exhibits characteristics as a human body (raised in current feminist poststructuralist arguments, eg Kamler 1997) that highlight issues of gender, weight, and even race discrimination (eg Arogundade 2000)
- is used by groups such as feminists, New-Age groups, and poststructuralists with an interest in dislocating hegemonic cultural conceptions and assumptions

After its discovery in 1908, the Venus of Willendorf appeared in archaeological papers and articles. It was with its appearance in art history textbooks (Witcombe 2005), however, that the artefact's fame first spread in a pervasive way, the results of which are still producing effects. In the nine-year span of this research, 1998-2007, the amount of material available on the internet referring to the artefact has positively burgeoned. Descriptions of this profusion of items, as cited by two of the data texts, are: 'pendants, chocolates, soaps, t-shirts, incense burners, etc.' (Angelfire 2004: http) and '...jewelry of every description (brass, pewter, gold)...T-shirts, posters, postcards...paper dolls, and even...glycerine soap' (Lane 2001: 3). The variety that this present study
includes in its purview for deconstruction and postlinguistic analysis appears below. This list is fully referenced in Appendix C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book Covers</th>
<th>Icon</th>
<th>Stationery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bookmarks</td>
<td>Internet Blogs</td>
<td>Statues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bracelets</td>
<td>Jewellery Pieces</td>
<td>Tattoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candle Holder</td>
<td>Journal Notes</td>
<td>Television</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD Cover</td>
<td>Key Rings</td>
<td>The Human Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chocolate</td>
<td>Layout Design</td>
<td>Three-Dimensional Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>Maps</td>
<td>Timelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dictionary Entries</td>
<td>Magnets</td>
<td>T-Shirts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displays</td>
<td>Maps</td>
<td>Two-Dimensional Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolls</td>
<td>Mascot</td>
<td>Videos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawings</td>
<td>Meditation Kit</td>
<td>Wand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dress Ties</td>
<td>Menu</td>
<td>Wall Posts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drum</td>
<td>Necklaces</td>
<td>Website Logo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVD Label</td>
<td>Organisational Names</td>
<td>Website Mastheads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earrings</td>
<td>Patterns</td>
<td>Website Wallpaper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth Globes</td>
<td>Pendants</td>
<td>Gemstones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encyclopaedia Entries</td>
<td>Rubber Stamps</td>
<td>Soap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor Plans</td>
<td>Poetry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gemstones</td>
<td>Signs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The wide variety of types of images, products, and sources available is due in large part to the spread of internet access during this time. It is also due to the commercial nature of our current culture and partly due to the wide range of sources that, as a postlinguistic researcher, I acknowledge as text. The wide variety of discourses that refer to the artefact stands as testimony to its popularity, versatility, and ability to be utilised. This variety comes from literary, internet, video, product, and in-situ sources.

As the research grew and developed it thereby became no longer merely scholarly texts that were under scrutiny, but also internet texts, T-shirt slogans, product leaflets, information fliers, and the artefact itself as a text. This broadened purview is postlinguistically important to the research in that it is in keeping with relatively recent pictorial (Mitchell, W. J. T. 1994) linguistic (Mitchell, W. J. T. 1994, Lather 1991a: 13) and postmodern (Carlson 1992, Lather 1994: 45, Appignanesi & Garratt 1995, Carmichael & Lee 2000) turns.
As such, like feminism and the postmodern, postlinguistics and this educational research are 'discourses on the move' (Wicke and Ferguson in Lather 1994: 45). This wider critical-literacy purview is also important in that it does not limit these educationalist investigations to the realm of experts. Perhaps more precisely, it treats students as potential experts in that these educational practices are available at some level by a student, anywhere, anytime.

**Common Commune-ication & Critical Literacy**

As a text about communication, this research is not without its struggles and 'points of tension' (Marshall 1996: 107) in its efforts to communicate. Reflexivity only serves to magnify and augment these points of tension. While these tensions are inter-related, they are nonetheless able to be further broken down. Namely, I struggle not only between contradictions such as making the case of not making a case, but likewise between issues of what I am saying and why I am saying it. As I discuss further in chapter two, I am at cross purposes between issues such as deconstructive praxis, the convictions required to make meaningful points, and the educationalist ideal of open-endedness.

I struggle not only with the conflict between speaking for myself (debatably the only person I can speak for) and being in the position of speaking for others as an expert (Lather & Smithies 1997: xvi), but also with the conflict of learning for myself, and learning for others. I struggle with conflicts between authority and expertise (Lee 2000: 190-196, 202) over others, and within my own praxis when it is overtly and by requirement not only for myself, but also for others (Lather 1994: 41). For better or for worse, however, there is some leavening in that from a poststructuralist perspective writers cannot realise all of the effects and implications that are instigated by the manner in which they write. As an educator I see this as both an advantage and a disadvantage, as both a reprieve and a responsibility.

In exploring the possibilities of educational language and literacy, I have created discourse categories in this study, but I do not consider discourses to be
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units with clear boundaries (Gee 1999: 19). Neither do I consider the relationships between agendas, communication, discourses, language, literacy, or power to be clear-cut. Discourses both are and are not language. 'When "little d" discourse (language-in-use) is melded integrally with non-language "stuff" to enact specific identities and activities, then, I say that "big D" Discourses are involved.' (Gee 1999: 7) With the help of language, discourses and agendas assist in the construction of our identities and our relationships with others. Activities and identities, however, are not enacted through language alone (Gee 1999: 7). The categories of discourses and agendas are thus relevant to educationalist praxis for this research in that D/discourses (Gee 1999: 6-7, 17-19) are the means through which we communicate and vie for power (Foucault 1980). 'Language, the symbolic sphere, the tools of our intercommunicative practices are indeed implicated in the production and reproduction of hegemonic domination.' (Holub in Olssen 2006: 35)

Discourses, thereby, very much have to do with the Foucauldian-related question that this investigation takes up: 'How is power realized in language?' (Kress and van Leeuwen’s 1996: 147)

One might be tempted to think that the most important things to communicate to others would be things that they do not know. The paradox in communication, however, is that one cannot transmit a message to someone else that the other person does not in some way already understand (Hodge & Kress 1988: 4, 122-123). This line of thought is inherent in the word communicate itself, which comes from the Latin word communicare. This Latin stem is related to the English words commune, communion, community, and common (Skeat 1993: 90). The critical-literacy question: Who would be most likely to read and/or view this text and why? (About English 2007) is related to this sense of the word communication under current liberal-humanist assumptions (Weedon 1987: 75-85) in the dualistic-worldview terms of for and against. Under these assumptions students and educators would be most likely to read a text to either embrace it as supporting their own view, or to refute it in defining their own view. In other words, reading a text becomes not for one's self, but for one's power. This is in keeping with Foucault’s war analogy (1980: 114) regarding the history that bears and determines individuals in current
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hegemonic global society, where students and educators are most likely to use texts as ammunition. My educationalist, critical-literacy goal in this thesis in contrast is not one that is for or against (except insofar as it is required to be, as a coherent thesis that has a case and argues). It is rather an exploration of possibilities in the midst of limits, or better-stated ‘in the face of limit questions’ (Lather 2007: 83-84).

Foucault’s Power/Knowledge & Bio-Power: Moving from Against towards With/In

The English textual construction in the title of Foucault’s book Power/Knowledge (1980, published four years before his death in 1984) suggests that power and knowledge are integrated, in this usage, in a way that neither word on its own currently conveys. Foucault also crosses the boundaries of other verbal divisions by making new combinations in words such as anatomo-politics, bio-history and, bio-power (1978/1990: 139, 143).

If one can apply the term bio-history to the pressures through which the movements of life and the processes of history interfere with one another, one would have to speak of bio-power to designate what brought life and its mechanisms into the realm of explicit calculations and made knowledge-power an agent of transformation of human life. (Foucault 1978/1990: 143)

These word-combination constructions of Foucault’s suggest that current available language conventions, in English at least, best express his respective ideas in these regards by changing their micro-textuality and employing a virgule or a dash between words and word-parts to make a new word. In the case of power and knowledge, educators seem to persist in saying (and believing) that within education we are dealing in the business of learning meaning, and ignoring at best, or denying at worst, that we are in the business
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of learning power. Our preaching, in other words, seems to be out of line with our practice.

The Foucault quotation opening this thesis, which directly addresses education's power exercise of telling to others what their truth is and how to find it, relates to the present project through an idea of lived practice. In this ideal world, micro-, meso- and macro-practice (Cirlot 1971: xxxi, Campbell 1991: 71) consciously matches intention in every regard. The impossibility of such an ideal world is no reason not to endeavour to move closer to that ideal world. My own postlinguistic educationalist praxis thus involves seeking a do-as-I-do practice, rather than a do-as-I-say practice. In this idea, practice is the way in which we not only carefully act within our worlds, but also say we act and consciously intend to act. It is a move from power-over towards power-within.

When the participants of a communication share a low affinity of solidarity or of power (Hodge & Kress 1988: 123), the meanings they make in reading and writing texts tend to be different from each other. Differences such as this raise the need and the challenge for educators and their students to make room for the ability to see and accept more than one meaning for a given text and between texts. They raise, in other words, the challenge for educators and their students to learn and practice an ability to see and accept a multiplicity of meanings, not serially, as currently happens with breakthroughs in technology and knowledge, but simultaneously. Foucault's analyses of power/knowledge not only permit but also demand such acknowledgment of, and engagement with, multiplicity and complexity (Gore 1993: 61).

Women and men in issues of gender, for example, have historically held unequal access to power (Weedon 1987: 2). In response to this inequity, some feminists have turned to poststructuralism and Foucauldian theory (Weedon 1987: 32). The same poststructuralist account of the plurality of meaning (Weedon 1987: 24) that is in the best interests of feminists (Weedon 1987: 20-21) is also arguably in the best interests of potentially disadvantaged readers and students in learning situations. Likewise, the same history-specific
Foucauldian account of language that is of most interest to feminists (Weedon 1987: 32) is also of most interest to readers and students in learning situations. Further, educators and ultimately society at large are also potentially disadvantaged and thwarted from their full potentials, to the degree that readers, students, and educators in learning situations are society at large.

Just as surveillance of the self (Foucault 1978/1990: 116) can contribute to one's own oppression (Weedon 1987: 97) in the worlds one inhabits (Bottomore in Lather 1991b: 11, Derrida 1997b: 24, Gee 1999: 82), in reflexively scrutinising my own textual practice, I see that my use of language potentially contributes to my own oppression. This relates to Foucault's bio-power in that much of this productive, generative power is potentially inadvertently expended in the re-production of systems that students and educators may not consciously wish to support. Thus like feminists, educationalists are subject to the dangers of co-option and the reproduction of knowledge as power over rather than power for individuals (Weedon 1987: 14).

A hegemonic system is thus established as much through the active participation of social agents, as it is through sheer imposition of meaning by the more powerful on the less powerful participant (Hodge & Kress 1988: 123). Individuals are not the mere objects of language but the sites of discursive struggle (Weedon 1987: 106). As a doctoral education student I am both a student and an expert on the topic of my research (University of Tasmania 2003: 9). In this thesis, I work to show that both students and experts may stand to gain by a more conscious use of language in education, specifically a more conscious use of their language as action. This is not to imply that a conscious use of language in the way that one might hope, in participating in current social processes and practices (such as the praxis of this thesis), is possible. Nor is it to imply that material structures such as education can be changed merely at the level of language (Weedon 1987: 106).
Seeing How an Ability to Read Constrains as Well as Enables: (Over)View of Discourse & Agenda Framings

This chapter section provides an overview of the study's discourse and agenda framings of the Willendorf artefact. The way in which students learn to frame letters and words, and to follow particular connections and associations in their minds in becoming literate, I suggest, is the same way in which they approach the general idea of categories. These manners of framing both enable and constrain; that is, because a student has learned to frame ideas in a certain way, this learning tends to preclude an ability to frame ideas in another way.

As my collection of Willendorf literature grew, and with an immediate affinity for what was introduced to me as a poststructuralist perspective, I began to deconstruct the data for clues that might suggest a discourse with which a particular text itself seemed to be identifying. So while I do not assume that concretised meaning is to be found in textuality per se, I do assume that textuality exhibits tangible 'cues or clues' (Gumperz in Gee 1999: 85). In this way my poststructuralist perspective on discourse aligns with Foucault's, where social structures and processes are organized through institutions and practices. These institutions and practices are located in, and structured by, particular discursive fields (Weedon 1987: 35) or discursive regimes, such as the regime of truth (Foucault 1980: 133, Lather 1994: 41). Foucault's use of the term discourse is thereby not simply linguistic or sociological.

...in any given historical period we can write, speak or think about a given social object or practice (madness, for example) only in certain specific ways and not others. 'A discourse' would then be whatever constrains—but also enables—writing, speaking and thinking within such specific historical limits. (McHoul & Grace 1993: 31)
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There are many criteria available in order to make a decision as to what category of discourse a particular text might belong. As indicated, some of those I have used in this study include clues provided within the text itself, information about the author of the text, or other contextual references. From a poststructuralist perspective these categories or framings are constructions. From the point of view of the texts as writings, these are patterns that the texts make in 'building things through language' (Gee 1999: 11). They build these things through language using various techniques and strategies. What they are building is very much tied up with who they are, which is related in a reciprocal way (Gee 1999: 82) to how and why they write. ‘Emerging patterns’ (Burns 1997: 319) relating to discourse classifications evolved, resulting in the following categories:

**Discourse**
1. Feminist (57)
2. Liberal Humanist (275)
3. New Age (96)
4. Poststructuralist (9)
5. Scientific (53)

**Total** 490

**Agenda**
1. Academic (50)
2. Commercial (61)
3. Creative (43)
4. Emancipatory (58)
5. Popularising (161)
6. Promotional (117)

**Total** 490

The number in parentheses indicates the number of texts now standing in that category. Willendorf-data tables of the number of texts, the number of images, the amount of material, and the year of publication, listed by here-categorised discourse and agenda, appear in Appendix D. A complete list of data texts, including information about here-assigned discourse and agenda, appears in Appendix E.

From the point of view of the texts as readings, these patterns, or framings, in the case of this study are one research investigator's particular choices in reading particular texts. The report of these choices, or framings, also
comprises readings made at a particular time. At another time choices made by that same investigator may well be different, in accordance with different priorities, understandings, or experiences. Further, even at one particular time by one particular investigator, representations of discourses do not fit neatly, or only, into one category or another. In this manner, these categories are educationally valuable not in themselves as categories, but in how they encourage thought regarding the particular ways in which the data texts do or do not fit within them.

In the early stages of this research, my text was alone in the poststructuralist discourse group. My understanding of the defining feature of a poststructuralist text at that time was, and in terms of deconstructionalist forms of poststructuralism (Weedon 1987: 22) still is, that it juxtaposes text. The poststructuralist-discourse group has now grown to nine. This, however, remains quite a contrast from the 275 now in the largest discourse group, liberal-humanist (again, at least according to the particular way in which I have divided the texts here). Earlier configurations included discourse groups such as psycho-analytic, which contained a data text (Gass 1993) that in this particular case has since been subsumed into the New-Age-discourse category. Earlier configurations also did not include an agenda-classification group.

An agenda category evolved out of the discourse category through consideration of Foucault's above-mentioned concern of seeing historically how effects are produced within discourses. A recent intellectual concern with agency (eg Butler 1997a: 7, Levett 2000) is related to this concern with agenda. The word agenda speaks of 'things to be done' (Delbridge 1997: 37) and thus shares with the word agency significations having to do with 'producing effects' (Delbridge 1997: 37). This chapter section discusses a bit more some of the differences I am constructing, and thereby some of the similarities I am finding, between agendas and discourses in this investigation.

Agendas are relevant to educationalist praxis in that education purports to deal in meaning, and meaning is, arguably, inextricably bound with motivation (Gee 1999: 13, Threadgold in Lee 2000: 188). Agendas thus have to do with
discourses in that why we as humans use language in our lives is, in turn, inextricably bound with how we use it. Why we use language is even inextricably bound with the forms that our language itself takes (Voloshinov in Hodge & Kress 1988: 18). There are thus ways in which the discourse labels of this study could just as easily be agenda labels. Science, for example, could perhaps as convincingly be constructed as a scientific agenda rather than a scientific discourse. I construct the distinction in this study, again, not to establish particular categories or placement within a particular category, but to help sort out the reflexivities of thinking, linguistic practices, and effects which surround and permeate these postlinguistic concerns.

Perceived purposes of the Willendorf data texts thus shape the agenda categories in this study. These perceived purposes are gleaned, again like the discourse categories, from textual evidence in the data. A dollar sign or a Euro symbol, for example, might indicate that a text has a commercial purpose. Not all of the perceived and projected purposes for the Willendorf data texts of course exhibit such obvious textuality. In the case of categorising my own text as a Willendorf data-text for this study I, of course, have a much more comprehensive picture than I do for the other data-texts. I categorise my own agenda in this thesis as academic. In this I acknowledge that information represented here in this thesis cannot be separated from its goal of passing an academic degree.

While the thesis has maintained the agenda-classification group, it remains a very uneasy distinction, because the identity formation within discourse (and by discourse, Threadgold 1997: 5) and the motivational factors inherent in agendas are so closely linked as to be inseparable. I persisted in forcing the distinction in this study, however, in my effort to increase my perspectives on the poststructuralist concerns regarding discourses and agendas in general, and in my effort to increase perspectives on my data in particular. In constructing this framework of discourses and agendas, I have thereby endeavoured to draw lines not within a discourse or an agenda, but between discourses and agendas. Recognition that an ability to read constrains as well as enables—whether reading words, images, or categories (or letters, syllables, ideas, or ideals for
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that matter)—might begin to open space to see new ways to read. As students we will see in the following chapters what some of the Willendorf-literature evidence has to say.

Seeing Contra-dictions that Educators & Students have Learned (Not) to See

In the Foucauldian shift from paradigm to discourse, ‘poststructuralism demands radical reflection of our interpretive frames’ (Lather 1991a: 13). As already indicated, in working to resist a ‘hardening of the categories’ (Poynton 2000: 26) there are many ways in which data texts assigned to these discourse and agenda categories both do and do not fit these labels. As an introduction to some of the work of this research, this chapter section describes a little more about the purpose of formulating these dominant discourses and agendas that I identified in working with the Willendorf data, given that from a postlinguistic viewpoint, categories are the most useful when they remain transient. It asks whether or not it is contradictory that we as students have learned to not count items in more than one category.

In basic drawing class my undergraduate fine-arts professor asserted that there are no lines in nature (B. Palchick, personal communication, January 1980). He maintained that there are only, from where you are standing, visible edges between forms you are drawing and their backgrounds. Yet artists use line creatively and successfully all the time. So it is with the lines which frame the identified discourses and agendas in this study. I am describing lines that are not there. I can describe them because they tend to be there from my position, my perspective, my understanding, and my experience. My description of them tends to both enforce and reinforce their inscription, or lack of inscription, by readers of this thesis depending on whether they happen to agree, disagree, or are ambivalent about these descriptions.

This chapter section thus discusses further the effort made in this investigation not to silence differences between the Willendorf texts, but to let them speak for potentially educationally beneficial, multiple postlinguistic perspectives that
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see and allow simulacra. The educational purpose of postlinguistic categories is to help a student to see how she or he is thinking, in this case about framings regarding discourses and agendas, even though these categories are fluid and not necessarily right or wrong. The purpose in this case is thus to explore discursive identity formation and motivational agencies evident in discourses, without necessarily getting caught up in those frameworks that one made up for oneself in order to help oneself think. Just as in the case of symbols, where people tend to get lost in the symbol (Campbell 1990: 96), the main problem I see with frameworks is that people tend to get caught up in the framework. These categories are thereby not useful for me, or to my poststructuralist perspective, in that they are true or false, but again are useful only in so far as they are tools.

Now I believe that the problem does not consist in drawing the line between that in a discourse which falls under the category of scientificty or truth, and that which comes under some other category, but in seeing historically how effects of truth are produced within discourses which in themselves are neither true nor false. (Foucault 1980: 118)

The main way in which I see categories as tools for postlinguistic thought, has to do, again, with the differences between things. This is the case both for categories of discourses and agendas, and for categories in the ways in which we as humans think in order to use language. As previously indicated, the verbal and visual, textual and micro-textual styles in which the Willendorf data identify, present and represent themselves, tend to form patterns. They form patterns in the ways in which they are different or distinct from each other. The previously mentioned juxtaposition, as a defining feature of poststructuralism, is evidence of this. This feature utilises Derrida’s concept of différence, where ‘meaning is produced via the dual strategies of difference and deferral’ (Weedon 1987: 25). In this way difference is not a thing; it is a strategy. This strategy of difference constructs meaning by contrasting what is meant with
what is not meant. It is useful in setting up discourse and agenda categories, by helping to tease out the criteria students are utilising in the process of putting a text into one particular category or other.

In order to do this with printed or internet texts, students examine textual details. It is suggested that micro details can be indicative of larger meso and macro detail (Cirlot 1971: xxxi, Campbell 1991: 71). At least, from what I think of as my integrated-praxis perspective, micro-detail arguably should be indicative (i.e., when micro-textuality is in line with practice, and textuality is in line with ideas and beliefs). When texts do not seem to fit in existing categories, one solution is to create a new category. It is not an idea of some final category that is important, but rather the process, the interrogation, and in some cases the juxtaposition, required in order to make the categorisation. Thus, for me as the researcher and author of this thesis, as knowledge about a text or a discourse develops, that text may change categories virtually endlessly, depending upon how the data is looked at. ‘What we observe is not nature itself, but nature exposed to our method of questioning.’ (Heisenberg 1958: 58)

According to educationalist assumptions I gleaned in growing up in North Dakota in the 60s, the more one learns, the better. The more one learns, the more knowledge one possesses with which to make decisions; the more one learns, the more knowledge one commands with which to justify one's position. One thus has more tools, strategies, or, again following Foucault’s (1980: 114) war analysis, more ammunition. From my postlinguistic perspective—whether right, wrong, good, or bad—juxtaposition may highlight ideas heretofore not realised or fore-grounded. Therefore, a Foucauldian perspective on discourse both forms and informs these tentative categories of discourse and agenda, in working to see afresh.

Evolving perspectives continually re-categorise these poststructurally impermanent divisions, as familiarity with the data grows. Rather than argue for the truth of these categorisations, I work continually in the investigation to highlight anew the particular ways in which I see that a particular text both
does and does not fit these here-attributed categorisations. With my developing reflexive (ie 'discourse on discourse' Lather 1991a: 13) perspective on my own use of language in the research, the research in a similar way also works to highlight the particular ways in which my current language both does and does not fit my developing perspectives. In this way I am not trying to establish difference through my assigned categories and my use of language in this thesis; I am exploring difference. I am not seeking to dis-cover one one-and-only truth which in the process must necessarily silence others. On the contrary, the thesis seeks new ways of noticing meaningful silence(s).

Thus, instead of silencing difference in universalising frameworks, it might be possible to work at the limits of disputes, to focus on the rules (the grammar) of language games which bring participants to the point of conflict. The practical task in such an environment might not be to silence, or enforce a settlement, but to seek novel rules within the various games, to negotiate the auspices of participants' being. (Pavlich & Ratner 1996: 155)

Postlinguistically, I find it interesting that the very same framework, in this thesis a framework of categorisations for example, is just as useful for exploring difference as it has been in the past for establishing difference. This is arguably similar to the realisation that the very means 'by which “sex” is stabilised' (Butler in Threadgold 1997: 6) and normalised by repeated social construction, is also the very means by which it can be destabilised. The difference, so to speak, between exploring and establishing difference by constructing categories, depends upon what one's assumptions are (Gill 2004). Thus, while it is differences that identify the Willendorf discourse categorisations of this research, from a postlinguistic perspective these differences are not necessarily right or wrong, or good or bad in themselves, but carry with them certain advantages and disadvantages. They carry differing abilities to produce effects, such as Foucault's truth effects (1980: 118). It is the gaining of perspectives
about such effects that makes these categories, as tools, useful for this investigation.

Moving from Oppose towards Juxtapose: (A) Venues for Post/Linguistic Education

Chapter eight of this document constructs spaces for multiple academic perspectives on a single page. This construction endeavours to encourage multiple academic perspectives to stand side by side without the expectation of enforcing agreement between them. This page layout for the exploration of accepting multiplicity in texts is in keeping with a postlinguistic perspective in that discourses are allowed space with texts of a perceived like agenda. This work does not match conventional academic concerns in that, as already noted, academic concerns traditionally work to construct a single correct perspective. This concern of a single correct truth is also current Western hegemonic perspective. The power held by this traditional perspective is defended; that is, it is wielded for the purposes of its own defence (eg Sokal 1996a, 1996b, 1998). Academia holds a position of authority within current Western hegemony, and each reflects and reinforces the other (Williams 1989). Current Western hegemonic education reproduces this singular perspective, in part by re-producing singular-perspective language. As students we are trained to decide which voice is correct, or at the very least which voice we prefer. In this regard we tend to turn to the voice of authority: the parent, the teacher, the expert, to be told what it is that we think and why.

I do not mean to say that there is no place for authority or that I am against authority per se. Assuming that in questioning authority I am against authority, from my poststructuralist perspective at least, is in part an effect of our training in binary thought. This training leads one to think (again relevant to education as micro-textually evidenced in the old French syllable due, itself in turn from Latin, in the very word educate, ‘to bring out’ Skeat 1993: 127-128, 131) that if someone questions, critiques, or criticises something, then they must be against it. Perhaps questioning does indicate the possibility of being against a thing in some way, but again for me there are always ways in which
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chapter eight of re-presenting multiplicity (eg multiplicities of meaning in texts, multiplicities of discourses via text, and multiplicities of voice through texts), is for the purpose of exploring these differences without, or at least before, closing down on a settlement of thought.

When I say 'critical', I don't mean a demolition job, one of rejection or refusal, but a work of examination that consists of suspending as far as possible the system of values to which one refers when testing and assessing it. (Foucault 1988b: 107)

The ongoing open-endedness of education for which this thesis argues and chapter eight works to re-present, implies that students and learning facilitators need not remain exclusively in the domain of singular-perspective language learning.

I would like to believe in the multiplicity of sexually marked voices. I would like to believe in the masses, indeterminable number of blended voices, mobile of non-identified sexual marks whose choreography can carry, divide, multiply the body of each 'individual,' whether he be classified as 'man' or as 'woman' according to the criteria of usage. (Derrida in Bordo & Moussa 1993: 116)

This relates to education in that this sort of multiplicity applies not only to sexually marked voices as opposed to gender-trapped bodies, but also to personality and experientially marked voices as opposed to occupation-trapped hierarchies. Exploration within this sort of multiplicity is fascinating and rewarding for education-as-learning in that any particular point can multiply,
upon reflection, into innumerable simulacra. Similarities can be put together in new ways to see new connections and new wholes. The dance of one simulacrum can be traced in its encounters with other simulacra. All that is required is a student, a student with a will, choices, perspectives, and energies. Thus we as students need not remain exclusively in the domain of singular classifications that work to permanently confine certain aspects of thought and language and to permanently liberate others. Rather, we might venture forth into multiple-perspective language learning, and hence into unforeseen effects of such multiple classifications.

The ability to consciously perceive multiple meanings and multiple voices also has a wider purpose, which is to create space for individual options (Weedon 1987: 106) not only through praxis in learning or educational regimes (Case 1998, Lather 1994: 42), but also through the praxis of individuals going about living their lives (Berghoff 1997). The work of opening these spaces has to do, in part, with destabilising binary thought (Hiller 1998: 11), but there are other related issues that this thesis also explores with the Willendorf data. These include not only some of the ways in which binary thought is constructed through text and educational systems, but also other larger issues which Foucault raises, such as the regime of truth. These issues include what constitutes truth, the idea that it is truth that is the issue, and the building of structures regulating access to power on the grounds of that truth.

According to poststructuralist theories of subjectivity (Weedon 1987), students do not even need to venture forth; they need only be aware of, and limit, their re-inscription of established norms. Such new classifications may well not only liberate, but also confine in new ways. Our assumptions regarding these classifications might also then be broad enough to recognise the impermanence of these very confinements and liberations. This recognition might allow students and learning facilitators to access multiple sites in their various struggles, rather than fighting on single ground.

The educational intentions of the thesis—to further both an awareness of lived praxis and a poststructuralist re-cognition of communication practices—are
already present to limited degrees in some educationalist forums. Acknowledgment of the role that subjectivities play within meaning-making (Weedon 1987: 74-106) as it is addressed in this thesis is particularly relevant to, and beginning to be explored in, archaeology (eg Conkey 1997), art history (eg Moxey 1994), communication workshops (eg Killingsworth & Battalio 1998), English literacy (eg Bull & Anstey 1996), English as a second language (eg Wennerstrom 2003: iii), and the visual arts (eg McGinness 1999). Such recognition is perhaps most immediately accessible at tertiary levels. My own educational herstory (Ashby & Ohm 1995, Cartwright 2004b, Ohm 2001) and the Willendorf artefact’s herstory, for example, coincide in a way that would make undergraduate classes in art education a very workable venue for such educational acknowledgment.

Postlinguistic utilisation of this investigation’s Willendorf literature in student art-teacher programs (eg Art & Design Education 2007) would penetrate the education system where student teachers learn about the business of learning. Such educational acknowledgment, however, not necessarily of the Willendorf material in particular, but of such deconstructive critical-literacy, must eventually, and crucially, also be present in primary-school education. This perspective primarily condones not teaching, not do-as-I-say, but praxis (Case 1998: 81). In primary-school education, capacities for learning are arguably both the most available and the most formed by outside agencies. For the moment, however, the thesis begins where it is and proposes its educationalist work for the postgraduate level in lived research-as-education, such as this very study.

**Linearity to Multiplicity: If I were Going There I Would (Not) Start from Here**

‘When one wants to object in some way to the disciplines and all the effects of power and knowledge that are linked to them, what is it that one does, concretely, in real life...?’ (Foucault 1980: 108) This study itself is a multiple-layering of overlapping concerns with which it is very difficult to grapple. Like feminists in regard to the concerns of women (Weedon 1987: 14),
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educationalists within academic institutions concerned with the production of forms of knowledge relevant to the concerns of students, which contribute to the development of practical strategies for change, face difficult but important work. Arguably, one of the reasons for such difficulty is that the research entails a move from two-dimensional language to three-dimensional language, for example, from the over/under binary implication in the word understanding, to the position-orientation of the word perspective. This movement is problematic because each tends to reinforce its own position, not by any fixed position, but by means of its own position. So like the Irishman said, 'If I was going there, I wouldn't start from here!' (J. Mayne, personal communication, 2002). The best place to start in these conditions would be from within the respective position. This starting place relates to the earlier expressed idea of community and communication, where the people one can communicate with already are one's own community. Of course, on the other hand (or pluralistically from an-other position), there is no place to start from other than from where one is. This problem in itself would be difficult enough, even if it were not also the case that more than usual contextualisation is required before one even begins.

There is, I think a need to contextualise myself and the intellectual framework in terms of which I propose to explore the question of language and gender. I work with a tradition in Linguistics which is not or has not been mainstream - and which is therefore not widely known: and I do things with the linguistics which are of a broadly interdisciplinary nature, spanning literary theory, semiotics and post-structuralism or post-modernism - things that often seem problematic to both the linguists and the semioticians. (Threadgold 1988: 41)

This statement was made in regard to gender and language rather than education and language, and it was made nearly twenty years ago now. The
special need to contextualise within a perspective that has not been mainstream, however, applies to both scenarios. The need to contextualise a concern that spans disciplines, in my case not only literary theory, semiotics and poststructuralism but also digital technologies and the visual arts, also still applies. The particular tradition which I work with in this thesis, as an educational researcher, builds upon the language-and-gender work indicated in the quotation on the previous page. This tradition is perhaps now best known as poststructuralist feminist discourse analysis (Threadgold 2007). In addition to this tradition there is also a strong reliance in this thesis upon a growing recognition of the roles of the media, the internet (O’Riley 2003), and the agency of art in education (Kress & van Leeuwen 1996). For example, this thesis analyses the place of images as well as words in discursive sociocultural meaning-making. This concern aligns with Foucault’s idea of 'the performative function of language' (Marshall 1996: 108), and the performativity of which Threadgold has written in more recent years (1997). This concern also adds the ideas of performativity in art, and of art in education, which have trajectories and legacies of their own.

In this sense, my concerns for issues of education in this thesis replace the now more accepted concerns for issues of gender. The very same deconstruction and Foucauldian theory (Weedon 1987: 22) that were of most use to feminists, I argue are also of most use to educationalists. So while I consider myself more an educationalist than a feminist, I recognise the emancipatory potential for minority groups within education, as well as for learning and systems of education themselves, afforded by the legacy of feminist practice. The problem for feminists of course involved forms of emancipation from, and an awareness of co-option in, patriarchy and 'the reproduction of knowledge as power over rather than power for' (Weedon 1987: 14). The problem for educationalists as I see it involves emancipation from, and an awareness of co-option in, dogma (Marshall 1996: 107-109, 111) and the re-production of knowledge as power against rather than the production of power with/in.
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Education as Leading: Hierarchy versus Guidance

The word education is based on the syllable due, which means to lead. On this basis educating can be thought of, not as a telling to students, or a teaching to students, but as a leading of students to the sharing of learning. Educators are in prime positions to foster healthy and beneficial ways by their actions and their practice, in other words by their praxis. Educators are also in prime positions to lead students to healthy educational environments through modelling their own reflexive accountability. (Rosendahl 2002: 24)

The main problem I see as an educationalist is the issue of patronising and unsubstantiated authority. It is related to the gender issue of emancipation from patriarchy, although this is not the issue per se. Further related to this problem are ways in which education's practice seems to be out of line with its broad purported goals such as personal autonomy (Marshall 1996). Foucault challenges assumptions of liberal education such as that individuals are free of the authority and dogma of others, that self-identity is closely related to this freedom, and that education through such freedom can, if not solve human problems, at least relieve the human condition (Marshall 1996: 111). 'That is, in schools and other educational institutions we need to look at our lived practices of teaching and learning in relation to power relations because they may be dominating and subjugating.' (Marshall 1996: 108)

Arguing for open-mindedness makes about as much sense to me as fighting for peace, although one can of course follow the sentiment. While education purports to question and interrogate, its traditional language deals in providing answers. While a thesis is designed to extend thought, it must by definition argue in a way that closes in on meaning, in order to convince. Educationalists seem to want students who are able to think for themselves, but a large part of
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what educationalists seem to learn is how to tell others what to think. It is these ways in which, in my opinion, educationalist praxis as it stands is problematic. This deconstructive critical-literacy study seeks, in a practical way with tangible data, to explore these philosophical postlinguistic issues in education. The thesis considers what its point about knowledge regarding this Willendorf artefact is, given its argument that, postlinguistically, answers are the most useful when they remain questions.

Reflectivity: De- & Re-Scripting the Thesis

Although beginning depends upon the criteria one uses to define that beginning, in one manner of speaking the thesis began life as a special project for a Master's degree in education (Rosendahl 1999). It then graduated to being the Master's dissertation, only for its data contents to be temporarily shelved while much of the theoretical contents were used for that dissertation (Rosendahl 2002). Beginning life afresh in 2003, the thesis document sported a separate MS-Publisher-layout chapter for each of its six identified agendas. This layout was part of the research's strategy to write other/wise (O’Riley 2003: 20) for the purposeful changing of power relationships and generic norms (Threadgold 1988: 49), namely relations between students and educators for the sake of learning itself.

Becoming too large, however, all but the academic chapter that is now chapter eight were removed and set aside. This allowed room for the development of other issues that I also considered to be important strategies in re-presenting the thesis for writing other/wise. These issues included things such as voice (eg academic, active, passive, personal), layout (eg footnotes, double-siding of pages), computer and text juxtaposition illustrations, and special font-effects to show the construction of text in the thesis. In juxtaposing problems within these issues, however, and thereby having to develop things such as chapter cover pages to unify the patchwork that the chapters had become, these chapters again became too large. Some of these chapters and the cover pages were thus again culled and set aside. While some of the special fonts remain in
single chapters where they are appropriate, at various stages these devices permeated the entire text of the document.

Thereby, in working to write other/wise, with a view to bringing my textual praxis in line with my poststructuralist educationalist theories, producing this textual document has been anything but a straightforward process. Perhaps this is in keeping with a text that is setting itself up to critically question dualistic worldviews, binary thought, and linear conceptions of time. After exploring other ways of performing my own praxis, writing, and textuality, I return here in this introductory chapter to translate, not only to others who have remained here where I was before I went on the journey, but also to my former self. I think that progress as an entirely positive process is a misconception. In going through a process one becomes different, in ways that can not help but have both positive and negative effects. Re-turning to where one was before, it is my experience that one tends to relearn valuable lessons that had been lost along the way, in the light of new perspectives. In this relative deconstructive poststructuralist sense, translation is perpetual and will always be in demand.

The greater the process or the journey, the greater the potential gain, but also the more difficult, and necessary, translation back to the land of all the significant other people and places in one's life (Campbell 1973: 205). Such translations of praxis, writing, and textuality do nothing to make the path less time or energy consuming. Coyote, the voice of 'an other' (Lather 1994: 44), had a similar effect in another text on educational discourse. 'Coyote insisted on insinuating her/him/self into my research and my doctoral dissertation de- and re-scripting my thoughts and vocabulary, not to mention prolonging/lengthening the writing process' (O'Riley 2003: 20). Written before, during, and after (Lather 2007: ix) the investigation, and thereby before, during, and after learning that occurred within this study over a period of nine years, this document is itself an artefact, or more precisely a rather large collection of artefacts, in more ways than one.
Dealing with texts referring to an archaeological artefact offers an ideal opportunity to show how far removed a culture can be from that which its discourse signifies, and still convincingly construct the position it has come to condone. That which Western culture's discourse signifies to be 'the supposedly hard facts of social existence' (Geertz 1995: 43) in the case of Willendorf, for example, occurred circa 25,000 years ago. The research asks whether or not the particularities of the Willendorf data support this perspective in dealing with texts.

The boy at my side said, turning his head slightly to the mother, 'Jimmy wrote a paper today on the evolution of man, and Teacher said he was wrong, that Adam and Eve were our first parents'. 'Well, Teacher was right. Our first parents were Adam and Eve.' ...The youngster responded, 'Yes, I know, but this was a scientific paper.' ...The mother, however, came back with another. 'Oh, those scientists!' she said angrily. 'Those are only theories.' And he was up to that one too. 'Yes, I know,' was his cool and calm reply; 'but they have been factualized: they found the bones' (Campbell, J. 1973: 3-4).

Bones and artefacts do not say word for word, two-dimensional image for two-dimensional image how it was, how they themselves have been, or what they have meant for our forebears. Bones and artefacts speak, in a manner of speaking, but it is in a language that is neither verbal nor flat. Rather, bones and artefacts act to enable and to limit what we will and will not think, according to the manner in which we think. I see these bones and artefacts related to Lather's 'limit questions' (2007: 84), and it is not only bones or artefacts that enable and constrain in this manner. Language itself also speaks as it interprets for the purposes of communication. In addition to purposes of
Exploring the Inter-related Educational Issues of Literacy, Contra-diction & Colonisation

communication, other processes of communication also stretch, warp, and affect textual Willendorf significations, as chapter four explores. The research endeavours to explore, and to re-present, ways (including non-true and non-false ways) in which these purposes and processes of communication warp that which they are employed to communicate.

As explored by this thesis and as chapter five works to re-cognise, subjectivities of the present also bias textual Willendorf significations. What it means, from a Western hegemonic perspective, to have found Willendorf as artefactual evidence is potentially different in the subjective hegemonic present than it would be at another time. What it means to have found Willendorf as artefactual evidence is different in a particular student’s personal subjective present than it would potentially be at another time for that student. The existence of this Willendorf artefact does not prove certain subjectivities; it constricts, limits, and silences other subjectivities. The existence of this Willendorf artefact does not prove other subjectivities; it directs and enables certain subjectivities. These certain and other subjectivities both are and are not the case. What a travesty of education it is, to use education’s authority to enforce that one is the case for all and the other is not.

Education has the potential to be, and inherently is, so much more than the superficial enforcement of rote-learned concrete hegemonic practices. With the postlinguistic recognition of relativity, impermanence, and open-endedness, education comes into its own. Of course those rote-learned concrete hegemonic practices can be true. Of course those practices can work. Of course those practices can be beneficial. So much more, however, can also be true; so much more can also work; so much more can also be beneficial. Education is the agency in the optimum position to work continuously to seek out those open-ended cases, that open-ended workability, and those open-ended benefits.

Exploring-the-Issues Summary

This thesis is about what some of the implications for educationalist practice might be, if we as educators are willing to make room in our praxis for
assumptions other than those such as the traditional liberal-humanist view of
the transparency of text. While I understand that the acts of promoting things
such as the transparency of text, giving voice, dialogue, and testifying are liable
to their own sorts of tyrannies (Strathern 2000, Lather 2007: 75), from my
postlinguistic perspective I at the same time find it interesting that a thesis in
education is not allowed to not find a problem to argue. I find it interesting that
a thesis in education is not allowed to not exhibit a command of
convincingness, in a game that speaks of meaning but does nothing if not vie
for power. ""Mainstream semiotics"...attributes power to meaning, instead of
meaning to power." (Hodge & Kress 1988: 1-2) In my opinion it is very much
the case as Foucault says, that no matter how we may speak to the contrary,
we are not in a history that deals in meaning, we are in a history that deals in
power (Foucault 1980: 114). For it is still more the case in my experience that
power dictates definition, than that definition empowers.
Theoretical Literature:
The Post/Linguistic Site of the (Re)Search

Poststructuralist modes of discourse analysis, or postlinguistics, have by their very nature denied the possibility of a 'how to do'. They have argued that the binary separation of metalanguage (or theory) and data (that which is given to be observed and analysed) is already an impossible separation. (Threadgold 2000: 40)

Through deconstruction and reconstructivism, the emerging field of postlinguistics is redefining what can be meaningfully or usefully separated/combined from its new points of view. ‘To mix and combine in the places in which you would analyze—isn’t this hence a good methodology?’ (Serres & Latour in O’Riley 2003: 41) This de- and re- construction extends reflexively in this research to analysis of its own inevitable (Threadgold in Lee 2000: 202, Strathern 2000) use of metalanguage or grand narrative (Natoli 1997: 17-18). Here, the investigation has questioned terms used to attribute agency, by analysing and experimenting with its own use of terms such as the investigation (as in this very sentence), the thesis, the study, the chapter, and the word I (Bordo & Moussa: 1993), etc. This questioning explored which verbs in acceptable English usage can convincingly be paired with which nouns. This questioning pushed the boundaries of English language conventions to
extremes, by at one stage systematically removing or reconstructing every single sentence in the passive voice. It did so in order to get a better sense, a more conscious sense, of the boundaries, limitations, constrictions, and influences of the medium through which it was trying to speak. Remnants of this type of reflexive, deconstructive, postlinguistic analysis are still to be seen in the red-green-and-pink font coding of chapter eight.

None of the agencies signified by nouns, such as those named in the above paragraph, act in isolation as current metalanguage seems to imply. In deciding whether to say the investigation has questioned, for example, or to say I have questioned, I consider which seems the most accurate in the particular context. I do not decide to say one over the other because one is false, per se. That is, I did not do the questioning outside of this investigation, and the investigation did not do the questioning on its own without me. Likewise, there are influences acting upon and informing the theoretical postlinguistic position of this thesis that are not literary sources. English Western hegemonic linguistic traditions, current academic climates, research concerns of my former and current academic institutions, current research concerns of my colleagues and mentors, my own current research concerns, and my current ideals of postlinguistic research praxis as textually lived practice, all converge at the nexus that is the theoretical site of this text.

These influences are also not all in agreement. They are in tension and conflict at various points and in varying importance, vying word for word, micro-textuality for micro-textuality, style for style (eg APA style: American Psychological Association 2001, feminist-poststructuralist style, developing-postlinguistic-praxis style, American spelling and style, Australian spelling and style, avant-guard-academic style etc) in micro- and macro- detailed combat over the finished form the manuscript will take. Given the hegemony and arguable inevitability of metalanguage, the most that this chapter (as part of a traditional thesis) can do to keep faith with its postlinguistic ideals of praxis is to explicate its influences, rather than to ignore, presume, condone, or essentialise them. This is despite the case that there may well be better ways to accurately re-present itself. In other words, in keeping with its postlinguistic
perspective, the most a single narrative can do with its metalinguistic textuality is to put these influences back in play as it were, and to never stop working to keep them in question.

By exhibiting the research's theoretical literary sources in quotations and in parenthetical references and by verbally performing my position (in an explored academic voice) regarding those literary textual sites in this chapter, I map the postlinguistic herstory of this research. In doing so, I show some of the literary evidence that has led me to the theoretical stance that I take. In the course of doing so, I also endeavour to indicate why this theoretical stance is best named postlinguistic. The answer lies not only within herstories/histories, but also within this research's combined concerns of textuality, power, and reconstruction.

The literary textual sites of this chapter represent key herstoric feminist poststructuralist perspectives and historic concepts, which inform my position in the ways in which I agree with those perspectives and concepts. These sites also work to define my position in the ways that I tend to disagree with those re-presented perspectives and concepts. The perspectives and concepts include the linguistic structuralism of Saussure (1986), the deconstruction of Derrida (1997a), and the radical work of Foucault (Horrocks & Jevtic 1999: 172). They include the poststructuralist theory of Weedon (1987), the sociocultural discourse analysis of Gee (1990, 1997, 1999), and the feminist research of Lather (1991a, 1991b, 1994, 1996, 1997, 2000, 2007) and Lather and Smithies (1997). These perspectives and concepts also include the postlinguistics of Threadgold (1988, 1997, 2000) and Lee (1996, 2000), and the rhizoanalytic educational explorations of O'Riley (2003). This chapter also further discusses the apparent oxymoron of a poststructuralist thesis (ie a deconstructive argument) that I raised in chapter one.

The genealogy this chapter maps is thereby a very brief herstory of postlinguistics as it pertains to the perspective of this Willendorf research project. This mapping (point-in-the-text for point-in-the-text, literary source for literary source, simulacra for simulacra, the same but never quite the same) and
its acknowledgment as my particular perspective, is the strongest way in which my traditional academic position and my postlinguistic praxis position is the same position.

Back through 
**Saussurean Linguistics & Structuralism**

In the expression of its combined focus on poststructuralism and language, the term *postlinguistics* encapsulates the theoretical position of the research. This one word taps the academic thought that undergirds this work, and is thereby the rhizome through which the chapter surveys its sources. It is perhaps a curious marriage, the term *linguistics* with its prefix *post*. In adding post to its name, postlinguistics works to add to its agenda the underlying motivator inherent in all terms with the prefix *post* (e.g., postfeminism, Phoca & Wright 1999). Among other imperatives, one imperative is to exceed the confines of the signifiers they precede, while still oddly and inescapably residing within those signifiers. In other words, postlinguistics is still inescapably linguistics. In a certain sense, the term *postlinguistics* is a marriage between poststructuralist theory and linguistics, where poststructuralist theory informs linguistics and linguistic theory conforms poststructuralism.

The most important distinction between this chapter [entitled ‘Poststructuralism and discourse analysis’] and Poynton’s (chapter 2) [entitled ‘Linguistics and discourse analysis’] is that Saussure’s work, although it keeps reappearing here like the ghost in the machine, is not the beginning point for these poststructuralist stories as it is for the linguistic stories. Poststructuralist narratives look back through Saussure (a little like his metaphor of the sign as a two-sided piece of paper) to the philosophy of Husserl, Nietzsche, Hegel and Kant among others, sometimes influenced by, sometimes contesting these earlier positions. (Threadgold 2000: 40)
In another sense, the marriage of the term *linguistics* with its prefix *post* is a doubling up on language, because the centrepiece of poststructuralism already is language (Richardson 1994: 518). Most significantly then, in changing the root of its name from structuralism to linguistics (ie in moving from poststructuralism to postlinguistics) postlinguistics stresses precisely that part of poststructuralism which makes a liberatory and emancipatory praxis possible, namely the unfixability of subjectivity and consciousness through language (Weedon 1987: 21).


Poststructuralist theories as presented by Weedon (1987), Cherryholmes (1988), and Lather (1991a, 1991b, 1994, 1996), however, are the inceptive textual sites formulating what postlinguistics means for this research. This
research works to construct the open-ended nature of poststructuralist thought as not only useful within education (Davies 1994, Alloway & Gilbert 1997: 59-61), but also as education itself. ‘We make things disappear by naming them as if we knew what they were.’ (Fuller, R. 1995: 36) Utilising poststructuralism within feminist contexts (eg Schutte 2000: 47-48, Weedon 1987) relates particularly to this current postlinguistic project both in its anti-discrimination strategies in their own right, and to the degree that the data literature itself deals in feminist issues. Other earlier theories relevant to this research, the implications of which feminist authors and scholars continue to explore, are linguistic theory (Cameron 1992), literary theory (Eagleton 1986), postmodernist theory (Benhabib 1996, Fraser, N. & Nicholson 1990, Soper 1996, Waugh 1996), and deconstruction (Poovey 1996). These textual sites comprise the research’s grounding in feminist poststructuralism, and thereby inform the research’s approaches to the postlinguistic analyses of its Willendorf literature.

**Derridian De/Construction**

I consider myself a poststructural deconstructionist, a person willing to look to the relationship between different texts (Weedon 1987: 22) ad infinitum, in order to see what I can see (a *will to see*). As a discourse analyst, however, I must also have a point (Gee 1999: 7-8). I note that what is signified here by the term *a point* is, by its nature and as constructed by language, singular rather than multiple. Furthermore, as a doctoral student I must produce a thesis in which by definition I argue, maintain, and defend a position, proposition, or specific view (Delbridge 1997: 2198, Kirkpatrick 1984: 362, Mish 1993: 1224, Swannell 1993: 1136; a *will to convince*). I note that what is signified here by the term *a position* is also, by its nature and as constructed by language, singular rather than multiple. This apparent paradox between multiplicity (ie the relativity of poststructuralism and the suspension of judgement, Foucault 1988b: 107) and singularity (the convincingness of a thesis based upon achieving the status of “‘truth’...by definition fixed, absolute and unchanging”, Weedon 1987: 131) is only resolved for me by considering each (ie the regimes of multiplicity and singularity, respectively) not as foundational truths

So while I consider that poststructuralism would no more argue a case than a thesis would deconstruct one, as an educationalist intent upon bringing my practice in to closer alignment with my thinking (ie intent upon praxis, Lather 1991b, 1994: 42, 2007), I persist with the combination. Both of these approaches, the latter by requirement and the former by emergence-cy, are thus utilised in the course of this research-as-education.

My question then, in this educationalist thesis, is which of these is the most important for education, or in other words, which of these is (or should be) imbedded in which. The question is do we (those involved in education) see in order to convince, or convince in order to see. As an educationalist who lives to learn and to facilitate learning, my current perspective in changing literacies and changing education (Lankshear 1997) is unequivocally the latter. According to current accepted definitions of a thesis (based upon basic ideas that Foucault tried to show change through time: Dreyfus 1997, Carlson & Apple 1998: 11), however, my performativity and textual practice (Lather 2007: 83-84, the very praxis for education for which in this research I argue and deconstruct), cannot here match my perspective in this regard. The Foucauldian quotation opening this thesis speaks directly to this issue (of convincing over seeing as it currently stands in philosophical argument, Lather 1991b: 10).

It is clear to me that one cannot argue and defend without something to argue and defend. My position is that what I defend are ideas, ideals, and (to use a very problematic word, Leitch 1992: 2-3, Lather 2007: 104-105) ideologies that come from individuals, from accounts by individuals, from society, from the cultures in which they were spawned via agencies (Bordo and Moussa 1993: 110-112) that arguably neither educationalists nor philosophers fully understand. By the same token, I cannot deconstruct and see, without something to deconstruct and see (although admittedly such things abound,
given that from a poststructuralist perspective, phenomena, Leitch 1992: 3; Silverman, J. & Rader 2005, 'the visual, the filmic, the spatial' Threadgold 1997: 2, and the corporeal, Threadgold 1997: 2, Kamler 1997, can also be texts, and thereby can also be deconstructed). In this way, I argue that while both theoretical argument and poststructuralist deconstruction (Bernasconi 1997) can in some ways themselves be construed as ideas, ideals, or ideologies—for the purpose of this research I consider them both to be tools of education and learning that are seemingly at odds, but connected in the wills of students and educators. Speaking for myself personally, I live in the hope that students and educators also continue to be 'readers and viewers' (About English 2007), 'reading and viewing' (Australian Education Council 1994: 8-9) in order, not just to convince others (and themselves), but also to see what they can see.

Turning from the problematic praxis between deconstruction and argument then, to deconstruction itself, Derrida's idea of differance (Derrida 1997c: 23; Weedon 1987: 13), is a key analytical postlinguistic tool used in this project. It is a key exposing and identifying tool of juxtaposition, difference, and differentiation. It belies the idea that what a student is reading or writing about is here, or to use the theoretical terminology: metaphysically present (Weedon 1987: 13). As raised in the Foucault's-Power-Knowledge-and-Bio-Power section of the last chapter and the quotation opening this chapter, in addition to the creative or generative aspect of putting things together in new ways (as in re-presenting, framing, or re-constructing), postlinguistics also involves separating things in new ways (as in deconstruction). It involves working to see, for example, 'how texts work and how literacy itself works' (Anstey & Bull 1996: 191) by juxtaposing texts and by keeping things in question. As also previously noted, this is the case whether those texts and that literacy are verbal or visual (Anstey & Bull 2000; Dondis 1973; Kress & van Leeuwen 1996; Mitchell, W. J. T. 1994).

Visual literacy is highly relevant to all of the Willendorf data texts. It is directly relevant in a majority of the Willendorf data texts in that they represent the artefact within their own textuality. It is indirectly relevant in the remainder of the Willendorf data texts by association, in that they refer to an artefact that is
visual. There are a number of trajectories that attend the 'word and image' (Mitchell, W. J. T. 1994: 1-8) nexus. These are trajectories such as illustration traditionally supporting written text, text traditionally anchoring visual art, and the traditional scholarly hierarchy between the fine arts and visually-unadulterated verbal philosophical texts. By constantly listing them (verbal and visual) separately I do not mean to suggest that the textual delineation between them is simple, straightforward and clear. I intend, rather, to begin to make explicit some of the often unacknowledged work accomplished by the visual in texts, both on obvious and less obvious levels.

Deconstruction is important, not to destroy or debilitate structures, although as Moxey (1994: 1), Lather (1994: 51), and Halpern (2001) point out this can also happen in the process. Deconstruction is important, rather, to disrupt, to question, and to re-view them.

Deconstruction moves against stories that appear to tell themselves. It creates stories that disclose their constructed nature. (Lather 1991b: 129)

In this praxis-oriented thesis, inhabited nexus of postlinguistic deconstruction are at work. They are at work to take apart, for example, postlinguistics itself as a word by means of the virgule in the subtitle of the thesis. These underlying nexus are at work to see how the prefix post might be working on the term linguistics. They are at work to investigate in what ways the term postlinguistics both does and does not signify linguistics. The poststructuralist micro-textuality of the virgule in the word post/linguistics paradoxically works to re-combine. In this way this poststructuralist word formation endeavours to signify more than, both, and neither, of these two verbal components.

Deconstruction is important in order both to expose and to utilise the workings of language with everyone, not only admittedly and openly, but also consciously. That is, this research endeavours to explore the workings of
language not in order to enforce its self-discovered truths upon others, but as a possible exemplar for the self-responsibility of its own learning and insight. This is in relation to its own habituation (Pheng in Threadgold 1997: 84), its habitation (Threadgold 2000: 58), and its self-inhabited worlds (Derrida 1997b: 24).

Grosz describes deconstruction in terms of disrupting binaries, and shows one way of using juxtaposition:

While impossible to freeze conceptually, deconstruction can be broken down into three steps: (a) identify the binaries, the oppositions that structure an argument; (b) reverse or displace the dependent term from its negative position to a place that locates it as the very condition of the positive term; and (c) create a more fluid and less coercive conceptual organisation of terms which transcends a binary logic by simultaneously being both and neither of the binary terms. (in Lather 1991a: 5)

Part of deconstruction's valuable task of prying open binary thinking and argument is the separation-for-the-putting-together of multiple and plural ways of knowing (Lather 1991b; Knobel & Lankshear 1999). Prying open binary thinking and argument is not the only task of deconstruction in this project, but since dualism is so prevalent in Western hegemony, it is a common one. Other tasks include seeing in ways we have not yet seen, and thinking in ways we have not yet thought to think. Deconstruction is a poststructuralist tool that 'helps us ask questions about what we have not thought to think, about what is most densely invested in our discourse/practices, about what has been muted, repressed, unheard in our liberatory efforts' (Lather 1991b: 156). If education is about anything I say it is about learning, and if learning is about anything it is about questioning. This is why poststructuralism's imperative of questioning, of keeping things from settling too much, of keeping things in play, is in my
opinion such an invaluable perspective for education, for educators, for students, for learners, for readers, and for individuals who themselves are alive, dynamic, and at play in the world.

**Foucauldian Technologies**

Other literary sources from philosophy which are relevant to this postlinguistic genealogy include perhaps most notably the work of Foucault, where ‘...too much Foucault is barely enough...’ (Matthews 1994). As well as works by Foucault himself, many of the sources undergirding this postlinguistic project are works that cite, describe and discuss Foucault. These include not only works such as Barrett (1991), Bouchard (1977), Rabinow (1991), McNay (1992), McHoul & Grace (1993), and Horrocks and Jevtic (1999), but also importantly from my gender-studies background as an educational researcher: Weedon (1987), Lather (1991b), and Cameron (1992). In one word, Foucault's work is associated with power (C. Hiller, personal communication, 1998); it has been used to bolster the arguments of art historians, feminists, and political theorists of the disenfranchised Left (Horrocks & Jevtic 1997: 172). Foucault is also well known for his work on 'regimes of truth' (eg Foucault 1980: 133, Gore 1993: 50, Lather 1994: 41, Rosendahl 2002: 161) and how cultural ideas, normally taken to be permanent truths about human nature and society, change through time (Dreyfus 1997). As a thesis on communication and power, Foucault's work is important to this research in both of these key ways.

The word *technology* (translated from the French) as used by Foucault (likewise the word *technologies* in the title *Technologies of the Self*, Foucault 1988c) is also important to note in this theoretical-position outline because it gives cues and clues as to a reconstructed way of thinking about discourses that are important for this study. This usage is summarised in the following quotation:

> The 'economy' of discourses—their intrinsic technology, the necessities of their operation, the tactics they employ, the effects of power which underlie them and which they transmit—this, and not
Technology in this sense is Foucault's perspective on how discourses work, as opposed to how education (or what we have learned) may have led us to think that they work (ie via a system of representations). Technology in this sense is thus in some ways in tension with praxis as 'theory itself becoming practical—the opposite of pragmatism' (Tiedemann in Lather 1994: 42). That is, praxis is what I am pragmatically (ie in the face of socially inscribed limitations and constraints) working within (and working against) in trying to make my idealistic poststructuralist theories, themselves, practical.

Also featuring in this Foucauldian section of this postlinguistic-genealogy chapter (as well as featuring in the Willendorf artefact itself) is the importance of textually evident objective and subjective attitudes to the human body. 'The concept of the body has come to be among the most powerful resources for feminist work in certain contexts in recent years.' (Threadgold 1997: 4) Thereby for this research, one of the most important ways of thinking about the body relates to the Foucauldian idea of technologies acting on the self. This is in addition to the ways in which the Willendorf data is appropriated as a body for the sake of living bodies within discourses. This Foucauldian idea implicates bodies in technologies of their own domination (Foucault 1978/1990: 116, Weedon 1987: 97).

Technologies of domination then essentially act on the body, classifying and objectifying individuals. But in so far as these objective classifications are adopted and accepted by individuals, so their selves are also constructed. (Marshall 1996: 117)
(Re)View of the Theoretical Literature
Post/Linguistic Site of the (Re)Search

This relates to the 'question of "complicity with oppression"' (Weedon 1987: 84) in that according to poststructuralist accounts of subjectivity, individuals (knowingly or otherwise) contribute to the very processes that keep them in the places they may be attempting to leave behind.

Weedon & Subjectivity

'A poststructuralist position on subjectivity and consciousness relativises the individual's sense of herself by making it an effect of discourse which is open to continuous redefinition and which is constantly slipping.' (Weedon 1987: 106)

If this position, which is my position (Rosendahl 1998a), is tenable, then education needs to deal with these discursive effects as discursive effects and not as something solid, essential, and permanent. It needs to deal with them as discursive effects and not as something external to cultural assumptions, experience, and action. If this position is tenable, then education needs to deal in them as discursive effects and not as something that has nothing to do with cultural constructions. According to some perspectives, the source of textual meaning has already been relocated in negotiations between readers, writers and texts (Threadgold 1997: 2). Therefore, educators must at least know that these alternate poststructuralist positions exist, and they must know what the benefits of these positions are, not only for individuals of marginalised groups such as those of gender and race, but also for individuals of hegemonic groups such as readers and students.

What this means for this educational research is that it has a responsibility to learn and lead the way in exploring subjectivity as a discursive effect, not only in its lip service, but also in its praxis. Education has a responsibility, for itself and its students, to know more about a potentially beneficial perspective that sees research as 'asking new questions out of reflexive encounters and re-encounters with our practice' (Lather 1994: 42). It has a responsibility to know more about a perspective that sees 'the micropolitical practices of representation of self and others in situated inquiries' (Lather 1994: 42) not only as relevant, but also as crucial.
Education has a responsibility to know more about, for itself and its students, a potentially beneficial perspective that sees individual subjectivity and consciousness as continuously redefined, surrounding and permeating us every day (Weedon 1987: 33, 105-106). Education has a responsibility to faithfully model, for itself and its students, a perspective that includes these poststructuralist viewpoints where subjectivity and consciousness are open and constantly slipping. Such viewpoints on subjectivity and consciousness arguably prompted Foucault to say 'do not ask who I am and do not ask me to remain the same' (Horrocks & Jevtic 1997: 3). Education, as a vehicle for learning, not only what within the traditions of what has been known but also within the trajectories of what it is possible to know, has a lot to gain by promoting such a viewpoint.

**Gee, the Sociocultural & Building Things through Language**

For those of us who work in the area of sociocultural (really, Discourse) approaches to language and literacy, there is some bite to this perspective on humans and texts. The bite is this: it makes absolutely no sense to take the text out of the coordinations it is in, its trajectory through 'coordination space', and the Discourses which render all this meaningful. Outside these it is, quite literally, meaningless, unrecognizable, nothing (the same is true also, of course, not just for texts, but, for instance, for various tools and technologies, as well). In this sense, there is no other approach to texts, language, and literacy than a sociocultural one. (Gee in Lankshear 1997: xvi)

A major difference between traditional linguistics and postlinguistics is the recognition by postlinguistics of language per se as part of larger systems. This extended purview is, further, not limited to only certain ways of thinking about
a wider context, but ever open to new combinations of ways to expand or refresh contextual purviews. These new combinations might include trajectories of micro-meso-macro-levels, of reflexivity, or of power politics (Harris 1993). In having concern for access to power, Foucauldian methods investigate why individuals and cultures build things through language in the particular ways that they do. New combinations of extending purviews might include trajectories of performativity, or of creativity, or of still other ways that educationalists may not yet have recognised or had the need to re-cognise.

In having concern for how systems and structures work, discourse analysis investigates the ways in which individuals (and individuals collectively and reflexively through social cultures) build things through language (Gee 1999: 11-12, 85-86). This includes, but again is not confined to, the more traditional linguistic semiology (Cameron 1992: 14), or study of semiotics (Hodge & Kress 1988, ie the study of sign systems, Gee 1999: 82). Semiotics in isolation has been criticised for not sufficiently taking in to account the 'functions and social uses of semiotic systems, the complex interrelations of semiotic systems in social practice, all of the factors which provide their motivation, their origins and destinations, their form and substance' (Hodge & Kress 1988: 1). In beginning to extend the purview of mainstream semiotics, social semiotics (Hodge & Kress 1988, Halliday in Threadgold 1997: 90) investigates, among other things, the part that writers and readers play as participants in semiotic activities. 'Logonomic systems prescribe social semiotic behaviours at points of production and reception, so that we can distinguish between production regimes (rules constraining production) and reception regimes (rules constraining reception)' (Hodge & Kress 1988: 4)

Anyone who has played a certain communication game known as the telephone game or Chinese whispers (Delbridge 1997: 385) has encountered the outcome of failed production, failed reception, or both, where some semblance of resultant meaning is nonetheless required. In this party game, a person whispers a short message to her neighbour. The whispering continues down the line from neighbour to neighbour, until the person at the end of the line announces the message she heard. The announced message often bears
little resemblance to the initially whispered message. Here production regimes also come into play in making sense of a statement that a player may have only partially heard. This game begins to highlight some of the problems at the best of times, technical and otherwise, inherent in acts of communication. It is yet another example of the tentative way in which acts of signification might appropriately be treated.

Agencies at work in this game include homonyms and the serendipity of other non-related words that happen to sound the same in the English language. These agencies co-mingle with other grammatical English language rules, among other things, to produce a resulting message. Like these agencies, additional agencies such as discourses and agendas co-mingle with grammatical English language rules to produce resulting messages. Although in some cases they are very difficult to access, these agencies are nonetheless of postlinguistic concern.

Thus, while I look through the lens of written language in this postlinguistic project, I do not seek to explore the problem of meaning-making within language per se. Rather, my postlinguistic view in this research is that language supports and interplays with virtually innumerable contextual factors, and, crucially, inevitably exhibits cues and clues. These cues and clues include both those that are intentional and those that are sometimes unintentional, both those that are noticed and those that are sometimes unnoticed. Merely those factors that research investigators choose to look at, reach the gaze (Foucault 1994: 132) and come into focus. From my postlinguistic perspective in this research, this occurs reflexively and via praxis, whether students and educators choose to acknowledge and re-cognise it or not.

Lather, Praxis & the Unsaid/Unheard

'Praxis is the self-creative activity through which we make the world.' (Bottomore in Lather 1991b: 11) It relates to all of the other postlinguistic rhizomes discussed in this chapter, and as previously indicated, is the name of the game, so to speak, for this research project. Praxis relates to linguistics and
structuralism in that these are ‘habit, custom’ (Delbridge 1997: 1682), ‘customary practice or conduct’ (Mish 1993: 915). It relates to deconstruction in this research project in that deconstruction is one of the main performances, so to speak, of analysis for the investigation. In other words, it is what the investigation does. It relates to Foucauldian technologies in that what educators, students, readers, and writers do, contributes to the “economy” of discourse (Foucault 1978/1990: 68-69) and to ‘technologies of domination’ (Marshall 1996: 117). Praxis relates to subjectivity in this research in that the personal is political (Weedon 1987: 5-6, 41, 74). It relates to building things with language in that this, too, is an activity in which (consciously or not) individuals and cultures engage. Praxis relates to performativity and poiesis in that it, too, is generative, and it relates to analytic authority in its capacity as expert exemplar, or ‘a set of examples for practice’ (Delbridge 1997: 1682).

Oddly, not saying things is also something that educators and writers do. In this perspective a negative (not saying a thing) is a positive (doing something); it is a silence.

Language is delimitation, a strategic limitation of possible meanings. It frames; it brings into focus by that which goes unremarked. While the silences of my own writing are subject to some comment in what follows, I am keenly aware that I write in a time when the formerly unsaid/unheard are becoming increasingly visible and audible. Historical "others" move to the foreground, challenging and reshaping what we know of knowledge. (Lather 1991b: xix)

The word unsaid is not a particularly common word and yet it has so many trajectories. Perhaps it is because of its lack of prevalence that some of these trajectories are more visible than others. In its negativity/positivity it can be contrasted with the signifiers unremarked and unheard in the above quotation. Likewise it is possible to group and thus contrast it with the signifiers unsayable
and *unthought*. Within the signifier *unsaid* itself, a distinction can be made between some of the reasons why the unsaid is unsaid. One of these reasons is the impossibility of remarking upon everything; philosophically there is not, and could never be, enough time or space. Necessarily, therefore, some things always inevitably go unsaid. The enforced prioritising of this necessity, however, is very telling of values. Evidence of values is very important for research such as this, which investigates mechanisms and technologies of the making of meaning.

Because the unsaid does not overtly appear in written text, researchers require ingenious strategies in order to examine it. Derrida's deconstruction as previously discussed is one such strategy. The unsaid as an omission, as something that is missing, can also be telling of motivations or values. By asking the critical-literacy question, who's interests are being served by this missing thing not being overtly stated, a critical reader learns potential clues about the writing site.

The unthought is related to textual signification in that, like that which signifiers work to signify, it remains elusive. In other words, both the unthought and the unsaid persistently and elusively hover in and amongst the signifiers that would attach to them. These are both that which signifiers work to signify (ie the said), and that which they do not work to signify (ie the unthought).

Reading means being ready to catch a voice that makes itself heard when you least expect it, a voice that comes from an unknown source, from somewhere beyond the book, beyond the author, beyond the convention of writing: from the unsaid, from what the world has not yet said of itself and does not yet have the words to say. (Calvino in Breathnach 1995: 477)
The unthought relates to the emancipatory imperative of this Willendorf research project in that it highlights the non-essentiality of the status quo. The unthought beckons to the ideals of educators and students. It beckons in terms of the ways in which reading, writing, and knowing have not yet been in the world.

The unsayable, although potentially no less supportive of the status quo than other omissions, is more tangible to the degree that the unsayable is prohibited. This is not that which is impossible to say, but something much more of traditional emancipatory concern. It involves the politics of that which goes unsaid because external and internalised authorities do not allow it. It is taboo, tapu, banned, forbidden.

The unheard relates to problems of reception, which can nonetheless be caused by assumption-supportive omissions. If a student or learning facilitator does not expect a statement or an aspect of a statement to be present, she or he will tend to not notice it even if it is there. I consider that educational forums at the primary school level are in ideal positions to encourage an ability to receive, because primary-school students have not quite yet learned what they are supposed to hear and what they are not supposed to hear.

If a student or learning facilitator says something and for whatever reason the receiver does not hear it, from the perspective of the receiver it remains unsaid. In this way, it is impossible to say something that the receiver does not already have the ability to receive. This relates to the community of communication discussed in chapter one. It also relates, again, to the emancipatory imperative of this Willendorf research project in terms of praxis. The status quo, whatever that is at any particular time and place, tends to be proliferated because it is in play. It highlights that whatever group is speaking, this constriction of reception confines that group to speaking exclusively to that group. This is insofar as the group comprises people who already have the ability to hear what they are working to say. In other words, the degree to which postlinguists are people with postlinguistic perspectives is the degree to which this
constriction of reception confines postlinguists to speaking of postlinguistics to postlinguists.

**Threadgold & Performativity**

My idea of performativity in this study is that written texts are performances, just as all speech acts are performances. This is whether or not a student focuses on the performance in relation to the body (Butler 1997), in relation to itself textually as a performance, or in relation to other perspectives on these acts as performances. Just as education cannot be changed at the level of language alone (Weedon 1987: 106), it is not my idea that learning disadvantage by readers and students can be ameliorated at the level of speech acts alone.

Discursive practices are embedded in material power relations that also require transformation for change to be realised (Weedon 1987: 106). My argument, however, is that language plays a key role in such power relations. Textual performativity for me thus stands in complex relation to material effects. Such effects, and text acts themselves, thus both enable and constrain what is convincing and what is possible. Performativity in this study is therefore a performance in the sense of a theatrical rehearsal (Threadgold 1997: 7, 84) where the body of the actor (just as the words or the body of a text) cannot be transformed into another differently lived or crafted body in accordance with any simple single theory, practice, or praxis.

**Lee & Analytic Authority**

'Together, the question of analytic authority, the question of textuality and writing, and the attendant underpinning oppositions which structure the field, form a major complex of issues that discourse analysis as an emerging scholarly field needs to address.' (Lee 2000: 189) As a poststructural discourse analyst in education, I take very seriously Lee's challenge to discourse analysts 'to account reflexively for the textuality of their own texts' (Lee 2000: 202, Lee in Rosendahl 2002: 113, 122) in their academic and emancipative endeavours. Like the common-sense assumption of the transparency of text (Weedon 1987:
(Re)View of the Theoretical Literature
Post/Linguistic Site of the (Re)Search

78), the authority of analytic texts is often assumed and thereby often goes unquestioned. I do not mean to suggest that one can ever sufficiently account for one's own text, or for someone else's text for that matter, but I nonetheless agree that one must also present this accounting in the 'speaking for, about, and to, others' (Lee 2000: 202) of discursive analysis.

O'Riley & Rhizopoiesis

'A poiesis, a making' (Threadgold 1997: 1), a rewriting, a performance, is to a degree a creation. I do not mean to suggest that this creative element is the whole story, but not to acknowledge its presence at all, as scientific discourse seems to persist in doing, is equally extreme. ‘Threadgold comments in a recent interview that critical discourse analysis “has never talked enough about the making...the generative nature of the meaning of texts, the process and the metaphor of performativity”’ (Lee 2000: 200-201). It is important for education, as a promoter of learning, to acknowledge or at the very least to explore this role of creativity in discursive practices and meaning-making. It is my poststructuralist position that this creative aspect is a crucial aspect to recognise in order to engender any sort of change, whether that change involves gender and racial discrimination or student and reader disadvantage.

In that, poststructurally, discursive effects on individual subjectivity are made in increments, reconstituted each time we think, speak (Weedon 1987: 33), read, or write, we need to recognise the possibility for change the same way (ie in small increments every time we think, speak, read, or write). As a student of both education and art, it is my intention in this investigation to highlight the potentially emancipative role played by that which is creative, and arguably present, in all discursive practices. My theory or voice is also but one small increment in the postlinguistic direction for which this textual performance, in the form of a philosophical, doctoral, educational thesis, argues. The thesis is itself a site that comprises increments both of time and of the influences of powerful individuals affecting the site. ‘My voice is one voice in a chorus of many voices, and together we map a creative pastiche, a rhizopoiesis, a “valid”
No set of research tools and no theory belongs to a single person, no matter how much academic style and our own egos sometimes force (or tempt) us to write that way. I have freely begged, borrowed, and patched together. If there is any quality in my work, it is primarily in the 'taste' with which I have raided others' stores and in the way I have adapted and mixed together the ingredients and, thereby, made the soup. Some will, of course, not recognize the ingredient they have contributed, or, at least, not want to admit they do after they taste my soup. If there are occasional 'inventions,' their only chance for a 'full life' is that someone else will borrow them and mix them into new soup. (Gee 1999: 5)

'Learning again will require displacing image and information with a shared and storied engagement in the world, reshaping western patriarchal techné into a more poetic techné as poiesis and poethics joining body, spirit, and land.' (O'Riley 2003: 145)

In this ideal text, the networks are many and interact, without any one of them being able to surpass the rest; this text is a galaxy of signifiers, not a structure of signifieds; it has no beginning; it is reversible; we gain access to it by several entrances, none of which can be authoritatively declared to be the main one; the codes it mobilizes extend as far as the eye can reach, they are indeterminable (meaning here is never subject to a principle of determination, unless by throwing dice); the systems of meaning can take over
this absolutely plural text, but their number is never closed, based as it is on the infinity of language. (Barthes 1975: 5-6)

Above, Barthes describes my ideals as an educationalist researcher for the potential plurality of text. Perhaps oddly, at the completion of this study I no longer see this necessarily, or primarily, as a change in the text (although this is always also a possibility), but as a change in my assumptions as a student, expert, and educator in reading and viewing a text.

**Theoretical-Literature Summary**

This theoretical-literature chapter has represented some of the landmark literary sites that have guided this postlinguistic research project. The chapter is reflexively both the inception site of this postlinguistic research and informed by that very research. That is, I drafted it before the work of the body of the research and revised it during and after that work. The chapter has cited its relevant literature through the key postlinguistic links or rhizomes of linguistics, structuralism, deconstruction, Foucauldian technologies, subjectivity, the sociocultural, praxis, the unsaid, the unheard, performativity, analytic authority, and rhizopoiesis. For the first-time reader, these signifiers begin to sketch out the theoretical postlinguistic position, concerns, and perspectives of this liberatory project. Thus, rather than treat these terms as ultimately definable, the chapter has endeavoured to treat them as placeholders to cues and clues about these perspectives in current usage and as they pertain to postlinguistics at the particular nexus that is this Willendorf-literature research. To use an ocean metaphor for the precariousness of the temporary fixing of meaning (Weedon 1987: 105), these rhizomes of academic thought form the philosophic islands volcanically bubbling up from the ever-changing, unstable postlinguistic sea, which reflexively spawns, constitutes, and informs this investigation.
Rather than the illusory 'value-free' knowledge of the positivists, praxis-oriented inquirers seek emancipatory knowledge. Emancipatory knowledge increases awareness of the contradictions distorted or hidden by everyday understandings, and in doing so it directs attention to the possibilities for social transformation inherent in the present configuration of social processes. (Lather 1991b: 52)

As the methodology chapter, this chapter works to explain my awareness of the rigour and systematicity I employ while performing this postlinguistic investigation. In using the polyvocal words informing, rhizoanalysis, representation, and ideals in its title and headings, the chapter works to represent the reflexivity and the interconnectedness inherent in the agencies of method with which it is concerned. In using the deconstructive spelling c(t)s instead of the letter x in the words praxis and reflexivity, the chapter headings work to open up the genealogy of meaning-making for these words. They do this by highlighting their historical relationships to the words practice and reflection, respectively. The chapter subtitle, systems of praxis, works to encapsulate this project’s approach to its methods of research.
This research is a qualitative survey of literature on a particular artefact in the sense that the 'data is...analysed using content analysis techniques' (Knobel & Lankshear 1999: 91). Broadly speaking, I take an ideographic approach to methods (Burns 1997: 3). This qualitative, naturalistic, phenomenological mode emphasises the importance of subjective experience. In this study, the emancipative imperative of praxis further informs this phenomenological approach. Here, in part, the subjective focus of the research develops from the individual subjectivities with which the research engages. The subjectivity of the research itself includes poststructuralist and feminist frameworks that 'acknowledge how language constructs both a representation of experience and a positioning of readers and writers in relations of power' (Hiller 1998: 4).

This approach is representational in that the thesis document is not representing the investigation without reflexive thought and conscious consideration, deliberation, and experiment. Rather, the representation is the lens and the materiality through which the thesis document is the investigation. In keeping with its postlinguistic perspective, where pertinent, the methodology works to adhere not only to traditional scientific and academic representation but also to re-produce its academic, feminist, and poststructuralist, social-science ideals. In other words, rather than performing the investigation in order to have something to represent, the performance of thesis representation dictates that which the research investigates. Thereby from the outset, this thesis report overtly makes its investigation via the orientation of this very report.

This approach is rhizo-analytic in that it works to see not solid ground from an objective overview but relationships within and between subjectivities. These relationships include relations of power. It acknowledges its work, not above or outside, but from within centres and concentrations of subjectivities. The methodology in this investigation is further rhizomatic in that like a rhizome "...it is entirely oriented toward an experimentation...open and connectable in all of its dimensions; it is detachable, reversible, susceptible to constant modification. It can be torn, reversed, adapted to any kind of mounting, reworked by an individual, group, or social formation. It can be drawn on a
wall, conceived of as a work of art, constructed as a political action or a meditation...’ (Deleuze & Guattari in O’Riley 2003: 27). With the current climate of scientific objectivity, however, as a researcher I do tend to see solid ground from an objective overview. In this regard, I work reflexively within the research to see my own construction of this objectivity-building as it occurs. In tension between its history of objectivity and its imperative to mobilise reflexive, rhizo-analytic praxis, the praxis of this research works to actuate the justifiable, responsible and demanding standards of postlinguistic rigour.

Thus, poststructuralist praxis is a method in that it is what one does. Unlike isolated ideals of method, however, praxis is not limited to archaic divisions and frames of human knowledge (Kilminster 1979). It potentially includes a whole range of values as input. These include values a researcher within a culture has learned (eg Gee 1999: 14-17, 66-68). They may be within microcultures, or between cultures. Further, they are not just those one has learned to include as method per se. Reflexively, praxis also involves asking new questions about what else it is that is acting as method within a research project. In this way, what poststructuralism’s imperative of praxis includes is open-ended. It is the poststructuralist researcher’s responsibility to consciously determine, and continually re-determine, the scope of such praxis. While this chapter discusses the systems of rigour and method involved in its collections, tools, strategies, and software, the site is most concerned with an awareness of relationships and reflexivities between these systems.

Because of these combined emphases of praxis, relationships, awareness, and their impact upon methods and methodology, I work to formulate the social scientific purview of methodological values in this research as rhizoanalysis and representation. Through collecting the data, building up the data bases, and experimenting with representational strategies in the thesis document, I build and employ this design. Thereby while forms of discursive textual analysis are researching methods in their own right, with their own sophisticated bodies of methodological strategies and justifications, current usage does not currently equip the term textual analysis to signify, on its own, all that is noteworthy in what the process in this particular research entails. This
notwithstanding that there is an ever-expanding purview, with discourse approaches to language and literacy now including visual, contextual and sociocultural factors (Gee 1997), this research works to expand the boundaries of this purview even further. Indeed, the position of this research is that this purview is educationally never expansive enough, because philosophically the closer one gets to a position, even an ideally expansive purview, the farther one becomes from an-other position. Farther, that is, from a position that is other. This is due, paradoxically, to the limits of having a position. This occurs even if that point of view is a position one had once learned and known well. Hence, this wonderfully fascinating poststructuralist project of education is admittedly, overtly, and vitally never-ending (Kendall & Wickham 1999: 4).

Idea(l)s of Prac(t)sis: (Re)Search Design Tools & Strategies

This chapter section works to explain how I see my research ideas of praxis translating into manageable design tools and strategies for the study. These design tools and strategies include word and idea search (Tappe 2002: 115-133), and word and idea assay (Tappe 2002: 89-97). The design tools and strategies of the research also include a rhizo-analytic form of pattern recognition (Gee 1999: 48), juxtaposition, and deconstruction as shown in chapter five. They include discourse analysis (Gee 1999) as shown in chapter six and an analysis of agenda as shown in chapter seven. They further include experiments in representing the non-settlement of difference (Pavlich & Ratner 1996: 155) as shown in the multiple-text representation of chapter eight. This juxtaposition of texts, through page layout, utilises Microsoft® Office Publisher 2003 (MS Publisher).

This project employs courage, creativity, flexibility, simplicity, and postlinguistic tenacity and persistence in its design tools and strategies. The tenacity it employs is postlinguistic in that, being process-oriented rather than static-oriented, the approach focuses upon the work rather than the result, and continually returns to that work. In this way the success or failure of the work's efforts is not limited to judgements located outside of the work itself; it is
something that also belongs to the work itself. Research praxis informs these tools and strategies in part via the instigating agencies of the theoretical literature and the postgraduate advisors of the research. The availability of qualitative research software and the data literature also shape the research’s praxis. These agencies comprise the community of praxis (Case 1998: 81) initiating the research.

The resulting praxis also reflexively informs these tools and strategies by its work in preparing this very report, a draft of which has been under construction since the site undertook this doctoral project in 2003. The system of research design strategies in this thesis is thereby a consensus between the positivistic, scientific, technological culture in which the research was spawned, my creative, academic, and poststructuralist thoughts as a researcher, and the agencies of power, tradition, and conventionality which adhere and constrain these processes. Part of the way in which my ideas of praxis as a researcher become tools and strategies is thus recognised here as via modelling or exemplary practice. Explicitly stated, that is, research praxis modelled for me tends to be reproduced as research praxis by me in my capacity as a researcher. In this reproduction, I consider praxis as both methodological conduct and an agency of education. Here, integrated praxis is living what you believe.

Dictating in order to foster dictators would be integrated praxis. A schizoid praxis would be yelling at students to be quiet, or fighting for peace. I also consider that age is not a segregation factor for methodological praxis as an agency of education. In this regard, as a postlinguistic learning facilitator, I consider flexibility according to age and competency level preferable to prescription, or a ‘how to do’ (Threadgold 2000: 40). With encouragement and explicit space afforded by educational forums, students at all levels of age and competency can learn from postlinguistic methods using the tools of deconstruction, juxtaposition, reflexive analysis, and Foucauldian and electronic technologies. Like Wennerstrom’s ‘Discourse Analysis in the Language Classroom’ (2003, 3-4), I consider adaptations of the methods
employed in this research useful to any student wishing to develop writing skills.

These adaptations are also useful to any student wishing to develop understanding of the role discourse plays in the workings of power within a cultural setting. 'With a more sophisticated understanding of discourse they [students] are in a stronger position to make informed choices in their future writing.' (Wennerstrom 2003: 4) In this sense, the methods may also serve as a template. This Willendorf project thus builds the idea of template into its very research methods. It endeavours to do this by means of the poststructuralist imperative of praxis, to act as research that is explicitly and overtly an exemplar. Role models in research design include Lather and Smithies (1997). Role models in method include G. Fuller (2000), Gee (1999), Hall and Stevens (1991), Kendall and Wickham (1999), Lather (1991a, 1991b, 1994), Lather and Smithies (1997), Lee (2000), O’Riley (2003), and St. Pierre and Pillow (2003). Role models in semiotic, discursive, and visual analysis include Anstey and Bull (2000), Dondis (1973), Gee (1999), Hodge and Kress (1988), Mitchell, W. J. T. (1994) and Kress and van Leeuwen (1996).

Ideas of postlinguistic praxis inform my decisions to include the many juxtapositional strategies employed in the thesis, in part, via my understanding of what juxtaposition has the ability to show. This understanding sees juxtaposition as a research tool, not to show the rightness of one text and the incorrectness of another (Kendall & Wickham 1999: 30), but to explore the subjective nature of text production and its will to power. It sees juxtaposition as a research strategy that interrogates text not for static information, but for dynamic perspectives. Given the hegemonic assumption of singular truth, this interrogation includes an exploration of linguistic competition for power. In chapter four, these assumptions about the subjective nature of text production and its will to power inform the established qualitative tools of verbal text searches, and of assaying textual occurrences, by grouping and presenting the results in dialogue bubbles. Chapter four’s presentation works to highlight relationships of the data within and between the dialogue bubbles. The dialogue-bubble illustrations represent these relationships, not in a hierarchical
manner, but simply in difference (Weedon 1987: 25) and in reference to each other.

Ideas of postlinguistic praxis also inform my decisions to include deconstruction strategies in the thesis, in part, via my understanding of what deconstruction has the ability to show. This understanding sees deconstruction as a research tool that has the ability to show tricks and traps surrounding language production. Deconstruction reflects postlinguistic ideals by undoing and redoing linguistic building work (Gee 1999: 11-13), again not for static information, but for a perspective on of power processes surrounding those linguistic constructions. This concern for the understanding of processes also informs the deconstructive strategy of clustering in chapter five. This clustering is a rhizo-analytic form of pattern recognition that reflects postlinguistic ideals by finding new relationships in working with the data, not just those promoted and facilitated by traditional or everyday understandings.

As with the juxtapositional and deconstructive strategies, ideas of postlinguistic praxis also inform my decisions, by means of what discourse and agenda analyses potentially have the ability to show. This perspective sees discourse and agenda analysis as a research tool that interrogates text, not to reinforce them as current informational speeches and pictures, but to emphasise them, like Willendorf itself, as archaeological artefacts that offer telltale signs about the culture or micro-culture that produced them. This is the case also, of course, with the thesis document itself as an artefact.

Ideas of postlinguistic praxis thus inform the artefact collection of the research (Knobel & Lankshear 1999: 93), not as material supportive to the research, but as language-production sites. Two-dimensional texts (Knobel & Lankshear 1999: 91), photographs (Knobel & Lankshear 1999: 91), and drawings (Knobel & Lankshear 1999: 91) mark these sites. These physical texts freeze sociocultural communication data prior to collection by the researcher. Thus, while as a researcher I select, colonise, frame, and embed these texts, I am not directly creating or affecting the production of these texts, as is the case for example with research interviews. As with other tools and strategies, ideas of
postlinguistic praxis inform my decision to include multiple-text representation. I decide to include multiple-text representation, again in part, because my understanding of what multiple-text representation has the ability to show. This perspective sees multiple-text representation as a research tool to include the reader or student as researcher and analyst. It is likewise a tool that positively facilitates the writer as researcher and analyst throughout the work on that chapter, and as a method has an effect on the final outcome of the thesis artefact.

Ideals of the project shape chapter eight in that multiple-text representation simultaneously allows each of the differently categorised texts its own space. I work to construct this allowance from my postlinguistic perspective, not to settle discrepancies, but to explore their voices in relation to each other. Highlighting their voices in relation to each other is a postlinguistic strategy to investigate, explore, and interrogate discursive difference. Interrogating discursive difference is potentially useful in understanding and utilising the textual production of the respective discourses. It is also potentially useful in utilising understanding about textual production regarding discourses in general.

The multiple-text representation of chapter eight takes sample texts from the data collection and these samples run one after the other in the upper windows of the chapter's page layout. In an earlier version of the thesis, this format extended to six chapters, one for each here-identified agenda in the data. This earlier version included each and every data text of the study. Due to space constraints, however, chapter eight now presents only some of the data texts here categorised as having an academic agenda. These comprise all the academic data texts at the time the chapter was written. I have since included in chapter eight an additional 13 liberal-humanist-discourse, academic-agenda texts, and 5 scientific-discourse, academic-agenda texts.

That there is not room for representation of all of the data texts, thus necessitating some justification for conscious selection, belies a constant culling and constructing process. Work on this thesis thus provides a metaphor for me,
in that such constrictions may well occur throughout not only the micro-, meso-, and macro-aspects of writing research, but also throughout aspects of other micro-, meso-, and macro-processes such as selecting words to represent thoughts. I chose academic-agenda texts for the chapter because the academic agendas of these data texts match the academic agenda of this thesis narrative. This is relevant in that part of this narrative forms the running subtext in the lower window of the chapter's page layout. In this way the chapter analyses, compares, and re-presents nothing but academic agendas with academic agendas. As far as practicable, the thesis narrative speaks to the data that is presently in front of the reader, whether that data be the thesis narrative self-reflexively in the lower data-text window, or the collected data appearing in the upper data-text windows.

(Re)Presentational & (Rhizo)Analytic Systematicity: What to Leave In, What to Leave Out

This chapter section works to explain my awareness of responsibilities regarding where to draw the line in employing methods for this research. This is relevant to postlinguistic methods in terms of the critical literacy imperatives of consciousness and overtness. The chapter section also works to explain my awareness of things such as responsibilities regarding where to draw the line in this very chapter, in matters regarding stating its methods. This project employs the powerful search tools of commercial websites and the internet in general in its data collection. These tools greatly facilitate the availability of data texts for analysis, and thereby the potential scope of the project. The responsibility of where to draw the line in decisions regarding the Willendorf-literature data involves what formats can be considered as potential text. Academically, methods of analysis from the very conception of the project include concerns for a wide and thorough, if not exhaustive, cross-section of data. Ideas informing this collection process include the poststructuralist idea that comparison from diverse sources in time and place can be highly enlightening. In this post-modern era, considering the context and format of potential data texts is important in the systematicity of what to include in this investigation. As previously noted, from my poststructural perspective, I
extend notions of available text to include not only traditional academic book and popular literature, but also things such as consumer goods, product inserts, T-shirt slogans, and television and internet excerpts, because these texts are inherent in 'the way we live now' (Wicke & Ferguson in Lather 1994: 45). Present educational systems' problems arguably stem, in part, from being out of date and inappropriate to the way in which many students now live.

The responsibility of where to draw the line in decisions regarding the Willendorf-literature data also involves specific criteria for collection. The collection comprises available texts containing a word signifier, image signifier, or both word and image signifiers, of this Willendorf artefact. Early on in the project, the sole criterion for inclusion as a data text was simply that the word Willendorf be present. The vast majority of texts captured through search on this one word are indeed texts relevant to this study. As data texts on the village of Willendorf in Austria joined the collection, however, a further criterion required became that the content of the text have some bearing on, or direct relevance to, the famous Willendorf artefact. Upon collecting a text containing an image of this Willendorf artefact but no accessible word Willendorf (eg Korean National University of Arts 2003), I amended collection criteria so that a recognisable image of Willendorf alone is also a sufficient criterion for data texts to be included in the study.

There are necessarily extant texts containing the word or image of this Willendorf artefact that are not included in the study. In addition, the data collection in its entirety does not include all texts containing the signifier or image of this Willendorf artefact that I found toward the end of this period, as extant texts became increasingly inexhaustible. The collection, however, does include texts in German and Spanish. The rationale for this is to avoid precluding any information which has the potential to prove insightful or beneficial to the project’s aims. Exposure to other languages and literacies is educationally relevant from a poststructural perspective in Western hegemony’s global era. It provides yet another indication of the constructedness of culture and text. Further, German is the official language of Austria ('Austria' 1997: CD), the country that is currently home to the 25-
millenia-old archaeological artefact. It is, therefore, not surprising that some, if not the most important, of the data texts regarding the artefact might be in German. My knowledge of German is a working knowledge rather than fluent understanding. This is a disadvantage in that linguistic nuances escape recognition. Postlinguistically this is a potential advantage, however, in that linguistic fluency, ironically, can blind one to existing genealogical and relational cues and clues in language.

As data accumulated and the number of texts became counterproductive to the study, I discarded texts that referred to Willendorf only as an archaeological site or that were surplus editions of existing data texts (eg Andrefsky 1998; Champion, Gamble, Shennan & Whittle 1984; Honour & Fleming 1991; Ivinski 1999; Malainey, Przbylski & Sheriff 2001; Naturhistorisches Museum 1999; Pettitt & Pike 2001; McEvilley 1998; Svoboda, van der Plicht & Kuzelka 2002; Vishnyatsky 1994: http; 'Willendorf' 2001; Zell, O. 2001). Tomaskova (1995), however, was retained (in part for its interesting discussion of anti-positivist movements after 1880) even though the term Willendorf in this data text also only refers to the archaeological site and not the famous artefact. Additionally, I admit certain newly found texts (eg McGinness 1999; Moon 2005; Megaw & Jones 1972; Denton & Herring 2003; Zell-Ravenheart, O. 2006) even after the collection reaches a productive size. I include these texts for various reasons. These reasons include that the text is one with which I am very familiar but had not previously recognised as a text citing Willendorf (eg Campbell, J. 1990, 2002; Megaw & Jones 1972; Prehistoric Man 1968), that the text is of interest because it seems to have the same author as existing data texts (Zell-Ravenheart, O. 2006), and that the text makes an especially unique contribution to the collection (eg McGinness 1999).

Decisions regarding what analysis of the data collection can show involves where this collection was gathered. Sources for gathering the Willendorf data texts include the internet online shopping sites Amazon.com (2007), eBay (2007), and the pay web service HighBeam Research (2006) formerly known as eLibrary. Texts in the data collection include individually owned and operated websites yielded by the internet search engines of Microsoft (2006), Google (2006),
Sources for gathering the Willendorf data texts further include libraries at the University of Tasmania and Auckland, New Zealand. They include personal collections and bookstores in Australia, Europe, New Zealand, and the United States. The physical locations of source gathering are the countries of Austria, Australia, England, Ireland, New Zealand, and the United States. Physical locations of source gathering include the Stone Age Museum and the discovery site of the artefact, both located at Willendorf in der Wachau, Austria. Physical locations of source gathering also include the current in-situ site of the artefact, the Museum of Natural History in Vienna.

Decisions regarding what analysis of the data collection can show, also involves how this collection was constructed. As the researcher, I construct the collection at every stage in its processes of acquisition, storage, handling, and framing of the texts. Acquisition and storage of data texts entail the production of a hardcopy and a digital capture. I produce hardcopies via photocopy, computer printout, or transcript. Four A4 binders house hardcopies in alphabetical order by author. The method of capturing a digital copy for the collection is by direct computer copy from the internet, optical character recognition (Xerox 1997), or transcription for verbal texts, and direct computer copy from the internet, scanning, or digital photography for graphic texts. NVivo 7 (QSR International 2006) stores the digital copies of verbal text in a project file entitled Willendorf. Microsoft® Office Windows 5.1 (MS Windows) stores the digital copies of graphic text in a folder called W Images by Author. The handling of data texts entails titling, by author, both verbal and graphic texts with corresponding names.

video graphic (Craig 2000). The Willendorf in-situ images (Restaurant Der Venus 2004a, 2004b; Rosendahl 2007: 173; Szombathy 2003; Verschönerungs- und Museumsverein Willendorf 2004b, 2004c, 2004d, 2004e, 2004g, 2004h, 2004i, 2004j) and product photos (MMII-BAS 2004, Naturhistorisches Museum 2003e, Verschönerungs- und Museumsverein Willendorf 2004a) were also photographed using a digital camera. MGI PhotoSuite 4 edits photographs taken on the project's camera to appropriate dimensions for various appearances within the thesis document. One of the ways in which this extent of technological detail is postlinguistically relevant in a chapter section on what to leave in and what to leave out, is that image size, zoom, and clarity has a bearing on whether or not, as the researcher, I include that image in the purview of the research. That is, how well the project can frame an image has a bearing on whether or not I include that particular image as relevant text for the project.

The data collection for this project is a random sample in that all data on Willendorf readily accessible to me was included up to a certain point (i.e. January 2006). The data sample for this project is not random in that data accessible to me includes data gathered, not only directly from library, bookstore, internet and in-situ searches, but also through leads from friends, family and colleagues aware of this Willendorf-literature project. For example, one data-text is a segment from the Australian Science Television Program, Quantum. I acquired a video of this segment via a lead from a fellow postgraduate. The data sample for this project is also not a random in that given more data than is conducive to the project, I shape and frame the research collection for presentation within documentation of the research. The thesis thereby relies upon a system of positive evidence. It does not presume to say anything about what might exist outside its own collection. It does not presume to say categorically what its own collection means. It does say, however, that this evidence exists, or has existed in some version of simulacrum, whatever that might mean for a particular position or perspective and however that might enable or constrain a particular perspective.
Unabashedly theoretical, I have, nonetheless, long believed that practice always exceeds theory's grasp. Hence, my goal throughout my academic work has been to ground my projects in a theory of knowledge where praxis 'does not put itself in place of theory; it would be theory itself becoming practical—the opposite of pragmatism...’ [Tiedemann 1989, p. 202].

(Lather 1994: 42)

While I work in this thesis towards my own theory becoming practical, I am also well aware of the ways in which this does not yet happen, and can never entirely happen. This chapter section works to explain my awareness of the effects of software on method within the research, and indeed the degree to which software is the method. In this, our western hegemonic, electronic, technological age, proficiency with software programs is vital to a research student (Giroux 2000: 69, Lather 1991a: 4, Wennerstrom 2003: 148). An awareness of the potential effects of any materiality currently vital to a research student is likewise poststructurally important. An awareness of the effects of software on method is particularly important because the age of software is relatively young compared to the age of other conventions of academic tradition. This awareness is also poststructurally important because Western hegemony is ostensibly unaware of these effects. Western hegemony is unaware to the degree that it works to place software, as it works to place language, in the box it builds for things it treats as immaterial or transparent (Weedon 1987: 83).

Although everyday understandings often hide effects of materiality, materiality has a tremendous impact upon thought, action, process, and production. Indeed Foucault expounds the unconventional view that, rather than reinforcing the traditional constructions of their distinctness, the ways materiality and thought refuse separation is a much more fruitful direction for
intellectual inquiry (Kendall & Wickham 1999: 45). Standard computer and specialised research software programs are the method in this study in that there is no physical material in the data to handle, other than words and pictures. Computer programmers design software to deal specifically with words and pictures, and to handle words and pictures in various ways. Software programs are thereby the method in this study to the degree that these programs reflexively enable, facilitate, constrain, and limit standard filing and specialist research operations with words and pictures.

Standard computer and specialised research software programs are not the method in this study, however, in that the content of the data reaches far beyond words and pictures. This content permeates learned intellectual, emotional, and experiential association. It reaches through the data's physical materiality of words and pictures and produces both visible and invisible effects. In this regard, feminist, poststructuralist, and sociocultural theories inform the method. In addition, software programs are not the method of this research in that this method is largely informed by the scientific and academic tradition of which this thesis is a part. These traditions have their own well established rigour, methods, and systems of data analysis. Along with the newer practicality of computer software systems, these older traditions, too, continue to play their part in reflexively shaping method in this study. Further, software programs are not the method of this research to the degree that thought, theory and praxis are the motivating forces, with or without computers. At the same time, in that the thesis utilises computers in its method, its method is no longer separable from them.

Gee's theory and method of discourse analysis (1999) overall inform the way in which I utilise computer software for textual analysis within the thesis. The thesis analyses images and written text, 'the form of the social relationship made visible, palpable, material' (Bernstein in Chouliaraki & Fairclough 1999: 118). The over-riding feature of this approach in this investigation is to seek clues from a wide socio-cultural context (Gee in Lankshear 1997: xvi) in combination with the textuality of the texts under scrutiny, rather than from the textuality of the texts alone. In the case of this study, this means...
consciously, overtly, and explicitly bringing learned knowledge as a researcher to bear on the textuality of the data. This follows in the wake of, and is in keeping with, the traditions of systemic functional linguistics (SFL) (Hodge & Kress 1988, Young 2006), critical discourse analysis (CDA) (Chouliaraki & Fairclough 1999, Young 2006), and rules of visual literacy (Dondis 1973; Kress & van Leeuwen 1996; Anstey & Bull 2000).

MS Windows copies and displays images with such ease that it is sometimes difficult to remember that the software itself produces effects. The effects of MS Windows on method in this research include an increase in the number of visual data texts that the project is easily able to handle and process. The program's facilitation of transferring texts to and from software programs, email, digital storage devices, and printers supports this increase. An increase in the number of visual data texts potentially produces the effect on method of including a wider purview of data. This has the advantage of potential appeal and perceived relevance to a wider educationalist and research audience. It also has the disadvantage of potentially leading the research to take on more than it can effectively and meaningfully process in the allotted time.

Standard computer software utilised by the study also includes the word processing program Microsoft® Office Word 2003 (MS Word). MS Word has many features, some of which have the potential to affect the way a research student thinks about things. Poststructurally for example, the list of English dictionaries that the program offers highlights that correct English-language spelling is neither universal nor essential, but is dependent upon geographical location. This evidence maps that the English language at a particular location has evolved through time and with influences that are different to other locations. The effects of MS Word on method in this research include an increase in the types of postlinguistic analysis the thesis develops and utilises. The disadvantages of this increase include the creation of too large a project. The advantages of this increase include multiplicative understandings at the nexus of this research.
The specialist qualitative research software was upgraded to NVivo 7 from NUD*IST (QSR 1997) which the research utilised from its inception in 1998. This upgrade proceeded in stages, through NVivo 1.0 (Fraser, D. 1999, Richards 1999), and NVivo 2.0 (Tappe 2002). NVivo is an Australian-developed program that facilitates interrogation of the data texts. The program has the ability to assist interrogation of written text in very sophisticated ways. Because of the large number of texts involved in this study, however, the most basic of these was the most utilised. This basic assistance is that NVivo allows a text search of all of the data literature with one query. Issues constraining the thoroughness of computer text searches alone include representation of an idea in more than one way and spelling variations between U.S. and Australian English. In addition, software font formatting translation issues and typing errors constrain what a computer search on its own can accomplish. Nonetheless, I would not have completed the study on schedule without this single feature. By their very literal and specific nature, computer text searches have the added advantage of highlighting word connections and genealogies that I may not otherwise have considered.

NVivo also allows grouping by category, which was of use to the study in greatly facilitating the ascertainment of category percentages for a particular query, or a particular query set. The investigation also utilised the standard computer database software Microsoft® Works 8.0 for basic tracking and statistics reports regarding the data texts as the study grew. I created the standard bar graph and pie charts in Appendix D using Microsoft® Office Excel 2003. In 2003 NVivo imported 73 Willendorf data files from its 1999 pilot study. NVivo stores the texts in computer-file format for comprehensive qualitative interrogation and analysis. Each data text is in a separate document with a title displaying its author, year of publication, assigned discourse, and assigned agenda, for convenience when working with the documents. NVivo requires the copying, scanning, or typing of the verbal data texts into ‘rich text files’ or ‘RTF’ (Fraser, D. 1999: 23).

MS Publisher is a page-layout software program that enables flexible multiple windows of running text. MS Publisher allows the simultaneous perusal and
analysis of multiple like-categorised data texts. This system is methodologically important to both rhizoanalysis and representation. It is important to rhizoanalysis in that I reflexively write, read, and analyse my academic-agenda thesis narrative while simultaneously reading and analysing other academic-agenda data texts. This potentially allows and encourages the making of rhizo-analytic connections and disparities. This system of praxis is methodologically important to representation in that multiple textual voices appear on the same page. This potentially allows the simultaneous exploration of disparate as well as connected perspectives. This practical exploration is important for the combined poststructuralist perspectives of praxis and multiplicity.

MS Publisher also allows writing of the thesis narrative at the same time on the same page. Word processing directly within MS Publisher allows the utilisation of both controlled and random juxtaposing of texts. Early on in the investigation, I used this approach to interrogate all of the data texts I acquired by re-presenting them in MS Publisher according to the agendas I had tentatively assigned them. This present version of the thesis document represents only the academic-agenda group. The academic-agenda data texts appear as chapter eight, the multiple-text chapter of the thesis. I produce and store this chapter in a separate MS Publisher file. The rest of the thesis document exists in MS Word files, with separate files for some of the graphics pages because of the cumbersomeness of the additional memory capacity required.


This chapter section works to explain my awareness of reflexivity at play throughout the course of the investigation. It also works to explain my awareness of the methodological tools of rhizo-analytic reflexivity that I employ throughout the course of the investigation. Rhizomatic reflexivity is postlinguistically important to methods in this study because of the strong bearing that rhizomatic reflexivity has on social construction. Social
construction is important to methods in this study via praxis. For example, in learning about what data has to say, it is not the data that learns and changes. How I as the researcher represent that data within the thesis changes. How subsequent readers of these representations think about that data changes. In this way, the methods of this research work to understand social construction, not to understand data per se. They work rather to understand data qua social construction. Understanding rhizomatic reflexivity is thereby an important part of understanding at least three perspectives of the social construction of the data. These three perspectives include the social construction involved in the production and representation of the data before I, as a researcher, collect that data. They include the social construction involved in my representing my understanding of the data as the researcher, and they include the social construction involved in re-presenting the data itself.

The ways in which reflexivity is at play throughout the course of the investigation thus include not only micro aspects of textual investigation in this project, but also the macro aspect of the whole approach to writing and representation. The idea of method here rhizomatically spans strategies, the handling of data collection and software, and the handling of reflexivity itself. Each grows from and builds upon work accomplished in the other, back and forth reflexively throughout the process of the project. The thesis' overall method of approach is thus rhizomatic in that the reflexivity of hypotheses, data handling, data analyses, data representations, and the construction of the thesis as a written artefact simultaneously develop, grow together and shape each other.

Like Gee's chicken-and-egg reflexivity question of which comes first, the discursive situation or the language of the discourse (1999: 82), neither the research's data nor its methods of working with its data come first. The methods select the data, and the data shape the methods. In this thesis both hegemonic and poststructuralist academic methods shape ideas about what constitutes data. Conversely, scientific, feminist, and New Age data shape types and methods of categorisation. The poststructuralist question is thus not
whether hypotheses shape data or data shape hypotheses, but in what ways each shapes the other.

As a self-purported poststructuralist thesis, methods of analysing, representing and discussing the Willendorf data within the thesis work to highlight the constructedness of texts. Reflexively, discoveries in the constructedness of texts affect strategies of constructing doctoral analysis, representation, and discussion. Methods of discussion of the Willendorf data, for example, have developed from analysis of the constructedness of the data texts. The methodological tools of rhizo-analytic reflexivity that this thesis employs are inherent in its design tools and strategies of juxtaposition, deconstruction, and postlinguistic analysis. These are rhizo-analytically reflexive in that they are oriented toward experimentation and are open and connectable in all of their dimensions. Further, throughout the course of the research, I subject these tools to constant modification. With ideas regarding the investigation’s word searches of the data, for example, no matter how obscure or esoteric the association, my modus operandi early on are to follow these associations and then later to edit as needed. The same is the case with representing ideas of my understanding of the data. My method of working early on in the project was to include these ideas as they occur to me, and later to edit as needed. The rationale for this rhizo-analytically reflexive strategy is to optimise the thesis’ exceeding of its own boundaries and limitations.

The investigation’s methodological tool of pattern recognition in chapter five is rhizo-analytically reflexive in that it is open to making connections between Willendorf, Barbie dolls, rainbows, and the globe. This tool is also rhizo-analytically reflexive in that it is open to modifying the ways in which it interrogates and represents those connections. The investigation’s methodological experiment of the multiple-text representation in chapter eight is rhizo-analytically reflexive in that it is susceptible to different readings, depending upon the student. This tool is an experiment in that the chapter does not establish the multiple-text representation’s ability to convince regarding the non-settlement of difference between the data-text discourses. It remains an experiment. If systematicity in the thesis differs from that of any traditional
academic research, it is thus perhaps mainly in its lack of concern for settlement or outcome and its attention to exploring, learning, and judging process.

**Informing-Methods Summary**

The influences of academia, feminist practice, science and technology, microtextual analysis, SFL, CDA, poststructuralist theory and praxis combine to inform methods at the nexus that is this postlinguistic research site for education and critical literacy. Methodological systems for this research are here constructed as ideas of rhizoanalysis and representation. Reflexivity and praxis assist in signifying the new and multiple senses in which I approach and use my awareness of these methodological systems.

Methods in this re-search investigation include a concern for utilising both explicit and implicit systems in the socio-cultural environment. They include techniques for rhizomatically gathering, assimilating and analysing evidence. They include techniques of reflexive data analysis, reflexive data representation, and reflexive thesis representation. Reciprocally, these techniques work to acknowledge and re-cognise the agencies of creativity and motivation in processes of learning (within research-as-education such as this thesis), as well as in systems of method per se. They endeavour to highlight the subjective systems of convention, culture, and power, which surround the subjective systems of language in the educational environment. Rhizoanalysis and representation work to emphasise fluidity and process. They work to suspend closure and judgement. They seek not only accurate snapshots of configuration but also accurate perspectives of the ongoing processes of reproduction in the language of educationalist praxis.
Signifiers Indicating this Willendorf (Arte)Fact:

Some Juxtapositions

'The language we use is a convention, and it makes no difference what exactly the nature of the agreed sign is.' (Saussure 1986: 10)

'Ideology may not be divorced from the material reality of the sign...' (Voloshinov in Hodge & Kress 1988: 18)

This chapter juxtaposes textual signifiers of the artefact from the project's data texts, both verbal and photographic. These signifiers are highlighted in blue in the main body of this chapter. These juxtapositions assist in beginning to do the work of deconstructively reading the data texts. This type of thinking about the texts is one approach to trying out the poststructuralist toolbox. From its learning-in-education perspective, the import of the chapter is on the type of content (eg examples of postlinguistic subjectivity) as much as it is on the content (eg range of particular signifiers) itself. The main aim of these juxtapositions is to recognise that the signifier is not, and ontologically can never be, the signified. Precisely the kind of rhizomatic thinking involved in these juxtapositions, and the possibilities these 'unfolding sequences of thought-lines' (Bridge 2003: 5) and 'lines of flight' (Lather 2000: 303, Deleuze
in Reynolds & Webber 2004: 2, Reynolds & Webber 2004: 4) open up, are at the heart of the work this thesis moves both to accomplish and to foster.

The quotations opening this chapter are of particular relevance to this signifier chapter in that they both speak about signs. Like every statement, as with every signifier, there are ways in which each statement both is and is not the case. As such, the juxtaposition of these statements appropriately introduces my approach, as a researcher, to signifiers within this research. Saussure’s statement is the case in that without knowing the culture, a researcher cannot predict the meaning of a sign for that culture. From my perspective in this research, Saussure’s statement is not the case in that the material reality of a sign, in Western hegemonic culture for example, embodies subjective effects, experiences, and histories constructed and built up over time. A sign is in this regard, thus, not arbitrary. Voloshinov’s statement is the case in that signs work to embody ideologies. Voloshinov’s statement is not the case insofar as language-in-use, in Western hegemonic culture for example, is successful in its efforts to divorce the materiality of the sign from ideology. That is, it is not the case insofar as Western hegemony is successful in its efforts to construct the materiality of the sign, for and by its users, as both essentialist and transparent.

This signifier chapter exhibits widely varying descriptions and photographs of a single artefact. This single artefact is the object that qualifies a text for inclusion in this postlinguistic study. The wide variety of descriptions includes descriptions of age, height, material, of the artefact. They also include a wide variety of names for the artefact. The wide variety of graphics includes variance of black-and-white and colour photography, variance and absence of background, and variance of camera angle. It includes variance of object angle, variance or absence of spotlighting, and the variance or absence of spotlighting’s resultant shadows. It includes variance of zoom, variance of cropping, and variance due to reversing or flipping the image horizontally (as in the good-old-fashioned-technology days of the reversed slide in the slide projector during art-history class).
While working towards conscious and intentional accuracy from a particular perspective is an important concern of academic work, by showing such a huge variety this chapter works to move beyond the simplistic dualism of right and wrong. For example, my main concern in this chapter is not to show that stating that the Venus of Willendorf is ‘in Germany’ (Gilman, D. 1992: 171), rather than in Austria, or that the artefact was discovered ‘in 1906’ (Barasch 2000: 242; Ladle 2001: 190; Porter+ 2003: 129, 213; Porter+ 2005: 128, 212, Barasch in Rosendahl 2007: 174), rather than 1908, are in the minority among the texts. I am more interested in the opportunity a case like this latter one might potentially show in terms of the reflexivity of information (what in traditional Western perspectives one might refer to as the proliferation of misinformation).

Likewise, my main concern is not to decide from the statistics whether or not Willendorf was found in a cave or buried in the ground. My concern is not to decide which is most accurate (according to some over-riding viewpoint): that it was ‘found in a European cave’ (Eisler 2000: 96) or that it was found ‘lying deep in the mud of the Danube River outside the town of Willendorf, Austria’ (Lane 2001: 1), that it was ‘found in a cave in Austria’ (e-archetypes 2005: http) or that it was ‘discovered in a cave in Willendorf, an alpine village in Austria’ (Miller, S. 2001: 273). My concern is not to decide whether it is really ‘a buxom Celtic figure found near the Danube’ (Sanders 2002: 548) or a ‘cave sculpture’ (Kerridge 2002: http). I am interested, rather, through the course of this chapter to see the subtle perspectival and political constructions potentially evident in the differences between such textual constructions as: that the Willendorf artefact was found (Broom Closet 1999: http, 2003: http; Koeller 2000: http; Lane 2001: 1; Lynx UK 2004: http; Rainbow Crystal 2003: http; Reimer 2003: http; Stamp Act 2004: http; Witcombe 1999: http, 2005: http) by Szombathy although he was the director (Curtis 2003: http) and not one of the two conductors of the archaeological dig, and that it was found by ‘Szombathy and Bayer’ (Kohen 1946: 49).

I am interested to see the subtle constructions potentially evident in the differences between statements such as: that ‘Obermaier...discovered...it’
(Gilman, S. L. 2001: 232), that the research was ‘carried out by J. Szombathy, together with J. Bayer and H. Obermaier’ *(Verschönerungs- und Museumsverein Willendorf* 2004f: 1, Satzl 2005: http), and that the ‘excavations... yielded’ *(Verschönerungs- und Museumsverein Willendorf* 2004f: 1, Satzl 2005: http) the artefact.

**Dating Willendorf: Age(s)**

Having learned the questions important to Western-hegemonic English-language culture, the question: *How old is it?* is one that an interested student of this culture comes to ask, in an art herstory class for example, when thinking about an unknown piece of rock such as the Willendorf artefact. It is not the age of the rock, however, that seems to be so intriguing. It is rather how long the rock has held its current interesting shape and markings. The question thus becomes: *When was it made?* Many texts discussing this artefact offer an answer to this question. The dialogue-bubble illustration on the following page juxtaposes some of these answers.

Rather than read and learn of a single date for the artefact from a single art herstory book, art herstory students might be encouraged to use this as a starting point to conduct their own research investigation. The student may wish to explore a different artefact. The student may or may not have access to resources such as the internet. The student may wish to design her own ways of re-presenting her data. This may, however, be a way for students to begin to engage with the ideas of multiplicity and complexity ‘that Foucault’s analyses of power-knowledge not only permit but demand’ (Gore 1993: 61). Taken at face value, the time significations indicated in the data texts for the artefact range from 530 BC to 34,000 BC, mathematically a span of 33,470 years. As previously indicated, while this thesis as an academic text concerns itself with accuracy, the chapter does not include the illustration of this vast range to prove that any of these clauses are wrong. It illustrates this vast range, rather, to show the wide range of mental subjectivities existing and proliferating about the artefact, and to raise issues of how they exist and proliferate.
4 Signifiers Indicating the (Arte)Fact
Some Juxtapositions

Figure 4.1: Age Signifiers for the (Arte)Fact

Most modern archaeology dates the Venus figurines to around 25,000 BCE, but recent British research points to a date for the earliest Great Goddess figures of up to three million years ago... a hoax.
The juxtaposition on the previous page, from a postlinguistic perspective, shows that all signifiers are subject to the facilitations and constraints of language. This is as opposed to the Western hegemonic assumption that there are correct signifiers and incorrect signifiers. The number following each clause states the number of occurrences in the data texts that the investigation found for that particular textual construction of the artefact's age. The number of occurrences indicated includes instances of implication. That is, it includes instances where a text cites a date range for Venus figurines in general and at the same time names the artefact. Each of the 41 dialogue bubbles contains signifiers of a similar time or time-range signification. NVivo counts these occurrences from titles, contents, captions, index entries, and any repetitions that occur in the bodies of the texts. A referenced list appears in Appendix F.

Our Western culture, led by its scientific culture, has had three revisions of dates according to Witcombe (2005: http), in answer to the question of when the artefact was carved. This understanding assists in accounting for the wide range of dates in the data texts. It highlights the idea that knowledge does not always return to its constructed scientific beginnings for regular updates and verification, but carries on reproducing itself, as it were, with a life of its own. Put another way, students do not generally do their own radiocarbon or stratigraphic dating of artefacts. Nor do they generally rely upon their own creativity or intuition, for example, regarding an artefact. Rather, they rely upon constructed texts. They rely upon these constructed texts in order to formulate their own constructed subjectivities. They also rely upon these constructed texts in order to formulate their own constructed texts.

Students learn that when our culture's answer to the question of the artefact's age changes, understandings of the artefact also change. Highlighting this subjectivity, however, strengthens the poststructuralist perspective of understanding as a social construction. Highlighting this subjectivity also encourages the idea that information is not simply information, but is socially useful (or not useful) because of its implications.
Students understand that it is the culture's information that is changing rather than the artefact itself. Highlighting that it is changing however, also strengthens the poststructuralist perspective of information as a social construction. These instances of highlighting further raise the idea that understandings and information are reciprocal. Just as information changes understandings, understandings have an effect on information. That is, when understandings change, the information a textual site selects for generation and proliferation by those understandings changes. The wide range of dates in the juxtaposition makes evident the proliferation and extent of these reciprocities.

Some of the texts qualify, to varying degrees, their answer to the question of the artefact's age; others offer no qualifications whatsoever and leave any qualifying that is to be done up to the reader. Qualifying signifiers such as *about, approximately, around, back to, c., ca., circa, roughly* and *to c.* in themselves belie the positivist implication that textual dates regarding the artefact can be facts and yet again strengthen the poststructuralist perspective of dates as social constructions. The same is the case with qualifying signifiers such as *and, between, the Upper Palaeolithic age, to,* and the dash, indicating a date range. The same is also the case with signifiers *B.C., B.C.E., B.C.E., and B.P.* These signifiers are acronyms for 'before Christ', 'before the Christian Era', 'before the Common Era', and 'before the present', respectively (Mish 1993: 1380). These acronyms and the meanings they indicate, belie the positivist implication that language is transparent and that dates, as they appear in language, are facts that already exist in the world apart from human culture. In the face of persisting assumptions regarding the transparency of text, these date signifiers yet again strengthen the postlinguistic perspective of signifiers as social constructions. Furthermore, they strengthen the postlinguistic perspective of dates themselves as social constructions.

*About the Size of Willendorf: Height(s)*

Having learned the questions important to English language Western hegemonic culture, the question: *How big is it?* is another that an interested student of this culture, when faced with a photograph of an unknown artefact
such as Willendorf, comes to expect an art herstory textbook to answer. Judging on the photographic evidence provided by an art herstory book alone, for example, this artefact could be any of a vast range of sizes. Many of the data texts offer an answer to this question. The illustration below juxtaposes some of these answers.

As with Figure 4.1 rather than showing that some signifiers are correct and others incorrect, from a postlinguistic perspective this juxtaposition shows that all signifiers are subject, among other things, to the facilitations and constraints of language. The number following each clause states the number of occurrences in the data texts that the investigation found for that particular textual construction of this Willendorf artefact's height. Each of the 22 dialogue bubbles contains signifiers of a similar measurement or measurement-range signification. NVivo counts these occurrences from titles, contents,
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captions, index entries, and any repetitions that occur in the bodies of the texts. A referenced list appears in Appendix F.

Some textual sites relate the size of the artefact to the human body, for instance: fist-sized (Steves 2003: 393), hand-sized (Gadon 1989: 6, Janson & Kerman 1968: 4, Ruppel Shell 2002: 23), palm-sized (Stone, K. 2003: 51), and graspable (Eisenbud 1996: 7, 11, 155). The numerically-measured height signifiers range from ‘4-inch-tall (10 cm)’ (Hoving 1999: 302) to ‘five inches long’ (Nelson, P. 1995: 375), including in between various degrees of fractions for inches and decimal points for centimetres. Students learn that working toward accuracy in measurement can be useful. Taking a measurement to a fraction or a decimal point, however, implies that it is accurate to that degree. In contrast, highlighting the disagreement of measurements taken to the same degree implies that they are not accurate to that degree. This wide variety belies the positivist implication that signifiers reproduce the ever-changing exactitude of the physical world, as some of these textual sites appear to claim via their significations. This wide variety strengthens the soft-science, sociocultural perspective of signifiers as approximations.

About and approximately are the two qualifying signifiers in the data texts used in connection with height signifiers. Again, these qualifying signifiers in themselves belie the positivist implication that textual numerical figures regarding the artefact can be precise, and strengthen the poststructuralist perspective of textual numerical figures as socially constructed estimates. The signifier only may be one small word but is as strong as a tugboat in its linguistic capacity to do positioning work. This innocuous-looking four-letter word, unaided, offers a critique of this Willendorf artefact’s size, implying that a student consider that size small and further that a student may well consider that smallness a surprise. The signifiers: height, high, long, and tall here exhibit that there is a choice of words available in English to describe a distance. Students learn that there is this choice, but highlighting that different textual sites do make different choices in describing the very same axis of the very same artefact, further strengthens the poststructuralist perspective of texts as constructions.
Judging appearance on the evidence of a single photograph alone can be quite misleading as to the material of this Willendorf artefact. Viewing these photographs together, they appear to be photographs of different replicas of the artefact made out of a wide range of materials. Some photographs make the artefact appear waxy (Amazon.com 2006: http [image 3], Ladle 2001: 190, Niederösterreich – Das Weite Land 2002a: 9, Niederösterreich – Das Weite Land 2002b: 9). Some make it look as if it were made of porcelain (Amazon.com 2006: http, Hoving 1999: 27). Some make it appear metallic (de la Croix & Tansey 1975: 34). Viewing and handling an object oneself does not necessarily make a student wiser, either, as to the particular nature of that object’s composition. Even after viewing and handling an object, an inquisitive student of Western culture may well still wonder: ‘What exactly is that material?’ Many of the data texts offer an answer to this question. The illustration below juxtaposes some of these answers.

As with Figures 4.1 and 4.2, from a postlinguistic perspective the above juxtaposition does not show that some signifiers are correct and others incorrect, it shows that all signifiers are subject, among other things, to the
facilitations and constraints of language. The number following each clause states the number of occurrences in the data texts that the investigation found for that particular textual construction regarding the material constituting this Willendorf artefact. Each of the 11 dialogue bubbles contains signifiers of a similar material or material-range signification. NVivo counts these occurrences from titles, contents, captions, index entries, and any repetitions that occur in the bodies of the texts. A referenced list appears in Appendix F.

The material signifiers range in detail from simply ‘stone’ (20 occurrences in ten texts) through to ‘a particular type of oolitic limestone not found in the region’ (Witcombe 1999: http), including one instance of ‘sandstone’ (Coutts Shema 1991: http) and one instance of ‘soapstone’ (Klein 2001: 21). One data text captions its drawing: ‘Venus of Willendorf, clay fertility sculpture’ (Kubert 1999: 9). Many of the artists and manufacturers of Venus-of-Willendorf replicas currently available on the market do indeed make them of clay (NVivo cites 91 instances of ‘clay’ in 51 of the 490 data texts). That both this signifier and the graphic it accompanies are at least once removed from the artefact that was unearthed in 1908, however, and further that no clarification is made in the text on these matters, offers an example of the type of conflations now accompanying the Venus-of-Willendorf signification nexus. A student may then also wonder if these types of conflations also accompany other signification nexus, in situations perhaps less obvious than the Willendorf case. This particular thus offers an insight into potential manners in which conflations occur in other signification nexus, even less clear to map than simulacra of a single physical object.

Students learn that language has the capacity for ambiguity. Highlighting that a text can appear to be clear concerning that to which it refers, however, when that reference is not at all simple or straightforward, belies the combined-sociocultural constructed-positivist power of written text. Exploring this ambiguity raises the poststructuralist perspective of simulacra, the phenomenon of endless copies with no originals (Baudrillard 1994: 172). The juxtaposition of this wide variety of signifiers, in exhibiting the lack of simplicity and straightforwardness of signification, further belies the positivist
implication of the transparency of language (Weedon 1987: 78) and strengthens the poststructuralist perspective of texts as political agents.

A Willendorf by Any Other Name: Name(s)

In Western hegemonic culture a name is more than a name. As with signifiers in general, the implication in Western hegemony is that a name is what the thing named is. In this way, the most important question an inquisitive student of Western culture learns to ask is not the question what is it called? or what is it named? and by whom? These are questions a critical literacy inquirer may learn to ask. Rather, the most important question an inquisitive student of Western culture may well learn to ask is the singular-truth-assumption question: What is it? Nearly all of the data texts offer an answer to this question. The illustration on the following page juxtaposes some of these answers.

The clauses represented in this juxtaposition include all articles, adjectives, nouns, prepositions and modifiers in the immediate clause surrounding the signifier Willendorf, where data texts use it as a name associated with the famous artefact that is the subject of this thesis. The juxtaposition widens the parameter around the signifier Willendorf to this degree because each of these grammatical positions has the ability to shed some light on discursive construction. Understanding the means by which the English language permits or encourages the use of these grammatical positions also assists in discursive deconstruction. Understanding the manners in which the English language constrains the use of these grammatical positions further assists in this endeavour. Deconstruction potentially exposes the ways in which a student reflexively constructs the world. A student reflexively constructs the world in constructing her or his thoughts regarding that world.

As with Figures 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3 the juxtaposition on the following page shows that all signifiers are subject to the facilitations and constraints of language. The number following each clause states the number of occurrences in the data texts for that particular textual construction regarding this Willendorf artefact's name.
Figure 4.4: Names or Verbal Signifiers for the (Arte)Fact

**NAME of this Willendorf Artefact**
as constructed by some of the many sources available

- Morning Star
- Lady...
- Our Lady of Abundance
- the fat, fecund Ladies of Willendorf...
- the Lady
- the Lady of Life
- the Lady of Willendorf
- their famous fat Lady
- this Lady
- Willendorf Lady

- the Aphrodite of Willendorf
- the artefact 10
- the artefact itself 1
- the Willendorf artefact 2
- this Willendorf artefact 1
- Creatrix of the Universe
- The Creatrix 1
- Mother Creatrix

- the donii 2
- the Venus von Willendorf
- the Willendorf figure
- Venus of Willendorf, Figure
- Willendorf Venus
- Willendorf Venus, Venus of

- prehistoric figurines... Willendorf
- the figurines of Willendorf
- the Willendorf figurine
- the... Willendorf figurine
- Venus figurines...of Willendorf.
- Venus of Willendorf figurine
- Willendorf figurine
- Willendorf Goddess figurine
- Willendorf Venus Figurine

- Goddesses of Willendorf...
- the famous Goddess of Willendorf
- the fertile goddess Venus of Willendorf
- the Goddess of Willendorf
- the Willendorf Goddess
- the Willendorf Mother Goddess
- Willendorf Goddess
- The Great Goddess of Willendorf

- a statue of a very corpulent female
- the statue of Myrtle of Willendorf
- the Willendorf statue

- the Willendorf stone
- our Venus statuette
- the Willendorf statuette
- Willendorf statue

- a "Venus of Willendorf" feel
- called Venus of Willendorf
- der "Venus von Willendorf"
- the "Venus von Willendorf"
- die "Venus von Willendorf"
- die sog. "Venus von Willendorf"
- die..."Venus von Willendorf"
- "goddess of Willendorf"
- known as the Venus of Willendorf

- the so-called Venus of Willendorf
- the Aurgnacian sculptured "fat Venus"... Willendorf
- the famous Austrian "Venus of Willendorf"
- the famous little "Venus"
- the famous mismated "Venus" of Willendorf
- the famous "Venus of Willendorf"
- the prehistoric fertility symbol called the Venus of Willendorf
- the rounded so-called Venus found in Willendorf
- the so-called 'Venus of Willendorf'
- the so-called "Venus of Willendorf"

- a "Venus of Willendorf" feel
- called Venus of Willendorf
- der "Venus von Willendorf"
- the "Venus von Willendorf"
- die "Venus von Willendorf"
- die sog. "Venus von Willendorf"
- die..."Venus von Willendorf"
- "goddess of Willendorf"
- known as the Venus of Willendorf

- the so-called Venus of Willendorf
- the Aurgnacian sculptured "fat Venus"... Willendorf
- the famous Austrian "Venus of Willendorf"
- the famous little "Venus"
- the famous mismated "Venus" of Willendorf
- the famous "Venus of Willendorf"
- the prehistoric fertility symbol called the Venus of Willendorf
- the rounded so-called Venus found in Willendorf
- the so-called 'Venus of Willendorf'

- the so-called "Venus of Willendorf"

- the "Venus of Willendorf"
- the Venus of Willendorf
- Die...Venus von Willendorf
- the big-bottomed Venus of Willendorf
- the blowzy Venus of Willendorf
- the famous Venus of Willendorf
- the off-illustrated Venus of Willendorf
- the Paleolithic Venus of Willendorf
- the Paleolithic Venus of Willendorf
- the prehistoric Venus excavated in Willendorf
- the ubiquitous Venus of Willendorf
- the Venus of Willendorf
- the Venus von Willendorf
- the Venus of Willendorf's
- The Venus of Willendorf
- the Venus von Willendorf
- the Venus of Willendorf
- the Venus of Willendorf
- the Willendorf Venus
- this Willendorf Venus
- Venus 2
- Venus of Willendorf 234
- Venus of Willendorf's
- Venus of Willendorf's
- Venus of Willendorf[sic]
- Venus von Willendorf 20
- Venus von Willendorf 14
- Venus von Willendorf, Figure
- Willendorf Venus
- Woman from Willendorf
- Willie 2

- a Willendorf
- Pavlovian-Kostjukian-Gravettian female figurines... Willendorf
- the ancient Willendorf
- the Willendorf
- the Willendorf 2

- the Woman of Willendorf
- Woman from Willendorf 6

- a Willendorf Mother
- Big-belly Mother
- Earth Mother of Willendorf
- Magna Mater
- Mighty Mojo Mamma
- the ancient earth mother venus of willendorf
- THE EARTH MOTHER
- the Earth Mother of Willendorf
- the Stone-Age large-breasted Earth Mother of Willendorf
- the Willendorf Mother

- Die V. v. W. 1
- Little Venus of W 1

- a Willendorf
- "Venus," figurines... Willendorf
- "Venus" of Willendorf
- "Venus of Willendorf"
- "Venus of Willendorf"
- "Venus of Willendorf" 1
- "Venus of Willendorf" 3
- "Venus of Willendorf" 7
- "Venus of Willendorf"
- "Venus of Willendorf"
Each of the 23 dialogue bubbles contains signifiers of a similar name or problematised-name signification. NVivo counts these occurrences from titles, contents, captions, index entries, and any repetitions that occur in the bodies of the texts. A referenced list appears in Appendix F. Some of the clauses represented do not exhibit the signifier Willendorf. These include cases where the clause is the caption to a Willendorf photograph, as in the case of 'Creatrix of the Universe' (Arizona Triad 2006: http), for example. They include cases where the context makes it clear that the signifier indicates Willendorf, as in the case of ‘The Venus’ (Craig 2000) where the entire text is a discussion of Willendorf.

To make the juxtaposition as brief and clear as possible, where the immediate Willendorf clause is the modifier within a larger clause, for example ‘the amusingly recognizable fat figure of the Venus of Willendorf’ (Comini 1990: 178), the juxtaposition does not show the larger clause. The illustration also does not include larger clauses such as ‘one of the so-called Venus figurines...Willendorf near Vienna’ (Eisler 1988: 1), where the signifier Willendorf is a distance away from the noun and its clause indicating the artefact. Chapters six and seven of this thesis analyse the content of these larger spreads where they have bearing on the discourses and agendas of the data texts.

In order to reduce issues of comparability as much as practicable, the juxtaposition also does not include Willendorf signifiers associated with the artefact that are relatively easily recognised as being more than one step removed from the artefact. These are signifiers such as ‘Lion of Willendorf’ (Walter 2003: http), ‘Willendorf’s Gallery’ (Crick 2001: http), ‘The Willendorf Statue’ (Abaxion 2003: http), ‘Willendorf Pages’ (Granju 1999: 17, Hunt 1998: http, Mothering 1998: http, Willie 1999: http, Willie 2000: http), ‘Willendorf Press’ (Airborne & Polack 2004: http, Berg 1995: http), and ‘a Venus of Willendorf’ (Bradway & McCoard 1997: 210). In these cases, the clause clearly refers to an artwork, appropriation, a creation, facsimile, cast, replica or reproduction based on the famous artefact that is the subject of this thesis, and not to the artefact itself. Having to make these decisions in constructing the
illustration again shows the complex nature of signification. Highlighting this complexity works to belie the simplistic nature of signification constructed and promoted by positivism.

The most common linguistic unit or grouping of words surrounding and including the single signifier *Willendorf* in the data texts is the clause *the Venus of Willendorf* (NVivo codes 234 occurrences without quotation marks in 162 of the 490 data texts). This unproblematised clause *the Venus of Willendorf*, which is still in current usage, presents itself as a simple and straightforward name (eg Bahn 2006: http, Dove 2007: http, Rosendahl 2007: 182; and viewed in terms of praxis and reflexivity, also: Barasch in Rosendahl 2007: 173, 174; Bradway & McCoard in Rosendahl 2007: 173; Campbell in Rosendahl 2007: 175; Dobson in Rosendahl 2007: 175; Elder in Rosendahl 2007: 176, 177; Elkins in Rosendahl 2007: 176; Hume in Rosendahl 2007: 180; La Barre in Rosendahl 2007: 181; Maringer in Rosendahl 2007: 180; McDermott in Rosendahl 2007: 185; Sacred Source in Rosendahl 2007: 183). The use of quotation marks not only has the ability to indicate the exact word or phrase used by another, but also to suggest or denote its problematisation.

Employment of adjectives such as *so-called* (NVivo codes 63 occurrences in 43 of the 490 data texts) and *dubbed* (NVivo codes 8 occurrences in 7 of the 490 data texts), is an alternate though less textually specific means of problematising *Willendorf* name-signifier usage. In this way, these texts question word choice, or the textuality, of other texts. Analysing usage has the added effect of knowledgeability. In other words, questioning usage gives the added impression that the unproblematised usage is inferior, by being an earlier or unthoughtful version. By using quotation marks, the text indicates the precise part of the usage that the textual site questions. For example, use of quotation marks allows differentiation between problematising just the word *Venus* and problematising the whole phrase *the Venus of Willendorf*. Isolating the word *Venus* alone has the ability to express that the *Willendorf* component of the phrase is acceptable, but with the *Venus* component the textual site takes issue. Isolating the whole phrase *the Venus of Willendorf* has the ability to express that this is how Western hegemony has known the artefact but the
usage is problematic. This latter is particularly interesting, and could certainly serve as a conscious political tactic, in that by means of criticising the usage of others, the intended artefact is signified without a textual site having to take responsibility for, or ostensibly endorsing, any signifier at all.

When a textual site problematises a single word using quotation marks, that word is invariably the noun *Venus* (NVivo codes 122 occurrences of this noun in double or single quotation marks, in 46 of the 490 data texts). Because this practice is so widespread (251 of the 490 data texts use single or double quotation marks in some configuration in at least one of their Willendorf-signifier usages), some textual sites may be copying the form that otherwise would not necessarily have considered problematising the usage themselves. That is, they may be copying the quotation marks, verbatim, as a proper part of the name.

This noun *Venus* is the traditional (Kohen 1946: 49, Witcombe 2005: http) and still most commonly used word in constructing name signifiers for Willendorf and in discussing the Palaeolithic figurines in general (NVivo codes 1260 occurrences of the word *Venus* in 401 of the 490 data texts). There are many configurations of these constructions. In some cases, an identifying or modifying clause follows this noun. In addition to the clause the *Venus of Willendorf* are the German and Spanish clauses *der Venus von Willendorf* (Neugebauer-Maresch 1995), and *Venus de Willendorf* (Encolombia 2001: http). In the clause *Venus Willendorf* (Virtual Concrete 1999: http), readings include the signifier *Venus* acting as a first name. In this reading, the modifier *Willendorf* acts as a surname identifying the particular Venus that the text means to signify. In the case of the clause the *Willendorf Venus* (22 occurrences in 19 of the 490 data texts) the noun *Venus* follows the identifying adjective *Willendorf*. In the clause the *Venus* (Campbell, R. 1998: http), a textual site in one instance uses the noun *Venus* with just the definite article the and without the identifier Willendorf.
Another noun used in these constructions is the noun **Goddess**. There are two configurations using this noun in constructing name signifiers for **Willendorf**. These are the **Goddess of Willendorf** (7 occurrences in 6 of the 490 data texts) and the **Willendorf Goddess** (7 occurrences in 6 of the 490 data texts). Further nouns used in constructing name signifiers for **Willendorf** in the data texts are **artefact**, **carving**, **creatrix**, **figure**, **figurine**, **ladies**, **mother**, **sculpture**, **statue**, **statuette**, **Willendorf** and **woman**. With such a variety, a student might understandably consider these signifiers to be describing different things. In a sense, this is the case. It is the case in that from their varying perspectives, what these textual sites describe are indeed different things. It is not the case, however, in that these textual sites are also working to reinscribe the very same thing with new or altered meanings.

Along with the potential personification of the verbal signifier **Venus Willendorf** already mentioned, the verbal signifiers of two other data texts work to personify the **artefact**. They do this by means of titles in the verbal signifiers: 'Ms. Willendorf' (Witcombe 1999: http, 2005: http) and 'Frau Willendorf' (Russell 1998: 263). The title Ms. creates a mental juxtaposition between the Stone Age and the present, as does the title Frau. The title Frau further emphasises the present language spoken in the locality of Willendorf, the site where Western hegemony found the **artefact**. These juxtapositions belie the positivist implication that language is an accurate translation of the world, as it is, separate from present-day humankind. They highlight the perspective of language as just as much a reflection of its speakers as it is a reflection of the signified about which it speaks.

**Photographs (Re)Presenting this Willendorf (Arte)Fact**

In engaging a student of pre-herstory, for example, with discussion about a famous object, the question: _What does it look like?_ is a primary concern of students in visually-oriented Western culture. Because a single physical object could hardly reach all the pre-herstory classrooms of the world, learning facilitators employ photographs to fulfil this task. Just as Western hegemony
fosters belief in a name as the thing itself, it also fosters belief in a photograph as the thing itself. Influenced by scientific thought, Western culture has great faith in the ability of the camera to reproduce what meets its lens. The question: *What does it look like?* becomes conflated into the singular-truth-assumption question: *What is it?* Many texts discussing the Willendorf artefact offer a photograph in answer to this question. Below is a juxtaposition of some of these photographs.

Figure 4.5: Photographs (Re)Presenting the Willendorf (Arte)Fact Itself

As with Figures 4.1 to 4.4, from a postlinguistic perspective this 140-piece juxtaposition does not show that some signifiers, in this case photographic
signifiers, are correct and others incorrect. It shows that all signifiers are subject to the facilitations and constraints, in this case visual and technical facilitations and constraints of photo-graphics. The juxtaposition works to highlight that visual Willendorf signifiers reflect and construct concepts surrounding the artefact, rather than being the artefact itself. The signifiers are in publication-year order. A referenced list for this set of signifiers appears in Appendix F.

Besides being various combinations of monochrome and colour, the backgrounds of the Willendorf-representation photographs vary in other ways as well. This set contains two with shadows suggesting that photographers may have taken these photographs with the artefact lying down (Janson & Kerman 1968: 5, Shaw, S.J. 2006: http). One is on a scenic background (Gass 1993: 1) and one has a map for a background (Naturhistorisches Museum 2003d). In some, textual sites cut out the Willendorf-representation photograph, and float it amongst and tightly surrounded by words (eg Tringham & Conkey 1998: 26, Husain 2001: 120). The photographs also vary in terms of framing and angle. Some are mirror images. These distinctive Willendorf-representation examples suggest that photographic choices can also vary in accordance with the fashion of the time at discursive sites. Students learn that things such as possible backgrounds for photographs of objects are infinite. Highlighting that the choice of background often varies in accordance with discourse and agenda, however, belies the positivist implication that a photograph is a faithful, transparent and unbiased conveyor of the outside world. This highlighting strengthens the poststructuralist perspective of photographs as participants in the construction of discursive and political agendas.

The visual or pictorial image is the oldest means of signification. Though a picture may be worth a thousand words, and though these may appear to be photographs of the artefact and not carvings, drawings, paintings, or sculptures by the relatively imprecise human hand, this wide variety of photographic signifiers for this Willendorf artefact works to reinforce that these signifiers, nonetheless, are not the artefact to which they refer. ‘World’s Oldest’ (2000: http) credits the Austrian AEIOU Project for their Willendorf image, but textual sites do not always include the sources of their photographs. Textual
sites also do not explicitly state that their photograph is taken of the very artefact that was unearthed in 1908, although University of Newcastle upon Tyne (1999: http) does state that their representation of the artefact is a facsimile. Textual sites do not specifically qualify their photographs of this Willendorf artefact by offering technical camera, lighting, and printing information or other information about decisions made in taking and representing the photograph, nor do they generally expose any political motivations for those decisions. The student must piece together or guess at this information. At the same time, the caption reassures the student as to what the student should note, and what the text represents to the student. The constructed title, combined with the photograph itself and any other accompanying text, promotes the culture's social values and ways of seeing, doing, and being in the world.

Photographs (Re)Presenting Willendorf Likenesses


Based on a single facsimile representation alone, there is no way for a reader or student to judge how closely that replica reproduces the artefact unearthed in 1908. The captions to these photographs also offer no qualifying information in this regard. Rather, they reassure the student what is important to note. They explain for the student, in effect, what that photograph represents to her or
explain for the student, in effect, what that photograph represents to her or him. Thus, not only does wondering what this famous object looks like become conflated with the question: *What is it?* but also with the question: *What does it mean?* Many textual sites discussing Willendorf take advantage of the Western hegemonic assumption that a photograph is an accurate conveyor of the world at large. Below is a juxtaposition of some of these Willendorf likenesses taken from the project's data texts.

As with Figure 4.5, from a postlinguistic perspective this 111-piece juxtaposition does not show that some photographic signifiers are correct and others incorrect. It shows that all signifiers, verbal and graphic alike, are subject to things such as the facilitations and constraints of the language that communicates them. The juxtaposition works to highlight the simulacra of visual Willendorf signifiers. That is, it works to highlight that photographs communicate copies, or copies of copies, but not originals. The signifiers are in publication-year order. A referenced list for this set of signifiers appears in Appendix F.

Figure 4.6: Photographs (Re)Presenting Willendorf Likenesses
Like the juxtaposition of photographic-representation signifiers, the juxtaposition on the previous page represents these likeness-representation signifiers in publication-date order. Also like the selection of photographic-representation signifiers, this selection includes a horizontal view (Amazon.com 2006: http [image 1]), a reversed image (Sacred Source 2003: http), both black and white and colour images, framed images (Curtis 2003: http), stretched photographs (Rainbow Crystal 1999: http, 2003: http), and various angles of front and side views.

Unlike the juxtaposition of photographic-representation signifiers, the selection of signifiers on the previous page does not include a photograph with a specific back view. Students learn that representations of likenesses show views exhibiting that which a textual site considers the most important or relevant. Highlighting this exhibition, however, belies the positivist implication that representation is mechanical, straightforward, and value-free (Lather 1991b: 52). This highlighting further strengthens the poststructuralist perspective of representations of likenesses as signifiers that textual sites base upon cultural values that students learn, consider, and construct. This is whether or not that consideration and construction is conscious, explicit, and overt. Some of the photographs in this juxtaposition show multiples of Willendorf-artefact likenesses. They show, for example, groups of two (Jai Bhagavan 1999: http, Sacred Source 2003: http, willendorf@geocities 2000: http, Marewindrider 2001: http, Sacred Source 2003: http, Henes 2006: http). They show a group of three (Broom Closet 1999: http; Jai Bhagavan 1999a: http, 1999b: http; Medieval Mayhem 2003: http), and they show groups of more than three (Lynx UK 2004: http, Henes 2006: http, Satzl 2006: http).

The implications of moving from visually representing one artefact image on its own, as in the case of a pendant, to visually representing two together, as in the case of ear rings (Sacred Source 2003: http) are philosophically significant. It is like the difference between viewing one earth and viewing two, identical in size, shape and appearance. It becomes evident that they are the very same earth, but seeing the two simultaneously reinforces the conclusion that they are
not. Simulacra become apparent via their seeming impossibility, as viewed by current modes of Western hegemonic thought.

Photographs (Re)Presenting Willendorf-Inspired Images

Some of the representations of Willendorf are not photographs of the artefact itself or of a facsimile, but are creative artworks inspired by this Willendorf artefact. These include strongly abstracted or coloured images (e.g., Blessed Bee 1999: http, Lytha Studios 1999: http, Medieval Mayhem 2003: http, O’Connell 2000: book jacket, Fugitive Colors 2003: http). They include symbols used in floor plans and maps to stand for the artefact (de la Croix & Tansey 1975: 24 & 25; de la Croix, Tansey & Kirkpatrick 1991: 26; Chang 2000: http; Golebiowski, Kruspel & Vitek 2002: 21; Naturhistorisches Museum 2001: 9). They include the liberal use of creative artistic licence to embellish, juxtapose, or make a point (e.g., Fugitive Colors 2001: http, Grey 2000: http, Hawkdancing 1999: http), and they include very obvious or strong photographic effects (e.g., Amazon.com 2006: http [image 4], willendorf@geocities 2000: http, Land Niederösterreich 2003: http).

Like the Willendorf-artefact likenesses, based on a single textual representation alone, there is no way for a student to judge how close an artwork is to the artefact unearthed in 1908, or in what ways and to what degrees it differs. Again, the captions to these images offer no qualifying information in this regard. The very features used to create an image identifiable with the Willendorf artefact become the features highlighted via textual comment in the image’s caption. These Willendorf-inspired images extend their creative licence to actively construct both visual and verbal signifiers answering the question: What does it mean? Like the artefact-representation juxtaposition and the likeness-representation juxtaposition, the creative-artwork juxtaposition on the following page represents its signifiers in publication-date order. Like these previous juxtapositions, this juxtaposition shows both black and white and colour images, and various angles of front and side views. Like the artefact-representation set, this set also includes an image with a purposefully shown
back view (catrepreneur@hotmail 2004: http). As in the case of the Willendorf-likeness photographs, some of the Willendorf-inspired-image photographs show multiples of Willendorf-artefact representations. Two show groups of two (catrepreneur@hotmail 2004: http, e-archetypes 2005: http). One shows a group of three (Hawkdancing 1999: http). Two show groups of four (Fugitive Colors 2003: http, catrepreneur@hotmail 2004: http), and three show groups of more than four (Melanie 2001: http, catrepreneur@hotmail 2004: http, Witchshop 2004: http).

As with Figures 4.5 and 4.6, from a postlinguistic perspective this 91-piece juxtaposition does not show that some photographic signifiers are correct and others incorrect. It shows that all signifiers, verbal and graphic alike, are subject to things such as the facilitations and constraints of the language that communicates them. The juxtaposition works to highlight that visual Willendorf signifiers offer clues to the import they hold for the creator of those signifiers and the target audience of those signifiers, rather than being that
particular idea itself. The signifiers are in publication-year order. A referenced list for this set of signifiers appears in Appendix F.

The signifiers in this juxtaposition are not constrained by working to reproduce a replica of this Willendorf artefact. Rather, they embody reproduced Willendorf simulacra to the extent that Willendorf becomes a chocolate one can eat or a pattern one can use to reproduce Willendorf images for oneself. They inspire humour and imaginative thought by representing the artefact drinking wine (Pond 1998: 254), looking into a mirror (Whitehorn 2001: http), and singing (Mitchell, A. 2003: http). They inspire artistic thought by representing the artefact with bright colours (eg Diva’s Designs 2003: http, Fugitive Colors 2003: http, Melanie 2001: http, Witchshop 2004: http), with concentric circles and spirals (Fugitive Colors 2001: http, Melanie 2001: http, Melanie 2003: http, Fowle 2004: http), and in quadruplicate (Fugitive Colors 2003: http). They work to impose suggestive thought by representing the artefact with a baby miniature of itself (Ting Hua Liu 2006: http) and with the globe of the earth for a belly (Hawkdancing 1999: http). They invoke other symbols such as the Triple Goddess (Triple Goddess 2006: http) by representing the artefact flanked by new moons (Rising Moon 2003: http).

Some of these creative-artwork signifiers highlight the structure of this Willendorf artefact (Curtis 2003: http, Wabi Sabi 2005: http). They accomplish this highlighting in much the same way that drawings identify lines marking edges offered by the artefact itself. These lines mark edges from a particular perspective, but do not exist as such on the artefact itself. Students learn that structural representations illustrate attributes of an object that are obviously not the whole story. Highlighting their necessarily partial contribution to the whole picture, however, belies the positivist implication that textual signifiers can be accurate representations of entireties. It belies that they can be the way it is in the un-signified physical world. It strengthens the poststructuralist perspective that textual signifiers are necessarily and inescapably partial.
This chapter has raised the emancipative perspective that none of these tempting signifiers is the artefact. It has worked to reinforce the idea that ontologically these signifiers can never be the artefact, the concept, or the idea to which they refer. It has worked to remind postlinguistic students and learning facilitators that both verbal and visual signifiers are reflexive, reusable tools in the form of simulacra.

The chapter has also endeavoured to show that there are ways in which micro-textuality, signifiers, and statements, both are and are not the case. It has worked to highlight ways in which specific cues and clues can indicate meaning. The chapter has undertaken to highlight these ways, without claiming permanent attachment of those cues and clues to those particular meanings.

The chapter has further worked to find a postlinguistic perspective beyond the bounds of the Western hegemonic authoritarianism that inextricably surrounds, permeates, and emerges from this academic text. Rather than offering its version of static answers, where the only work for willing students and learning facilitators to do is to accept and to learn those static answers, the thesis has moved to offer its version of open-ended textual tools, where willing postlinguistic engagement by students and learning facilitators is potentially unpredictable, dynamic, and far-reaching.
Willendorf De/Construction(s):
Three Prominent Verbal/Visual Nodes

The movements of deconstruction do not destroy structures from the outside. They are not possible and effective, nor can they take accurate aim, except by inhabiting those structures. Inhabiting them in a certain way, because one always inhabits, and all the more when one does not suspect it. (Derrida 1997b: 24)

This chapter clusters concepts and idea(s) surrounding this Willendorf artifact/artefact that, while not evident in the artefact itself, tend to form patterns by recurring in the project’s data texts. The chapter also includes works to include evidence of linguistic politics in its purview by using the de/constructive textuality of parentheses, virgules, and word strikeouts (eg as in Roth, R. & Roth 1998, O’Riley 2003). This de/construction assists in reducing textual constructions to some of the influences informing those constructions. It also assists in (re)combining these influences to see a fresh perspective.

Some of these graphic signifiers are also relevant to this de/construction chapter in that they exhibit juxtaposition and encourage de/constructive
thought within themselves. Some of these graphic signifiers are further relevant to this de/construction chapter in that they are examples of the three particular Willendorf clusters or nodes (Tappe 2002: 40) discussed in the chapter. These nodes are namely Barbie(s), (the) rainbow(s), and earth(s). In using polyvocal textuality in the signifiers de/construction(s), formation(s), Barbie (dolls), rainbow(s), and (the) earth(s) in its title and headings, the chapter works to represent the dismembering/(re)membering and the singularity/plurality nexus important to the political post/linguistic analysis with which it is concerned. A further perspective that becomes relevant here, particularly at the micro-textual level, is that written verbal text is also visual. While this is the case, the distinction I intend with the chapter subtitle verbal and visual nodality is between words and pictorial images.

Building/Seeing/Viewing with Post/Structuralist Tools

The main aim in constructing these node formations is to explore the element of the gaze. This aim in particular explores the gaze with/in the textual construction of meaning as a will to power (Foucault 1994: 290, Lather 1991b: 119). Post/Linguistic analysis in this chapter works to explore how textual sites literally put their texts together. It works to glean what tangible and intangible materials the textual sites use in putting their texts together. As the researcher in this investigation, I work to find new relationships between what I see in this de/construction process. In this way, the analysis works to make new constructions of these newfound perspectives and relationships. This kind of rhizomatic exploration is at the heart of the emancipative educational work that I move this thesis moves both to accomplish and to foster. Since Because I do not unquestioningly seek conventional conceptual order, the chapter again follows an alphabetical order. From its de/construction perspective a lack of conceptual order is not only acceptable, but also actually helpful.

The three Willendorf nodes move in and out of Western hegemonic perceptions and idea(l)s that speculate about possible purposes and significances of the artefact. Speculations include the artefact as a dildo (eg

Idea(s) include perceived purposes and significances of the artefact for the culture that carved it, purposes and significances for present culture based on those perceptions, and relevant newfound purposes and significances of the artefact for present living, growing culture(s). Each of the three node-sections explores this content in terms of strategies employed by textual sites. Each also explores this content in terms of evidence of the gaze. Each further explores the implications of the presence/absence of qualifying statements in data textuality. Like the last chapter on Willendorf signification, from its learning-in-education perspective the import of this Willendorf de/construction chapter is really on the type of content (eg that de/construction sites form new rhizomatic node groups) as much as it is on the content (eg attributes of a particular node) itself.
Grotesque/Voluptuous Willendorf (Doll/s)

Many of the excerpts gathered at this femininity-icon node utilise the juxtaposition of Willendorf with Barbie and other slender idea(l)s of beauty as part of their bid to construct meaning textually. The node draws together significations not only of multiplicity, but also of dichotomy, and of unity. It highlights problems of implication, category, and stereotype. It highlights bids for power via cultural/personal surveillance of the body. It highlights positioning work (by the writer on the reader/student) by means of emotive adverbs and adjectives.

An example of multiplicity at this node is the variety of juxtapositions of Willendorf with Barbie. Four of the project's data texts directly juxtapose Willendorf with Barbie (Lord 1994: 75; Brezsny 2000: 79, 121; Grey 2000: http; Andrews 2002: 20). A further example of multiplicity is the artefacts with which textual sites tend to group Willendorf. This example highlights that in reality multiplicity is in the eye of the beholder. It is relevant to all three nodes of this chapter. The group of artefacts with which textual sites tend to group Willendorf is often generalised by the signification Venus figurines. NVivo codes 93 occurrences of this usage in 26 of the 490 data texts. The number of artefacts grouped with Willendorf varies from dozens (O'Connell 2000: 14) to thousands (Kramarae & Spender 2000: 1357). In between are significations such as 'about one hundred' (Ruppel Shell 2002: 23), '160-odd' (Curtis 2003: http), 'well over a hundred... ' (Eisenbud 1996: 7), and 'nearly two hundred' (Gadon 1989: 4). Other significations regarding this number include 'several small female figurines' (Paleolithic Art 2003: http), 'many small statues of her' (willendorf@geocities 2000: http), and 'large numbers of female, or "venus," figurines' (Delson, Tattersall, Van Couvering & Brooks 2000: 296).

No one disagrees that Students learn that Barbie dolls are an element of Western hegemonic culture rather than an element of the culture creating this Willendorf artefact. Collecting these verbal and visual signifiers together,
however, works to belie the positivist implication that linguistic signification is about the signified. It strengthens the Foucauldian perspective that 'the history which bears and determines us has the form of a war rather than that of a language: relations of power, not relations of meaning' (Foucault 1980: 114). Showing such a relatively large number of texts with the same association highlights this association as a shared social perspective rather than a singular or odd one. This, in combination with these textual sites exhibiting something so obviously foreign to the era of the artefact itself, works to strengthen the post/structuralist perspective that signification largely comprises the element of the gaze. It strengthens the perspective that signification comprises the gaze much more than current scientific positivism admits. It strengthens the perspective that signification comprises the gaze much more than Western hegemonic culture currently suspects.

One text specifically juxtaposes Willendorf with Boticelli’s slender Venus (Fugitive Colors 2001: http). The name with which Willendorf is historically associated, *Venus of Willendorf*, also juxtaposes Willendorf with this type of classical Venus, the goddess of sexual love and beauty (Witcombe 1999: http, 2005: http). Students learn that Western hegemonic culture reveres the young slender female body. Collecting these verbal and visual juxtapositions together here, however, works as much to highlight the effort made in showing the difference, as it does to highlight a preference for one or the other. Highlighting the effort that textual sites make to show this juxtaposition works to ask an alternate question to the customary Western hegemonic question: *which is correct?* It works instead to ask the deconstruction and critical-literacy question: *why this effort?*

Students learn that appearances can illicit idea(1)s of ugliness and beauty. Collecting these idea(1)s together in one node, however, works more to highlight their wide variety than it does to justify any one particular idea(1). Highlighting this wide variety works to show their disparity. Showing their disparity begins to suggest their seeming arbitrariness. Suggesting their seeming arbitrariness works to strengthen the post/structuralist perspective that Western hegemony not only teaches correctness, but constructs it as well.
Highlighting their seeming arbitrariness also works to begin to question the Western hegemonic imperative to decide. It works to support the Foucauldian approach of suspending judgement (Foucault 1988b: 107).

Significations of dichotomy include not only grotesqueness and voluptuousness regarding the ugliness/beauty of the Willendorf artefact’s striking appearance, but also significations of distortion/lifelikeness, atypicality/representativeness, against/for, and fat/thin in Willendorf discussion. Additional binaries attending this node manifest within single words. These are words such as un/shapely (Neumann in Bord & Bord 1982: 17), ab/normally (Paleolithic Art 1994: http), and im/possible (López 2002: http). Via these opposing significations, this nexus of the Willendorf/Barbie node highlights the perspective that dichotomous thinking actively produces contradictions. An example from this node, of contradiction reflexively resulting from a black-and-white assumption, is the perceived Western hegemonic contradiction of a fat person caring how they look (Whitehorn 2001: http). Students learn that beauty is in the eye of the beholder. Highlighting the almost emotive language used to describe lack of beauty in some of these examples, however, belies the positivist implication that these significations are the manifestation of an objectivity that involves simple access to something that is pre-existing, fixed and true (Weedon 1987: 28). It strengthens the post/structuralist perspective that in order ‘to achieve the status of truth they have to discredit all alterative and oppositional versions of meaning’ (Weedon 1987: 131). These textual sites work to do this, in part, by using these negative and emotive-related signifiers.

At the distortion/lifelikeness nexus of the Barbie/Willendorf dichotomy, NVivo coding includes two passages relating to the distortion of Barbie, and ten passages relating to the distortion of Willendorf or artefacts like it. It includes two passages relating to the lifelikeness of Barbie or artefacts like it, and eight passages of the lifelikeness of Willendorf or artefacts like it. The data texts evidence this nexus in significations such as ‘the figurines generally aren’t very realistic’ (Spice 2003: http) on the distortion side, and ‘shapes identical to living women's’ (Duhard 1995: http) on the lifelike side of the binary. Students learn that there are two sides to an argument. Highlighting that textual sites use
the very same Willendorf artefact and the very same Barbie icon politically to argue either way, however, belies the positivist implication that content is where the action is. It strengthens the Foucauldian perspective that all statements are really about power (Foucault 1980: 114).

The atypical/representative nexus of this doll(s) node, even more than some of the other nodes and nexus, highlights issues of stereotyping and generalisation. The node highlights the post/structuralist perspective that to generalise, even in the use of a concept represented by a single word, is to lose complexity and multiplicity that is poststructurally relevant and vital to feminism (Weedon 1987: 19-21), as it is to all emancipatory projects. 'To employ...concepts in the analysis of power and/or domination, such as “hegemony,” is to lose some of the complexity and multiplicity that Foucault's analyses of power-knowledge not only permit but demand.' (Gore 1993: 61) The data texts manifest this atypical/representative nexus of the Barbie/Willendorf dichotomy in significations such as 'Willendorf, who is almost always used as representative, is in fact the fattest one' (Nelson, S. M. 2005: http). This example is on the atypical side of the binary. Examples on the representative side are significations such as 'perhaps the most widely known, the Willendorf, from Austria defines the type' (Gadon 1989: 6).

A fat/thin nexus further permeates these discussions, evidenced by 'grotesquely fat' (Ruppel Shell 2002: 23) on the one extreme, and 'anorexic' (Andrews 2002: 20) on the other. The statement 'beauty comes in all sizes' (Angelfire 2004: http), voices a further perspective of this nexus. This nexus of the Willendorf/Barbie node highlights a linguistic battleground over health. This battleground raises ostensible medical, nutritional and psychological concerns. Some of the data texts speak against these concerns. Examples against the ostensible concern for fatness are significations such as 'overturn medical wisdom' (Lord 1996: http) and 'cosmetic (as distinct from medical) reasons' (Pond 1998: 259). An example against ostensible nutritional concerns for thinness is the statement 'As one of my thin friends pointed out, thin women live in weight slavery too.' (Angelfire 2004: http) An example against ostensible psychological concerns for fluctuation between fatness and thinness
is the statement ‘Bodies which could not cope with periods of relative scarcity and abundance did not survive to pass on their genes.’ (Sones 2003: http) These concerns relate to Foucault’s work on prohibition, surveillance, the body and technologies of the self (1973, 1977a, 1986b, 1988c).

A nexus, against/for, in the Willendorf/Barbie dichotomy also permeates the Willendorf discussions in this node. The data texts manifest this nexus, against Willendorf, in significations such as ‘the dreadfully sagging shape of her breast and hips’ (Leroi-Gourhan in Taylor 1997: 121). The data texts manifest the nexus, against Barbie, in significations such as ‘the Barbie doll is a distortion of everything I love about the feminine sex’ (Andrews 2002: 20). They manifest against Willendorf in significations such as ‘the pear shaped, disproportioned Venus of Willendorf’ (Spice 2003: http). Significations speaking in favour of Willendorf include ‘She’s only a few inches tall, but she’s voluptuous’ (Simon, S. 2000: http). Significations in favour of Barbie include ‘Barbie is…a narrow-hipped mother goddess for the epoch of cesarean sections’ (Lord 1994: 75). Highlighting the dichotomy itself is the example: ‘a vastly different feminine ideal than that of today’s world’ (Sones 2003: http). Students learn that different persons/daughters often have different feelings about a subject. Highlighting that feelings penetrate all discourses, however, including purportedly objective scientific discourses, belies the positivist implication that textual signification has the ability to convey unadulterated material. It strengthens the post/structuralist perspective that textual signification is a social construction, subject to the same influences of (hu)man emotion as all social constructions.

Some of the data texts sidestep Willendorf/Barbie dichotomies and instead highlight their similarities. The similarities highlighted include uses served by the artefact or doll. In highlighting parallels of use, the node also highlights parallels of significance between Willendorf and Barbie. Some texts qualify their statements to varying degrees. Other texts offer no qualifications whatsoever, or make embedded statements that offer no qualification. For example, the contraction it's in the excerpt ‘it’s our beautiful curvas [italics added] that attract real men’ (López 2002: http) forces the reader/student to a
confrontational position, should s/he feel qualification of this statement pertinent. Likewise, the words all...are in the excerpt 'all these Venus statues, even the French ones, are grotesquely fat' (Ruppel Shell 2002: 23) work decisively to position the reader/student. Should s/he wish to engage with the text, foremost facing that reader/student is the binary option to agree or to confront. These linguistic practices discriminate against the reader/student, because having a different opinion without attacking, disagreeing, or disengaging is not an option allowed for by this text. Writers, readers, students, and learning facilitators of Western hegemony, however, all engage in these potentially discriminatory linguistic practices. This emancipatory (re)search endeavours (in hindsight both successfully and unsuccessfully) to sidestep these potentially discriminatory linguistic practices. It works to challenge the dichotomous assumptions behind these practices. It does so by highlighting post/structuralism's alterative perspectives concerning 'the plurality of language and the impossibility of fixing meaning once and for all' (Weedon 1987: 85).

Rainbow/Coloured Willendorf

Many of the excerpts gathered at this colour-emphasising node utilise the juxtaposition of Willendorf with expressions of rainbows and other strong colours as part of their bid to construct meaning textually. The node draws together significations of not only New Age and colour symbolism, but also significations of colour discrimination. Technical-(re)presentation concerns also attend this node. The node highlights issues of perspective. It highlights problems of singular meaning. It highlights the positioning work of consciously manipulating appearances in texts.

The colour symbolism nexus of this node is relevant to art history, performance art, psychology, and the visual arts. Significations evidencing this nexus include the vibrant rainbow spectrum of the New Age. A specific example of the rainbow significations is ‘Rainbow Venus’ (Diva’s Designs 2003: http). Students learn that the experience of Palaeolithic culture is not the
same as New Age culture. Highlighting that New Age culture makes its own sense of Palaeolithic culture, however, belies the positivist implication that Western cultures have the ability to see from the perspective of Palaeolithic culture. It strengthens the post/structuralist perspective that subjectivity can be only approximately (re)built. It strengthens the post/structuralist perspective that textual sites must necessarily (re)build that approximation in a context that is now.

Significations contributing to this colour symbolism nexus also include reports of red-ochre on this Willendorf artefact. Specific examples of the red-ochre significations include ‘seems originally to have been covered with pigments, of which traces remain’ (Honour & Fleming 1982: 13, 1995: 21), and ‘color of blood’ (Cartwright 2004a: http, Hoving 1999: 27). Another example is Gaulke’s production of Maberry’s performance as Willendorf, covered in earth red (Gadon 1989: pl. 32, Mutén 1994: 123, Graham 1997: 267, Merchant 1992: 116).

Three senses of meaning for the colour symbolism of red ochre appear in the data texts in relation to this Willendorf artefact. These senses pertain, in part, to the gaze of the speaker. The first is oblivious to the gaze as an issue. It speaks as though it can speak for the past. It dictates from current Western hegemonic culture, the meaning that red ochre on the artefact originally had for the culture that produced it. Examples include the signification ‘red ochre, the pigmented earth, symbolic of life-giving blood’ (Gadon 1989: 6). Here, though the meaning can be read as Palaeolithic culture’s meaning, being prefaced earlier in the paragraph by ‘...Palaeolithic people...’ and ‘they believed...’, it is necessarily not a Palaeolithic culture’s reading of the signification, but a contemporary culture’s reading.

The second is a qualified gaze. It reasons out, from a Western hegemonic perspective for a Western hegemonic perspective, a meaning regarding this Willendorf artefact for the culture that produced it. Significations evidencing this sense include the sentence ‘The assumption that Gravettian Venus figurines had an understood symbolic meaning, or cluster of meanings, is
supported by the fact that a number of figurines, including the Venus of Willendorf, were originally covered in red ochre.' (Curtis 2003: http) Here 'understood symbolic meaning' still purportedly belongs to Palaeolithic culture, but it is presented as a contemporary culture's worked-out understanding of then culture.

The third sense for the colour symbolism of red ochre is again oblivious to gaze, but emphasises contemporary rather than past meaning. It dictates meaning of this Willendorf artefact used by living cultures in which it now abides. Significations evidencing this sense include the sentences "Mana" has the bulbous appeal of the Paleolithic Venus of Willendorf. Roughly smeared with rusty color, "Mana" is a lava mound, fertility charm, beehive and breast of a rough beast.' (Hackett 1999: http) Significations in the data texts tend to conflate these senses of meaning. Significations evidencing this include the sentence 'Originally, the figure was painted with red ochre, the sacred color of blood.' (Hoving 1999: 27) This signification implies that red ochre has one meaning. It further implies that that simple, unproblematic, singular meaning is the one described.

The colour discrimination issue is particularly relevant to emancipatory feminism and to post/structuralism. This issue accompanies discussions of marginalisation, in reference to this Willendorf artefact in some of the data texts. The issue permeates struggles of desire, conformity, and social pressures resulting in the construction again, not only of text, but also of the body. Significations evidencing this issue in data-text discussions include 'self-confidence and self-love do not come from...the "right" hair color' (López 2002: http). Students learn that per/sons/daughters desire to be accepted by their cultures, but highlighting that counter-cultures also accept their people, belies the Western hegemonic implication that the Western hegemonic way is the best way. It belies the Western hegemonic implication that the Western hegemonic way is the only way. It strengthens the Foucauldian perspective of complexity and multiplicity (Gore 1993: 61).
The technical (re)presentation nexus of this rainbow/colour node is relevant to photography, physics, and the visual arts. Issues at this nexus are the advent and spread of colour photography, artistic techniques, and general constraints and considerations imposed by the laws of physics or inspired by the physical world. Specific examples include the phenomena of light refraction and a Venus of Willendorf paper model available for assembly (Curtis 2003: http). Students learn that nature and the physical world are basic to the (hu)man psyche, but highlighting connections between constraint, inspiration, and meaning, belies the positivist implication that textual sites can ultimately and quantifiably know the sum of those parts. It strengthens the post/structuralist perspective of infinite symbolic deference and referral. It supports the emancipative educationalist perspective of exploring in what particular ways statements belie and/or strengthen textual sites.

Four of the project’s data texts (Rainbow Crystal 1999: http, 2003: http; Melanie 2001: http; Curtis 2003: http; Diva’s Designs 2003: http) include direct verbal or visual significations of rainbows. Students learn that this Willendorf artefact itself shows no evidence of rainbows. Together these verbal and visual signifiers work to show that textual sites are indeed constructing connections between this Willendorf artefact and rainbows. They strengthen the post/structuralist perspective that signification largely comprises, again much more than Western culture currently suspects or than current scientific positivism admits, the element of the gaze.

This chapter section will not de/construct all of the qualification interstices of this node made regarding red ochre evidence on Willendorf, the relationship of Willendorf to rainbows, and symbolic meaning for red ochre or rainbows. Rather, because there is ample fruitful discussion there, it takes as an example the first of these: signification regarding red-ochre evidence on this Willendorf artefact, and explores its qualification statements. Three data texts qualify their red-ochre statements with the time of dis/covery of the artefact. The most red ochre signified with this qualification is ‘thick layer’ (Hitchcock 2003: http). The least is ‘traces...were found’ (Sones 2004: http).
Eight data texts qualify their statements concerning red-ochre and this Willendorf artefact with the word *originally*. As noted in the last chapter, post/structurally there are no originals; all is simulacra: endless copies with no originals. At best, this usage of the word *originally* is ambiguous and, as in the example of the last paragraph, could refer to the time of the artefact’s dis/covery. It could also refer to some time of the artefact’s creation or usage within the period of the Palaeolithic culture that produced the artefact. The most red ochre signified with the word *originally* is ‘thickly coated’ (Naturhistorisches Museum 2003d). The least is ‘painted with’ (Naturhistorisches Museum 2001: 3, Summesberger & Lehmann 2002: 2, Hoving 1999: 26). Students learn that without further clarification the word *originally* potentially means different things to different people. Highlighting that the word can mean different things and simultaneously provide an air of authority to a statement, belies the positivist implication that texts are accurate and innocent. It also supports the post/structuralist perspective of reflex(its)ivity and simulacra. In this particular example, textual sites effectively learn and use the word *originally*, although from the post/structuralist perspective of this (re)search, this usage is ambiguous and possesses no original referent.

Four data texts qualify their statements concerning the colour red and this Willendorf artefact with the word *still* (Broom Closet 2003: http, Brennan 1998: 75, Gadon 1989: 6, Rainbow Crystal 2003: http). One signification does not claim the time of colouring to be original, nor does it claim that the artefact is currently coloured, but by using the past tense puts the action of colouring, together with the carving of the artefact, at an unspecified time in the past: ‘The statue was carved from oolitic limestone and was colored with red ochre.’ (Koeller 2000: http)

Interestingly, both the addition of qualifying statements and the lack of qualifying statements have the ability to provide an air of authority. This occurs in the former via the perceived expertise involved in possessing this additional knowledge. It occurs in the latter via the no-nonsense, unequivocal, bare-facts impression given by the statements. Similarly, a text consciously constructed to avoid discrepancies within the confines of itself, works to
support its own authority and expertise. Students learn that there can be discrepancies between reports on a subject. Questioning those reports, however, by utilising the perspective that post/linguistically none is that which they signify, works to question the authority, expertise, wording, and implications of those textual constructions. It also works to strengthen the post/structuralist perspective that texts are varied, (hu)man-constructed simulacra.

The most ochre signified, with no time qualification, is 'made of' (Hower 1993: http). The least is 'tinted with' in 'of carved limestone tinted with red ochre' (Zell, M. G. 1999a: http). Students learn that there are different verbs to choose from in formulating a sentence. In this case, examples of verbs from which to choose obviously include made, covered, coated, painted, and tinted. Highlighting their resulting differences in signification, however, belies the positivist implication that language is a straightforward, transparent, and almost automatic affair. It strengthens the post/structuralist perspective that texts are the product of (hu)man questions, decisions, choices, and values.

Willendorf Earth Mother

Many of the excerpts gathered together at this mother-earth node are similar to the rainbow-colour node of the last section in their New-Age indications (Hayden 1996) of spiritual connections with the natural physical world. The node highlights a metaphorical/physical nexus in the data texts of Willendorf as fired in the kiln of the earth, planted in the earth, made of earth, born of the earth, painted with earth, embodying the earth, and mothering the earth. It highlights the archaeology of the physical artefact itself buried in the earth, unearthed in 1908, and associations of Willendorf with the (h)earth, caves, and Palaeolithic cave art. The node further highlights connections between sacredness, the miracle of birth, and motherhood. It highlights connections between life and death. It highlights the cycle of existence on earth. Drawing together such symbolic multiplicity, this Willendorf-earth-mother node also works to sidestep the imperative hegemonic Western cultural question: What
does it mean? concerning the artefact, by adding the de/construction questions:
in what particular con/text? and under what particular set of subjective conditions?

The node draws together ecological, feminist, and spiritual concerns that engage with the earth and the natural world. These take the form of such subjects as eco-feminism (Blair 1993: http), eco-psychology (Roszak, Gomes & Kanner 1995), feminist/gender archaeology (Russell 1998, Nelson, S. M. 2005), myth (Campbell, J. 1996), paleo-psychology (Cheyne 2000), radical ecology (Merchant 1992), and the psyche (Bradway & McCoard 1997).

Students learn that culture is a living entity. Highlighting the separations and marriages of fields of study here, for example, belies the positivist implication that culture, like social reality and the natural world, is stable and permanent with 'fixed intrinsic meanings' (Weedon 1987: 22). It strengthens the post/structuralist perspective that, because textual sites define and contest social organisation through language (Weedon 1987: 21), social organisation is open to (re)definition.

One of the project's data texts, as previously indicated, directly visually signifies Willendorf images with the globe of the earth for a belly. NVivo codes 76 instances of the terms mother earth or earth mother in 38 of the study's 490 data texts. Students learn that this Willendorf artefact itself shows no evidence of the concept of the earth as a globe. Highlighting this visual signifier together with the number of verbal mother-earth signifiers present in the project's data texts, however, works to show that textual sites are indeed constructing connections between this Willendorf artefact and the earth as we conceive of it today. Highlighting this construction works to belie the supposed permanent truth of '...ideas which people normally take to be permanent...' (Dreyfus 1997). It strengthens the post/structuralist perspective of the foundations of those idea(l)s as (mis)takes or partial takes. It strengthens those takes as social constructions continually in need of maintenance (Weedon 1987: 76).

An example of the many significations evidencing the metaphorical/physical nexus of Willendorf as earth is 'fashioned...from...the very stuff of earth'
(Gadon 1989: 6). Students learn that (hu)mans are social, cultural beings, living and communicating via symbolism and metaphor. Highlighting that cultures continue to use understandings of symbolism and metaphor to construct social reality via language, undermines the positivist implication that contemporary Western cultures have some accurate access to the perspective of Palaeolithic culture. It strengthens the post/structuralist perspective that the constructor to a large degree shapes the constructed.

Like the red-ochre symbolism of the rainbow-colour cluster, the data texts evidence three senses of meaning for the symbolism of Willendorf as earth mother in this cluster. The first is as a meaning regarding this Willendorf artefact for the culture that produced it, evidenced by the signification ‘The sculptural stress on the goddess’s fleshy breasts and generous hips was intended to suggest not so much sexual attractiveness as the prodigality of the milk-giving mother and her procreative potency.’ (Downing 1999: 11) Here, though the data text presents meaning as Palaeolithic culture’s meaning, it is of course not readers/students of a Palaeolithic culture that will be reading the signification, but readers/students of a contemporary culture. This (re)cognition begs the questions: Whose meaning is being presented? A Palaeolithic culture’s meaning? The author’s meaning? Potentially the reader’s meaning? Potentially a student’s meaning? The second is as a meaning regarding this Willendorf artefact for the culture working to make sense of it in terms of the culture that produced it, evidenced by the signification ‘it is commonly believed that these artifacts represent a prototypical Earth Mother or Earth Goddess’ (Dobson 1998: http). Here the data text still presents meaning as Palaeolithic culture’s, but it is signified as contemporary culture’s belief of then culture. The third sense for the symbolism of this Willendorf artefact as earth mother is as a meaning used by the living culture in which it now abides, evidenced by the signification ‘The Earth Mother On The Day After The Nuclear Holocaust, 1985’ (Gadon 1989: pl. 32).

Significations in the data texts tend to conflate these senses of meaning, evidenced by ‘this is Gaia, Mother Earth’ (Abaxion 2003: http). Here it is implied that this Willendorf artefact has one identity, the one described, which
is applicable for then, now, and permanently. Rather than collapsing into hegemonic Western cultural language's assumptions of single truth (Lather 1991b: 51), the de/construction of this chapter works to explore, explicitly and separately, the plurality of meanings evidenced in significations of the node.

Examples from the data texts of significations evidencing the metaphorical nexus of life, death, and Willendorf, are 'creator...of all life' (Auel 1983: 36), 'Mother Earth can generate terrible forces' (Great Mother 1999: http), and 'who combined in her ripe proportions the dual stimuli of fertility and sex' (Bayley 2001: http). Students learn that (hu)mans need belief systems, and that particular forms of individual subjective investment are important (Weedon 1987: 106), but highlighting meaning-construction at work via textual linguistic means, belies the (hu)man(ist) implication that meaning is an inherent essence. It strengthens the poststructuralist perspective that an individual's subjectivity is discursively constructed (Weedon 1987: 21, 75).

An example of the significations evidencing the metaphorical nexus of Willendorf as mother is 'she represents...the universal female principle' (Broom Closet 2003: http). An example of the significations evidencing the metaphorical nexus of Willendorf as sacred is 'experience of the natural world as sacred' (Gass 1993: 1). An example of the significations evidencing the metaphorical nexus of (hu)man beings, nature and Willendorf is 'the Earth Goddess provides the link between humans and Nature' (Goddess House 1999: http). Students learn that metaphors play a role in (hu)man communication and thought (Ricoeur 1977). Highlighting that metaphors are intrinsic to the development of language, however, belies the positivist implication that things have 'been visible from the beginning of time' (Foucault 1994: 132).

Textual qualifications made regarding Willendorf qua Earth Mother include the significations 'no one could' (Auel 1983: 36), 'they believed' and 'dead were' (Gadon 1989: 6). They include 'woman became' and 'nor did' (Farrar & Farrar 1987: 8), 'she is' (Austen 1990: 4, Goddess House 1999: http, Hawkdancing 1999: http), and 'this figure is' (Baring & Cashford 1991: 10).
They include 'has...always been' (Gass 1993: 3), 'this is' (Jai Bhagavan 1999a: http, 1999b: http; Abaxion 2003: http), 'they represent' (Ardinger 2000: 17), 'this comes from' (Koeller 2000: http), 'women were' (Downing 1999: 11), 'a magician...fashioned' (Bayley 2001: http), and 'she represents' (Broom Closet 2003: http). The truth is that These constructions force the reader/student to a confrontational position, should s/he feel qualification of these statements pertinent.

Like the qualifying signifiers of the other juxtapositions and clusters, qualifying signifiers of this cluster such as 'must have' (Janson & Kerman 1968: 3), in themselves belie the positivist implication that beliefs regarding the artefact, whether held now or centuries ago, can be facts. Other such qualifying signifiers include 'evidently' (Farrar & Farrar 1987: 8), 'commonly' (Dobson 1998: http), and 'symbolizes' (Corrigan 1997: http). They include 'ultimately' (Gass 1993: 3), 'provides' (Goddess House 1999: http), 'perhaps' (Ardinger 2000: 17), 'possible' (Koeller 2000: http) and 'to many' (Jai Bhagavan 1999b: http). These signifiers strengthen the post/structuralist perspective of beliefs as social constructions, as do the interrogative signifiers could it be (Janson & Kerman 1968: 4) and what would it have been like (Blair 1993: http), indicating open-ended idea(l)s. Further, these qualifying signifiers in themselves belie the positivist implication that (hu)mans, expert or otherwise, know conclusively, or have the ability to know conclusively, that which they signify. These qualifying signifiers in themselves belie the positivist implication that (hu)mans, expert or otherwise, have direct access to (micro/meso/macro)structures as they exist in the world apart from themselves. They strengthen the Foucauldian perspective of language not as a direct imitation or duplication of (meso)structures, but as the manifestation and translation of the fundamental will of those who speak it (Foucault 1994: 290).

**Willendorf De/Construction Summary**

Faced with two different versions of meaning, Western hegemonic perspective tends to ask the question: which is correct? By drawing together so many nexus of divergent and interconnected meaning/s, these nodes work to sidestep this
question. This is due in part to the overwhelming evidence in such multiplicity, that this Western hegemonic perspective is simplistic. Drawing together so many nexus of divergent and interconnected meaning(s) also acts to sidestep the hegemonic, Western cultural, essentialist question: *What does it mean?* concerning the artefact, that each of these textual sites, singly, works to answer. This ability to sidestep is due in part to the perspective, availed in such contradicting groupings, that something besides the transparent conveyance of the physical world to the reader/student, is going on here. The juxtaposition of contradictory multiplicity begins to work instead to ask the Foucauldian and post/structuralist question: *Who or whom does a particular meaning serve to empower?*

The main political motivation in de/constructing these clusters of verbal and visual text attending this Willendorf artefact is thus to highlight the element of perspective as an inescapable component in any meaning-making surrounding the texts. Further, the clusters of this chapter work to recognise the element of the gaze as playing a major part in the significations of these texts. That Barbies, globes, and rainbows are not evident in this Willendorf artefact itself and yet each have multiple occurrences that form patterns surrounding discussion of the artefact, belies the positivist implication that textual signification about the past is objective, unbiased, and untainted by the subjectivity of the present.
Knowledge of more than one discourse and the recognition that meaning is plural allows for a measure of choice on the part of the individual and even where choice is not available, resistance is still possible. (Weedon 1987: 106)

As previously, this chapter concerns itself with suspended rather than final category placement. In keeping with current scientific hegemony, it concerns itself with categorisation that changes as understanding changes. In contrast to current scientific hegemony however, it does not work to establish the matter as now settled. From its learning-in-education perspective the import of this Willendorf-discourse chapter is more on the type of content (eg the way in which language contributes to building assumptions and values) than it is on the content (eg assumptions and values of a particular discourse) itself.

**Constructing/Seeing/Be-ing with/in a Discourse, (Micro)Textuality, the Student, this Willendorf (Arte)Fact & the Writer**

By deconstructing discursive assumptions and values in the project's data texts, this chapter recognises some of the micro-textual means by which the
Willendorf data texts reciprocally (Gee 1999: 82) contribute to building the very worlds that they inhabit. This discourse chapter shows some of the characteristics exhibited by the various discourses. These characteristics include the objectivity of scientific discourses, circles evident in New-Age discourses, the valuing of writing and intellectualism evident in liberal-humanist discourses, the alterity exhibited by feminist discourses, and deconstruction techniques experimented with by poststructuralist discourses.

**Feminist Alterity**

This nexus connects struggle, "‘her’ story" (Blair 1993: http), matriarchy, and, via this chapter section, reader and writer subjectivity. With the year 1895 as the first recorded use in English for the word *feminism* in terms of women’s rights (Mish 1993: 428), the herstory of feminist alterity both is and is not old. It is not old in the sense that according to this source the word is only 117 years old. Feminism is old, however, in the sense that it has existed ‘for more than 100 years’ (Dahlerup in Whelehan 1995: 3). The feminist alterity or *otherness* (Kirkpatrick 1984: 34) of herstory appears to span centuries. That is, history seems to marginalise women long before such marginalisation becomes a mainstream issue in Western hegemony. Thereby, the age of feminist discourses is also relative. In terms of long-established, traditional discourses such as liberal-humanist and even scientific discourses, feminist discourses have a relatively short herstory of voicing ‘the other’ (Lather 1994: 44). In terms of the newer discourses of the New Age and poststructuralism, feminist discourses have a relatively long herstory. This length of herstory affords it a relatively solid basis from which to argue, making it one of the more explicit, and thereby more conspicuous, discourse categories of the study. From past struggles, traditional Western mainstream readers and students already assume that there are issues attending feminist discourses, and this assumption allows current feminist discourses the freedom to build upon that work.

NVivo codes 58 occurrences of the words *feminist* and *feminists* in 28 of the project's 490 data texts. The most obvious discursive construction in this node, working to build and construe feminism in certain ways, occurs by means of
is/is-not statements. On the positive side of this obvious discursive construction is the statement ‘a...feminist is a feminist who...’ (Fraser, M. L. 2002: http). The study categorises this text as utilising a feminist discourse and as having a promotional agenda. On the negative side of this obvious discursive construction is the feminist-discourse, academic-agenda statement ‘...what feminist thought is not’ (Nelson, S. M. 2005: http). The liberal-humanist-discourse, emancipatory-agenda data-text phrase ‘as a feminist I felt...’ (Hower 1993: http) works to construct that feminists have feelings, and reflexively to authorise those feelings in terms of feminist standing. Students learn that language works to say something, but highlighting that in working to say something thought reciprocally shapes it, belies the positivist implication that words are tools of truth. This highlighting, rather, strengthens the poststructuralist perspective that words are tools of power.

Using forms of the word herstory is just one of the ways in which feminist alterity, as read via this study’s categorisations, affects the textuality of its discourses. English first saw the use of this word in 1971 (Mish 1993: 544). For the purposes of this research, I tend to read feminist alterity as female otherness fighting for rights against patriarchy in mainstream consciousness. This alterity creates, chooses, and uses this word herstory rather than the mainstream word history. Additional textual practices working to build feminist assumptions and values in the data texts also include the creation of the word ‘flabulous’ (Wann in Fraser, M. L. 2002: http) and forms of the signifier grrl, from its hegemonic counterpart girl. Two versions of this form are ‘rockrgrl’ and ‘grrrl’ (Fraser, M. L. 2002: http) in a feminist-discourse, promotional-agenda text. In problematising patriarchal use of language, these playful and linguistic textual constructions work to discursively reclaim language for fringe feminists. In effect, they create a relevant grrl discourse. Feminist alterity also affects its textuality by using the words zine/s, zinester, and zinemakers from the word ‘fanzine’ (Fraser, M. L. 2002: http). In so doing, it promotes the self-published personal voices and networking of fringe feminisms. These feminisms engage in the political, via humorous, fun pop-culture.
In radical feminism, the value of re-membering the Goddess is the imperative of avoiding continual complicity in the murder and dis-member-ment of ‘female divinity...our own Selves...the deep Source of creative integrity in women’ (Daly 1979: 111). A new or reclaimed language is thus central to the radical feminist project of revaluing the feminine which patriarchy devalues (Weedon 1987: 81). Figure 6.1, below, represents part of a page from one of the data texts categorised by this study as utilising a feminist discourse.

Re-Membering

In the oldest artifacts yet excavated, we discover the female as primary power. She is at the very center of what is sacred and necessary.

—Christine Downing, Professor and Author
Former President, American Academy of Religion

Venus of Willendorf
ca. 25,200 B.C.E.

Figure 6.1: Discursive Feminist (Micro)Textuality

Hyphenation in the representation of the word re-membering in this feminist-discourse, emancipatory-agenda text (Corser & Adler 1993: 97) works to reconstrue hegemonic language in favour of feminist values such as healing and wholeness. The hyphen deconstructs to emphasise a more literal signification of the word. This signification works, together with similar previously published discursive feminist micro-textuality (Daly 1979: 111), to imply bringing back together again that which patriarchy has torn asunder.

In addition to hyphenation of the word re-member in the title of the above illustration, micro-textual practices working to build feminist assumptions and values in the data texts include capitalisation of signifiers such as Earth Mother. Feminist alterity further affects its own textuality by using terms such as Frau Willendorf and The Woman of Willendorf in reference to Willendorf rather than the more traditional term Venus. Students learn that hegemonic language and its use are powerful and empowering, but highlighting that alternate terminologies have the ability to proliferate and to permeate hegemonic practice, belies the positivist implication that textuality is static. It strengthens the poststructuralist perspective that textuality is malleable and changes
through time. The Willendorf artefact thereby brings to feminist alterity an example of womanpower, of a time ‘when god was a woman’ (Stone, M. 1978). Feminist alterity, in turn, brings to the Willendorf artefact the status of divine Grand Matriarch (Stone, M. 1978: back cover).

**Liberal-(Hu)Man(ist) Rationality**

This nexus links reason, percentage signs (eg Sones 2003: http), iconicity, and, via this chapter section, reader and writer subjectivity. In contrast to the feminist-discourse category of the last section, the liberal-humanist-discourse category exhibits the generic discourse of Western hegemony. In a sense, other discourses build from this discourse. This makes it one of the more difficult and elusive discourse categories of the study. It is difficult and elusive to the degree that its habitual, learned, assumed transparency is invisible. The advantage of building with this ubiquitous discourse is that forces adhering to Western hegemony have already done the work of building basic assumptions. Interestingly, the disadvantage of building with this discourse is also that forces adhering to Western hegemony have already done the work of building basic assumptions. That is, the assumptions that are required in order to communicate are the very assumptions that ‘impose limits on what it is possible to think’ (Belsey 2002: 5). To assume is to decide beforehand not only what is, but also what is not. In this sense, the degree to which one assumes is the degree to which one is limited.

Adherents of the humanist discourse, liberal humanism, concern themselves with the human or secular rather than the spiritual (Delbridge 1997: 1043; Mish 1993: 564). They/We consider rational consciousness as a unique essence of human nature (Weedon 1987: 80). The degree to which these concerns and considerations dominate traditional hegemonic English language is the degree to which liberal-humanist discourses are traditional hegemonic English-language discourses. Liberal humanism developed from the humanist discourse of Western Europe where ‘the God-given, socially fixed, unfree subject of the feudal order became the free, rational, self-determining subject’ (Weedon 1987: 80).
Traditional hegemonic English-language micro-textuality inescapably affects the thinking and speaking of liberal-humanist rationality by its standard forms and conventions, and vice versa. For example, the standard English-language convention of placing spaces between words, suggesting the straightforward, rational and reasonable distinctness of things, constructs the form of the very term *liberal humanism*, as does the standard English-language convention of typically placing an adjective directly before the noun it modifies, suggesting that the main thrust of an utterance comes last. Liberal-humanist rationality, in turn, also reflexively contributes to the continued re-establishment and maintenance of those conventions via its ongoing use of those conventions.

Liberal-humanist rationality affects the textuality of its discourses in the data texts. As read by this study's categorisations, it does this by using such traditional terms as the *Venus of Willendorf*, *Magna Mater*, and *Creatrix*. It does this by including titles such as 'Ms. Willendorf' (Witcombe 1999: http, 2005: http), in a liberal-humanist-discourse, academic-agenda text, and 'Miss Willendorf' (Spice 2003: http), in a liberal-humanist-discourse, popularising-agenda text. In that scholasticism retains vestiges of the Latin language, texts using the term *Magna Mater* reinforce the liberal-humanist values of intellectual pursuit. The term *Magna Mater* does not appear in any other data texts. In their very use of personal titles, texts displaying this usage reflexively reinforce the liberal-humanist values supported by the use of titles. These traditional values are potentially such things as place, hierarchy, class and achievement. As the oldest of the five here-recognised discourses, liberal humanism thus commands the formidable support of tradition. It utilises unselfconscious, unquestioned, but nonetheless learned, assumptions and values.

NVivo codes thirteen occurrences of forms of the word *humanism* in three of the project's data texts. Like the word *feminist*, the term *liberal-humanist* does not have a single definition, but codes ideas that are continually reconstituted anew in each new engagement, according to, among other things, reader and writer subjectivity. In this case, these coded ideas are potentially ideas such as endeavour, study, the intellect, and things of a fixed, permanent nature, triggered by words such as *disciplines* and *mind-set*, for example. Micro-textual
practices working to reinforce the hegemony of Aristotelian logic and rationality are such standard English-language conventions as the use of visual illustrations. These include, for example: graphs and captions, using capital letters to begin sentences, placing spaces between words, using full stops at the ends of sentences, and using ratio signifiers such as percentage signs and virgules.

We at Fugitive colors would like to introduce you to our unofficial spokes model.

The vivacious VENUS OF WILLENDORF
The Paleolithic Madonna

This lady has been around long enough to see all the colors change.

Figure 6.2 Discursive Liberal-Humanist (Micro)Textuality
An attractive grid and its caption, in this visual from a liberal-humanist-discourse, promotional-agenda text (Fugitive Colors 2003: http), work to maintain hegemonic language according to liberal-humanist values. The ubiquitous use of compartments and captions work to continually re-establish the liberal-humanist linguistic constructions of intellectual clarity and straightforward understanding. The colour categories shown include the three primary colours of pigment: red, blue and yellow, and the three primary colours of light: red, blue and green. The compartments are four, 'the number of material order' (Schimmel 1993: 86).

Reciprocally and ubiquitously, this English-language, liberal-humanist, micro-textuality standard manifests in all of the five discourse categories of the study. Because of the authority and import afforded scientific discourses in Western hegemony and their shared value of the human intellect, liberal-humanist discourses, as recognised by this study's categorisations, align closely with those of science. Capitalisation of the beginnings of sentences, placing spaces between words and the use of full stops at the ends of sentences suggest that reasonable and rational things are discreet and distinct, with specific and identifiable beginnings and endings. The standard English-language convention of using uppercase letters to highlight and emphasise names, for
example, is another transparent discursive liberal-humanist micro-textual form at work here.

Like the liberal-humanist rationality of history, the writing conventions of Western English-language hegemony did not suddenly appear fully formed. Using an upper case letter to begin a sentence (Sacks 2004: 143) is an example of these writing conventions. These conventions developed with and from lettering and manuscript practices of the middle ages. The practices themselves developed over centuries, going back through the seafaring Phoenicians to ancient Egypt (Sacks 2004: 1, 11). In its insatiable quest to explain the world, liberal-humanist rationality also has an intellectual answer to the question of the Willendorf artefact's raison d'etre. It gives to Willendorf its traditional role as overseer of fertility (Stone, M. 1978: back cover). The Willendorf artefact, in turn, makes liberal-humanist rationality far-reaching, allowing it to stretch farther back into the dawn of human consciousness and ancient, prehistoric creativity (Lemonick 1995, University of Newcastle upon Tyne 1999).

**New-Age Goddess Circles**

This nexus connects oneness, 'god/dess' (Blessed Bee 1999: http), rites, and, via this chapter section, reader and writer subjectivity. Along with poststructuralist discourses, New-Age discourses are some of the latest to appear in the public domain (Melton & Moore 1982; Melton, Clark & Kelly 1992). The New-Age Goddess circles of herstory reach back through times of witches and warlocks (Kelly 1992) to a time when pregnancy was 'magick' (Buckland 1991: 221, Cunningham 1993: 152, Cubulain 2002: 97, Lynx UK 2004: http, Pandora's Books 1999: http, Aswynn in Straubhaar 1999: http). In this sense, the re-emergence of New-Age Goddess circles both is and is not old. The first recorded use in English for the term 'New Age' (Delbridge 1997: 1448) is in 1956, but concepts drawn on by the New Age are ancient. The cultures drawn on by the New-Age approach to traditional attitudes and mores are many and varied, but often include Eastern and American-Indian cultures (Mish 1993: 782). Traditional Western mainstream readers and students are already familiar with many of the concepts attending New-Age discourses from
their historical learning of past cultures, whether or not they agree with those concepts. Aspects of those concepts, however, are some of the very aspects that hegemonic patriarchal religious discourses through time have actively worked to subvert, making the New-Age discourses some of the most interesting discourses of the study.

Traditional hegemonic English-language textuality inescapably affects the thinking and speaking of New-Age Goddess circles by its standard forms and conventions. For example the term *New Age* itself is constructed using two standard English-language words that come with their own associations and etymologies. New-age Goddess circles, as read via this study's categorisations, affect the textuality of their discourses in the data texts, among other means, by including the geometric shape of circles in their images. Including the mental circles triggered by representations such as the globe, geometric circles occur in 10% (10/96) of the New-Age-discourse texts that exhibit Willendorf images. This is not counting rings that appear in images that are functional such as for keys, pendants, candles, or diagram numbers. This is the highest percentage of geometric circles exhibited in any of the five discourse categories of the study. Figurative circles, as in groups of people, are also signified in New-Age writing. Forms of the word *circle* occur in 17% (16/96) of the New-Age-discourse texts. This is also the highest percentage of any of the five here-categorised discourses. Figure 6.3, on the following page, represents one of the many images from the data texts categorised by this thesis as utilising a New-Age discourse.

New-Age goddess circles also affect the textuality of their discourses by using the term *goddess* and the title *lady* in preference to less spiritual and less honourable terms when referring to Willendorf. Of the data-text categories, the New-Age category has the highest percentage usage of both the term *Goddess* (71%: 68/96) and the title *Lady* (10%: 10/96). Using terms that include the signifier *Goddess* is a textual means by which New-Age discourses work to reconstruct and reconstrue the Willendorf artefact according to holistic, ritualistic, and spiritualistic assumptions and values rather than the secular or patriarchal religious assumptions and values of traditional Western hegemony.
Using terms that include the signifier Lady, as in 'Lord and Lady' (Lipp 2003: 232), is a textual means by which New-Age discourses work to hearken back to the traditional attitudes, ideals, mores, and values of earlier times. New-age discourses draw on nature and ancient traditions, re-overlaying Western hegemonic assumptions and values with their own. In drawing on nature and ancient traditions, these recreated linguistic textual constructions work to reclaim language for spirituality and to reclaim the Willendorf artefact as belonging to the New Age. In discursively utilising these signifiers, New-Age discourses create, maintain, and support the very signifiers that reflexively create, maintain, and support their assumptions and values.

Figure 6.3: Discursive New-Age (Micro)Textuality
Circles in this logo from a New-Age-discourse, emancipatory-agenda text (willendorf@geocities 2000: http) work to reconstrue hegemonic language in favour of New-Age holistic values. This textual use of circles includes the geometric circles of the pentangle, orbs held aloft, and the body shapes of head, breast and belly. It also includes the metaphor of encircling arms and the word circle. New-age discourse chooses a purple and blue ink wash for the visual, rather than black and white. Blue, according to one textual site, symbolises inner spiritual essence. At this same site, purple, a mixture of red and blue, symbolises the difficult transmutation of inner spiritual values into outer concrete events. (Chetwynd 1993: 92-93) This and deifying capitalisation of the term Great Goddess are other discursive New-Age micro-textual forms working to reconstruct extant hegemonic language according to its spiritualist assumptions.

Students learn that stereotypes can be misleading. Highlighting that categories both are and are not the case, however, belies the positivist implication that category placements are either correct or incorrect. Highlighting that assumptions about New-Age discourses cross boundaries, overlap with and are borrowed by other discourses, strengthens the poststructuralist perspective that
category placements are temporary, fluid, and useful in the thought provocation afforded in the juxtaposition of their differences, rather than in their essentiality or fundamentality. Students learn that discursive identities include more than just language. Highlighting that geometric and figurative discursive connections do permeate a particular discourse, however, belies the positivist implication that language exists in stasis. As indicated, these discursive connections are connections such as visual and verbal representations of the circle. This highlighting strengthens the poststructuralist perspective that written language-in-use marks a convergence of agencies (Gee 1999: 18), where each re-engagement reconstitutes subjectivity continually (Weedon 1987: 33).

NVivo codes 18 occurrences of the term *New Age/New-Age* in five of the project's 490 data texts. All of the 18 occurrences of the term *New Age/New-Age* discursively create and maintain constructions of the New Age via adjectival use of the term. These occurrences create and maintain that there are such things as a 'New Age bottom line' (Newport in Rosendahl 2007: 178) for example. They discursively create and maintain that there are such things as 'New age bookstores' and 'New Age...music' (Sacred Source 2003: http). Textually the term *New Age* thereby does not have a single definition, but rather codes ideas, such as the ideas of harmony, integration, the feminine divine, oneness, magic, belief, and peace. Like all words, the word *New Age* re-triggers its coded ideas in reader and writer subjectivity according to respective experiences of its usage each time we think or speak (Weedon 1987: 33), and each time we read or write.

Micro-textual practices working to build New-Age assumptions and values in the data texts include recreation of terms such as *magick* from a previous standard spelling of the hegemonic word *magic*. They also include wordplay such as the New-Age-discourse, emancipatory agenda 'Fat!So?' (Wann 1998: 1999) They further include the capitalisation of signifiers such as *Goddess*. This micro-textual construction of capitalising words works, via traditional micro-textual linguistic means, to inspire feelings of awe and reverence for significations of New-Age spirituality. The feminist data-text set does the same.
in capitalising the word *Goddess* in signification of feminist spirituality (i.e. in opposition to the word *God* in current Western hegemonic signification of masculine spirituality). By bringing feelings of awe and reverence into linguistic circulation, New Age spirituality thereby reflexively creates, maintains, and supports these particular New-Age values. New-Age circles thus bring to the Willendorf artefact the status of Goddess, while the Willendorf artefact, in turn, brings to New-Age circles a look at (the) Goddess.

**Post/Structuralist Deconstruction**

This nexus connects perspectival juxtaposition, signifier conspicuity as in the text title *flatnessisgod* (McGinness 1999), value-suspension work, and, via this chapter section, reader and writer subjectivity. Poststructuralist deconstruction has historical ties with the theories of Derrida who lived from 1930-2004 (Stocker 2006: 1-2) and Foucault who lived from 1926-1984 (Dreyfus 1997). Feminist poststructuralism grows out of the political and theoretical influences of feminisms and history (Weedon 1987: 12-13), and reflexively finds sustenance in 'the multicultural societies that have resulted from the decline of empire' (Belsey 2002: 9-10), increased global travel, and the worldwide web. In this latter sense, the emergence of poststructuralist discourse is the most recent of the five discourse groups of the investigation. The use of poststructuralism as a discourse is in itself inherently and philosophically challenging. That poststructuralism is recently emergent, and currently emerging, makes the exploration and use of it as a discourse (within traditional frameworks such as doctoral thesis writing) even more challenging.

Traditional hegemonic English-language textuality inescapably affects the thinking and speaking of poststructuralist deconstruction by its standard forms and conventions. For example, agencies of poststructuralism construct the term *poststructuralist* itself using a standard English-language prefix and a word stem that have pre-existing etymologies. Not only does traditional hegemonic English-language textuality affect poststructuralist deconstruction; poststructuralist deconstruction also affects traditional hegemonic English-language textuality. The ways in which poststructuralist deconstruction
recognisably affects the textuality of poststructuralist discourses, include juxtaposing texts and quoting work such as that of Foucault. Other ways include deconstructing a visual image of the Willendorf artefact. They also include particular usages of terms such as arch(a)eologies, con/texts, his/stories, juxtapositions, mappings, perspectives, and signifiers. These particular usages suit poststructuralist perspectives about culture, desire, difference, and power.

![Reduction Statue symbol.](Image)
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**Figure 6.4: Discursive Post/Structuralist (Micro)Textuality**

Visual deconstruction of the Willendorf artefact in this basic design study from a poststructuralist-discourse, creative-agenda text (McGinness 1999: 60), works to reconstruct hegemonic textuality in favour of poststructuralist assumptions. It does this by offering two versions of reductionist dot configurations of the artefact's form. That there are two versions supports the poststructuralist value of the suspension of choice. The two-dimensional-design experiment works to support the poststructuralist perspectives of the creative transferability, literal un-transferability, 'undecidability' (Belsey 2002: 87), and unfixability of discursive sites (Weedon 1987: 106).

Forms of the term *poststructuralism*, as a word in its own right, do not appear in the data texts. Forms of its sister term *postmodernism*, however, make 19 appearances in 11 of the project's 490 data texts. Of the 11 data texts using forms of the word *postmodernism*, this thesis classifies seven as liberal-humanist discourses, two as feminist discourses, and two as poststructuralist discourses. Forms of the word *deconstruction* make three appearances in three of the project's data texts, none of which are here categorised as poststructuralist discourses. A feminist-discourse, emancipatory-agenda text, for example, textually constructs that there is such a thing in the world as 'a deconstruction of images' (Isaacs 2002: 75). As seen in the illustration above, one data text from the eight here categorised as poststructuralist, exhibits its own images of
the Willendorf artefact (McGinness 1999: 60). In these visual deconstructions of Willendorf, the artefact is ‘reduced to dots’ (Ivinski 1999: http).

Micro-textual practices working to build poststructuralist assumptions and values in the data texts include removing spaces between words, blacking or striking out words, and the use of virgules and parentheses in suspending word choices. Removing the spaces between words, as in flatnessisgod (McGinness 1999), and blacking out words (McGinness 1999: 5) occur in a poststructuralist-discourse, creative-agenda text. Striking out of the words ‘in the first place’ and ‘ultimately’ (Rosendahl 2007: 174, 175) occurs in the poststructuralist-discourse, academic-agenda text that is chapter eight of this thesis. The use of virgules and parentheses to suspend word choices and problematise binaries occurs in poststructuralist-discourse texts. These usages include ‘he/she/they’ and ‘make/take pictures’ (McGinness 1999: 38), ‘idea(l)s’ and ‘idea(l)’ (Rosendahl 2007: 183, 187), and ‘Theatre/Archaeology: Disciplinary Dialogues’ (Pearson & Shanks 2001).

These here-attributed poststructuralist micro-textual constructions work to question the hegemonic assumption of language transparency by subverting the very systems within which they operate (McGinness 1999: back cover). In this way these textual sites suspend as far as possible the systems of values used within those very systems (Foucault 1988b: 107) and highlight difference rather than reference (Belsey 2002: 10). They reflexively work to create, maintain, reflect, and support the poststructuralist perspectives of the fluidity, multiplicity, and plurality of discursive sites. The Willendorf artefact brings to poststructuralist deconstruction a cross-section of discourses. Poststructuralist deconstruction, in turn, brings to the Willendorf artefact multiple identity options.

Scientific Objectivity

This nexus connects systematic discernment, number signifiers as in ‘Willendorf no. 1’ (McDermott, L. 1995: http), Palaeolithic archaeology, and, via this chapter section, reader and writer subjectivity. With the year 1589 as
the first recorded use in English for the word *scientific* in the sense of 'exhibiting the methods or principles of science' (Mish 1993: 1045), the varying and developing histories associated with the word extend back over four centuries. In contrast, the year 1854 is the first recorded use in English for the word *objectivism* in the sense of 'the validity of objective phenomenon over subjective experience' (Mish 1993: 801). Developments, insofar as they attach to this particular word, thereby have much younger histories, extending back a mere century and a half. The manifestations of scientific discourses and their attendant institutions arise from wills to power in particular historical endeavours. ‘...The intentions of science to liberate reason from the dictates of kings and priests were inscribed into practices of control and prediction. These practices were rooted in a binary logic of hermetic subjects and objects and a linear, teleological rationality; the innocence of both observable facts and transparent language were assumed.’ (Lather 1991b: 104)

![Figure 6.5: Discursive Scientific (Micro)Textuality](image)

 NVivo codes 62 occurrences of the adjective *scientific* in 14 of the project’s 490 data texts. These adjectives discursively create and maintain, among other
views, a positive view of science. Micro-textual practices working reflexively to build scientific assumptions and values in the data texts include the isolation techniques of captions, frames, and headings. These micro-textual practices also include the prioritising techniques of lists, numbering, and ordering. These prioritising techniques are also techniques of efficiency. The layout of the illustration represented in Figure 6.5, on the previous page, visually objectifies the three archaeological artefacts it represents. This here-attributed scientific visual objectification of specimens is common Western hegemonic textual practice.

Traditional hegemonic English-language textuality inescapably affects the thinking and speaking of scientific objectivity by its standard forms and conventions. For example, English language constructs the term *scientific objectivity* using standard word stems and suffixes that come with their own etymologies. Scientific objectivity, as read via this study's categorisations, affects the textuality of its discourse in the data texts in its use of forms of the words *actual, fact, real, true,* as well as forms of the words *reveal* and *uncover* to establish and maintain the hegemony of its authority. The scientific discourse displays the highest percentages of these words in the five discourse categories of the study. Forms of these words also occur in the other four discourses of the study. Interestingly however, in each case the liberal-humanist discourse has the second highest percentage of usage. Of the data texts categories, emancipatory agendas have the highest percentage of texts that do not use these linguistic universal-truth-construction signifiers (64%, 37/58). Perhaps tellingly, academic agendas have the least (16%, 8/50).

As with the practices offering no linguistic qualification previously discussed, these linguistic practices constructing truth also discriminate against the student. These practices discriminate in that, in order to engage with the text, the text forces the student to agree or disagree. Again, having one's own viewpoint, without attacking, disagreeing, or disengaging from the text, is not an option allowed for by these truth-constructing linguistic practices. These practices that work to stand upon their own constructed facts, realities and truths as if they were absolute, universal, and un-constructed are hypocritical,
unfair, unjust, unsound, and unfounded. Yet again, these hegemonic practices do not manifest in particular discourses or agendas exclusively. For example, the particular linguistic constructions *in fact* and *the fact that* occur in all five here-categorised discourses and all six here-categorised agendas. This indicates that this potentially discriminating linguistic practice of universal-truth construction permeates all here-categorised discourses and agendas. It also indicates that the categorisation process is not differentiating on this particular criterion. Of the total 490 data texts of the study, 202 do not contain occurrences of any of the following linguistic universal-truth-construction signifiers: *in (actual) fact, a/the (actual, elemental, mere, obvious) fact/s (are/is) of/that, the (agreed upon, basic, most interesting, neutral) fact/s (remain/s).* Of these 202 data texts, the poststructuralist-discourse category (56%, 5/9) has the highest percentage of texts that do not use these linguistic universal-truth-construction signifiers. The scientific-discourse category (19%, 10/53) has the least.

These figures support that discourses affect chosen language-in-use. NVivo figures also support that poststructuralist discourses tend to choose non-gendered language and that scientific agendas tend not to include non-gendered language as an issue. No one disagrees that there is such a thing as signifiers in language, but highlighting the harmfulness of using those signifiers to universalise what is not universal, questions the morality of positivist implications. It questions the morality of the positivist implications that language is innocuous and simply a matter of convention. It works to support the poststructuralist battle against discriminatory language. It also works to support the poststructuralist perspective of language as an active participant in the construction of collective social thought.

Three scientific-discourse academic-agenda texts use numbers in their signification of the Willendorf artefact. This usage is evidence both of scientific discourses' accustomed need to differentiate between more than one Willendorf artefact and its valuing of clarity, compartmentalisation, and identification. Students learn that fractions, numbers, and percentages are enabling, efficient and useful, but highlighting that they provide an air of
accuracy where other textual sites equally convincingly contest that accuracy, belies the positivist implication that science is an infallible final authority. Highlighting that they provide an air of accuracy, where other discourses find such constructed accuracy inconsequential, also belies the positivist implication that science is an infallible final authority. It strengthens the poststructuralist perspective that scientific discourses, like all discourses, inescapably vest those discourses with personal desires and political motives. The Willendorf artefact brings itself to scientific objectivity as a splendid example of Palaeolithic archaeology. It is one of the most important, as well as famous, prehistoric works of art (Naturhistorisches Museum 2003a: http). By means of Palaeolithic archaeology, scientific objectivity, in turn, brings the Willendorf artefact its introduction to the world of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. Scientific objectivity provides the Willendorf artefact with all the statistics relevant to its physical identity and incarnation in the current Western hegemonic era. These include the validity of its age, height, the material that comprises it, who found it, when and where they found it, and its hegemonic identity as having been a symbol of fertility.

Willendorf-Discourses Summary

The main political motivation in deconstructing these five discourse categorisations has been to highlight that the data texts inescapably shape both the textuality and the micro-textuality of their discourses. That includes this very text, and indeed texts inherently. This motivation also works to highlight that, reflexively, discourses also shape the data texts. This deconstruction works to support the perspective that the textuality at discursive sites is flexible, fluid, mobile, transferable, and impermanent. The agenda in deconstructing these categorisations works to remind students of language, society, and culture, of an emancipative, philosophical, poststructuralist position. This position is that the textual, visual, and discursive worlds that students inhabit inevitably contribute to reflexively shaping them as language students of a particular culture. At the same time, via their textual, visual and discursive choices students also reflexively contribute to building and maintaining those very worlds.
The five discourse categories work to identify discourses by recognising and juxtaposing differences in the manner in which they represent the Willendorf artefact. Discussion within each category also works to suspend as far as possible ideas of categorical permanency. The discussion highlights the multiplicities of action and thinking inherent in sites of discursive practice. It further highlights alternative readings, alternate possibilities and the co-dependencies and co-influences evident within the here-constructed categories.
Willendorf-Data Agendas: Motivation(s) & (Micro) Textual Meaning-Making

When you speak or write anything, you use the resources of English to project yourself as a certain kind of person, a different kind in different circumstances. You also project yourself as engaged in a certain kind of activity, a different kind in different circumstances. If I have no idea who you are and what you are doing, then I cannot make sense of what you have said, written, or done. (Gee 1999: 13)

This chapter explores some of the textual and micro-textual implications of subjective meaning-making in the Willendorf data. Through analysis of words and graphics, this agenda chapter shows evidence of some of the values exhibited by the various agendas. This evidence includes things such as the orderly thoroughness of academia, the product orientation of commercialism, the insight and innovativeness of creativity, the cutting courage of emancipation, the obvious attractions of popularity, and the personal and professional causes driving promotions. This is not the only evidence of values present in the data texts, but it begins to open the practice for students, and might be used not only in research-as-education, but also, for example, in exercises in components of art teacher education.
The subjectivity that this chapter explores, namely that meaning is not independent but subject to who one is working to be and what one is working to do, inevitably produces effects. Textually, these subjectivities and workings produce additional effects as well as intended effects. The main aim of exploring these implications is transformative. Understanding that meanings are inextricably bound with the agendas of those producing and wielding power/knowledge, improves student chances of consciously and effectively engaging with those meanings in a way that is discursively and personally empowering.

'Producing effects' in the sense of 'things to be done' (Delbridge 1997: 37) is a signification that the word *agenda* shares with the word *agency*. In pursuing their respective agendas, the effects produced by the project's data-texts reflexively travel via infinite agencies. One of these agencies, in the case of the data texts, is constructed significations coded by this Willendorf artefact. The chapter's investigation of agendas and motivations in the data texts concerns itself with suspended rather than final category placement. As previously indicated, this type of open-ended analysis is at the heart of the work this thesis moves both to accomplish and to foster. From its learning-in-education perspective, and though they cannot be meaningfully separated, the import of this Willendorf-agenda chapter is yet again more on the type of content (eg the way in which textuality contributes to achieving particular goals and missions) than it is on the content (eg the goals and missions of a particular agenda) itself.

**In Pursuit of Esteem, Publication, Qualifications & other Academic Objectives**

As an academic-agenda case in point, this Willendorf artefact visually assists in constructing texts for the pursuit of discursive and personal scholastic endeavours, evidenced by the appearance of Willendorf images in the maps and timelines of art-history textbooks. Maps are conceptual representations of spatial analytical processes (Kress & van Leeuwen 1996: 90, 95). Timelines are conceptual representations of temporal analytical processes (Kress & van Theo
van Leeuwen 1996: 95). Willendorf assists in the attainment of discursive scholastic goals by being a protagonist in the construction of academic knowledge/power and by being an attractive scientific artefact. Knowledge of Willendorf potentially assists in personal academic endeavours such as passing exams and participating successfully in art-history discussions. These attainments, in turn, potentially assist with such things as earning academic qualifications, earning the esteem of academic colleagues, mentors, and students, or earning the right to publish as a knowledgeable/powerful academic. In using art-history texts that visually and verbally include Willendorf, schools, colleges and universities are using Willendorf to promote a particular knowledge/power construction. These places of learning thereby academically condone this particular knowledge/power construction. Reflexively via their constructed authority, art history textbooks also produce the effect of increasing the value of Willendorf images as textual currency.

\[\text{Figure 7.1: Spatial Mapping: Academic-Intentioned (Micro)Textuality}\]

Visually, two academic-agenda, liberal-humanist-discourse texts (de la Croix & Tansey 1975: 24; de la Croix et al 1991: 26), choose to use this Willendorf artefact on a geographical map. This micro-textuality contributes to achieving the particular academic goals of assisting students in mentally coding the physical location where Western hegemonic academia found the artefact. Reflexively, this Willendorf artefact acts as a mental anchor or landmark, coding the artefact as relevant information at that particular geographical site. Maps such as these, together with Willendorf, micro-textually produce the effect of constructing a manner of thinking about a place and an artefact that is flat, able to be categorised, knowable, and precise.

Academically constructed and motivated maps and timelines carry intended effects. These effects include such things as providing visual support for students to recognise and remember basic (hegemonic) information. Academic
agendas are not the only agendas to represent maps and timelines. Other agendas using Willendorf in maps and timelines are a creative-agenda map (Auel 1983: x), an emancipatory-agenda map (Curtis 2003: http), two popularising-agenda maps (Chang 2000: http, Roberts 1999: 45) a popularising-agenda timeline (Clair 1999: 1), and two promotional-agenda maps (Naturhistorisches Museum 2003d, Niederösterreich – Das Weite Land 2004: 10). All of these occur in liberal-humanist discourses, except for the one scientific-discourse map (Chang 2000: http). Maps and timelines thereby do not automatically imply academic-agenda texts. These here-attributed academic maps and timelines, in their establishment as linguistic currency, acquire a life of their own as it were, and thereafter tend to proliferate where they are useful.

Discursive and personal academic agendas of the Willendorf data-texts produce micro-textual constructions that produce the effect of, among other things, verbally and visually directing, enabling and supporting student thought. They do this, in part, by utilising, as the particular text may construct, this ancient, beautiful or ugly, realistic or unrealistic, scientifically interesting, but postlinguistically only indicatively signifiable Palaeolithic artefact. However, in the process of creating textual constructions that pursue academic
goals, such as personal academic esteem, well-received academic publications, and academic qualifications, textual constructions also inevitably produce additional effects. These additional verbally-and-visually-produced effects include not only the enabling but also the constraining of student thought.

In Pursuit of Business Acumen, the Almighty Dollar & Other Commercial Objectives

As a commercial-agenda case in point, this Willendorf artefact visually assists in constructing texts for the pursuit of discursive commercial endeavours and personal monetary gain. This is evident in the appearance of dollar signs next to Willendorf images in New-Age catalogues and on commercial web sites. Willendorf assists in the attainment of discursive commercial goals by being a protagonist in the construction of certain advertising texts and by being an image that sells. Willendorf also potentially assists in personal commercial endeavours.

Willendorf popularity is popularity about which it is potentially lucrative to be knowledgeable. For example, if one already has a running business or a weekend market stall, indications are that adding a Willendorf option to product lines might well boost sales. These sales in turn, potentially foster yet further sales. They also potentially promote discursive commercial experience and expertise. These potentially assist with such things as earning a living, making a profit, and owning your own business. In using these visual and verbal Willendorf texts, internet sites, museums, shops, and stores work to develop particular styles of text-construction for advertising that will attract buyers and foster commercially viable markets. Shopping, in turn, assists in increasing the proliferation of Willendorf images. This proliferation ranges from familiarity with Willendorf as a topic of conversation to familiarity with Willendorf as representing an ideology.

Other textual, commercial-agenda indicators include the words ‘add to cart’ (Medieval Mayhem 2003: http), ‘buy new’ (Amazon.com 2006: http), ‘buy now’, ‘Specials & Sales’ (Sacred Source 2003: http), and ‘special pricing’
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(Sacred Source 2003: http, 2006: http) in four here-categorised New-Age discourses. The commercial-agenda signifiers 'BUY this item NOW' (Mukaboo 2003: http), 'Euro' (Satzl 2006: http), and the Swiss Franc signifier 'Price (sFr)' (Museum Shop 1999: http) appear in three liberal-humanist discourses. The commercial-agenda textual indicator 'checkout' (Abaxion 2003: http, Sacred Source 2003: http, Mukaboo 2003: http) appears in two New-Age discourses and one liberal-humanist discourse, respectively. The commercial-agenda textual indicator 'option to buy' (Melanie 2003: http) appears in a feminist discourse. This commercial textuality changes the potential meaning of the text. It does this via the use to which a student may put the textuality. That is, commercial Willendorf textuality's relationship to a student is potentially different from that of non-commercial Willendorf textuality in that a student may read its main function as selling merchandise. A student may tend to make any subsequent readings of the text with this in mind.

Figure 7.3: Advertising: Commercial-Intentioned (Micro)Textuality

Visually, a commercial-agenda, New-Age-discourse website, chooses to use this Willendorf artefact as a webpage link for current 'Specials & Sales' (Sacred Source 2003: http). This micro-textuality contributes to achieving the particular commercial goals of attracting favourable attention and prompting a potential buyer's further investigation of the internet site, via this popular icon. Willendorf thereby serves the interests of the website in providing eye candy for a hyperlink button, while the website reflexively serves the interests of Willendorf promotion in providing this bonus showcase. Textuality of the phrase specials & sales works by its potential direct relevance to the reader or student. This relevance potentially affects the readers and students by the hegemonic goal of saving her or him money. This software-enabled hyperlink and Willendorf together also micro-textually produce effects such as thinking about connections in a way that is dynamic, rhizomatic, and user-driven.

Websites and catalogues constructed and motivated by commercialism carry intended effects. These effects include such things as creating and expanding market demand, creating and proliferating market knowledge, and/or creating and increasing market value. Entrepreneurs and business enterprises tap into
financial profit by constructing and providing this Willendorf artefact as a personal possession. Students pay a museum entry to see Willendorf in person. They pay movie entrance fees to see films about the artefact. They pay transport costs to see the village of Willendorf and to see the statue that marks the place where Western hegemony found the artefact. While these are not tangible commercial items, commercial enterprises still market them as something a person can own. In addition to this, businesses market them as exciting, not just in themselves, but also predominantly in the manner in which they relate to one as an individual. For example, Willendorf can belong to you in your itinerary as a tourist destination.

Similarly, entrepreneurs and business enterprises provide this Willendorf artefact as a personal possession by producing the artefact as tangible merchandise that you can keep. From businesses that produce commercial-agenda, liberal-humanist-discourse texts, an image of Willendorf can be yours to keep in a box in your drawer as a memento (Satzl 2006: http), in your book as a bookmark (Naturhistorisches Museum 1998), or on your wall as a handmade paper-relief (Talaria 2003: http), or poster (Amazon.com 2006: http [images 3-5]). It can be yours on your bookshelf as a book title (eg Myrtle of Willendorf, Die Venus von Willendorf, Hommage à Venus von Willendorf: Amazon 2006: http), on your table as a candleholder (Quantum Alchemy 1999: http), or in your purse as a keychain (eg Satzl 2006: http).

Commercial-agenda, New-Age-discourse texts encourage you to own an image of Willendorf to wear around your neck as a necklace (eg Jai Bhagavan 1999b: http), around your wrist as a bracelet (eg Henes 2006: http), on your earlobes as earrings (Sacred Source 2003: http), or on your finger as a ring (Che Designs 1999: http). You can wear Willendorf as a mascot or a slogan on your T-shirt (eg Snake and Snake 1999: http). You can have Willendorf in your bathroom as a bar of soap (eg Diva's Designs 2003: http), on your window as a decal (Rising Moon 2003: http), or on your desk as a conversation piece (eg Hawkdancing 1999: http). You can have Willendorf in your hand as a drum (Sacred Source 2006: http), a talis-woman (Goddess House 1999: http), or a wand (Mandarava 2006: http). You can have Willendorf to eat as a chocolate
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(Jai Bhagavan Ltd 1999: http, Sacred Source 2003: http [image 2]). You can have an image of Willendorf in your meditation kit (Mandarava 2006: http), in your gem collection as a crystal (Witchshop 2004: http), or on your fridge as a magnet (Who Needs 2003: http). You can have Willendorf on your mantelpiece as a statue (eg Smyth 1999: http) or stamped on your stationery (eg Cartwright 2004a: http). Once a lucrative market is recognised, it seems that innovation kicks in, for the possibility of a bite at the commercial pie.

Data texts other than commercial-agenda texts also exhibit monetary-unit signifiers. The dollar sign ‘$’ (Fraser, M. L. 2002: http; Sones 2003: http) appears in a promotional-agenda, feminist-discourse text and an emancipatory-agenda, liberal-humanist-discourse text, respectively. The signifiers ‘Euro’ (Curtis 2003: http), ‘pounds’ (Bayley 2001: http), and the South African rand sign ‘R’ (Johnson 2002: http) appear in two emancipatory-agenda texts and a popularising-agenda text, in three liberal-humanist-discourses, respectively. Characteristic of the sociocultural and postlinguistics, connections-are not predictable. A monetary-unit signifier does not automatically imply a commercial-agenda text.

Conversely, a commercial-agenda text does not automatically imply a monetary-unit signifier. These monetary-unit signifiers, in their establishment as linguistic currency, proliferate wherever they serve an immediate purpose. Agendas and motivations are thus multiple, plural, and unpredictable. Here-categorised commercial agendas feed into here-categorised creative agendas, and vice-versa. By making it yourself with a pattern from a creative-agenda, New-Age-discourse text, an image of Willendorf can be yours on your lapel as a pin (Wabi Sabi 2005: http), for example. The same is the case with the other here-categorised agendas. From three emancipatory-agenda websites, one feminist discourse and two New-Age discourses, respectively, an image of Willendorf can be yours in your lounge room as a wooden wall sculpture (Mitchell, A. 2003: http) or in your activity corner as a paper-doll book (Wann 1998: 129-147, 1999: http). In a popularising-agenda, New-Age-discourse text, an image of Willendorf can be yours in your music collection as a CD title (Gass 1993). From organisations that produce promotional-agenda, liberal-
humanist-discourse texts, an image of Willendorf can be yours: around your neck as a necktie (Naturhistorisches Museum 2003c: http), sent from your desk as a postcard (Naturhistorisches Museum 1995: postcard), or in your office as a notebook (Naturhistorisches Museum 1995: notebook).

Discursive and personal commercial agendas of the Willendorf data-texts produce textual and micro-textual constructions that encourage buyers, materialism, and profit. They do this, in part, by persuasively offering ownership of this intriguing Palaeolithic artefact. The artefact itself assists this by means of its attractiveness to particular potential buyers. Commercial endeavours work to exploit and optimise that attractiveness to buyers. This optimisation necessarily operates via commercial perspectives of that attractiveness. Reflexively, through offering ownership, commercialism promotes Willendorf fame. In using computer technology to pursue business acumen and monetary gain on the worldwide web, discursive and personal commercial agendas, together with the artefact, construct verbal and visual texts that produce effects. In addition to intended effects of the commercial internet data-texts, these effects may include things such as the encouragement of thinking about connections in a way that is dynamic, rhizomatic, and self-driven.

In Pursuit of Art for Art's Sake, Challenge, Fun, Humour, the (Un)Charted & Other Creative Objectives

This Willendorf artefact visually assists in constructing texts for the pursuit of discursive, organisational and personal non-conformist goals by being a protagonist in the construction of art texts, innovative formats, novels, poetry, short stories, and spoofs. It also assists in the construction of creative texts by being an inspirational object. As a creative-agenda case in point, Willendorf's appearance as an arts-and-crafts pattern (Wabi Sabi 2005: http, Wabi Sabi 2006a: http) is evidence of this. Knowledge of Willendorf potentially assists in discursive creative goals such as charting uncharted territory, fun, humour, meeting challenges, or, like postlinguistic deconstruction, working to un-chart
or rechart already charted territory. Knowledge of Willendorf also potentially assists in organisational creative goals such as art for art’s sake. In here-categorised creative texts, Willendorf acts as a cameo, the main character, a metaphor, a hoax, and/or the deity or object of honour.

Figure 7.4: Open-Ended Pattern Suggestion: Creative-Intentioned (Micro)Textuality
Visually, a creative-agenda, New-Age-discourse website (Wabi Sabi 2005: http, 2006a: http) chooses to use this Willendorf artefact as a free-of-charge beaded-doll pattern to make a key ring, pendant, pin, pin cushion, sachet, talisman, or other hand-made item. This textuality contributes to the creative goals of sparking imagination, individuality, and tactile, self-directed engagement via this delightful image. These effects are in keeping with the website owner’s explicit wish to inspire readers to start a beaded project. Via significations indicated in the website’s name wabi sabi, intended effects might also include nurturing the traditional Japanese ideal of beauty where ‘nothing lasts, nothing is finished, and nothing is perfect’ (Powell in Wabi-sabi 2006b: http), or the related key Buddhist concept, anitya (McDermott, J. P. 1997), of impermanence or continual change. Willendorf serves the interests of the website in providing a project with depth. Reflexively the website serves the interests of Willendorf proliferation in providing images of yet another manifestation of this ubiquitous icon. Micro-textual effects of this arts-and-crafts pattern potentially include things such as improving a student’s ability to imagine a three-dimensional object by looking at a two-dimensional pattern, or conversely to formulate a two-dimensional pattern for a three-dimensional object.

Reflexively via their inventiveness, Willendorf-attended creativity assists in spreading the image of Willendorf as a mascot, a talis-woman, and a conversation piece. Willendorf performs well in these roles by possessing the capacity to be such a delightful inspiration. Knowledge of Willendorf further potentially assists in personal creative endeavours such as arts and crafts, visual arts, and creative writing. These, in turn, potentially assist with such things as confidence, fame, fortune, fun, humour, personal satisfaction, prestige, and a sense of achievement. In using texts that visually and verbally include Willendorf, websites and books promote a particular innovative knowledge/power construction. This construction, among other things, fosters
new ways of looking at, thinking about, and using sociocultural language. Via their unconventionality, these internet texts also produce and introduce the subjective effect of thinking about the artefact and its attendant significations in unique and thereby innovative ways.

Available texts in this creative-agenda category include texts that are commercially available, freely available on the internet, or both. Freely available texts, verbally or visually graced by Willendorf, include website wallpaper (Fisher 1995: http) in a here-categorised New-Age-discourse text. They include a publicised home-contents inventory (McClintock 2004: http), a virtual body (Virtual Concrete 1999: http), and an overt spoof (Grey 2000: http), in here-categorised liberal-humanist discourses. Commercially available texts in this agenda category include fiction novels with cameo or metaphorical appearances by Willendorf. These texts appear in this study labelled as liberal-humanist-discourses (Auel 1983: x-xii, 36, 447; Carpenter 1994: 320; Palmer 2005: 191), New-Age-discourses (Dedman 1997: 235, 2001: 237; Dooling 1996: 197, 1998: 256), and a feminist-discourse (Michaels, A. 1998: 33, 104). Poems using the artefact in this creative-agenda category are a feminist discourse (McPherson 1994: http) and two liberal-humanist-discourses (Krysl 1998: http, Dove 2007: http). This creative use of Willendorf changes the textuality of the text, as well as potentially adding to the enjoyment it may afford a student. That is, what is in it for a student is potentially different from that of an uncreative Willendorf text. It is potentially different in that a student may experience its main function as stretching the imagination. Further relevant to this study is that a student may well make any subsequent readings of the text with this creative, or thought-opening, experience in mind.

Creatively constructed and motivated texts carry intended effects. They enticingly encourage students mentally to engage in alternative concepts, or actively to pursue their own creative projects. The effects thus include such things as provoking thought and encouraging personal creativity in an otherwise largely buyer- and spectator-oriented hegemonic culture. However, data texts other than creative-agenda texts also take the form of patterns, novels, and poems. An emancipatory-agenda, liberal-humanist-discourse text

Discursive and personal creative agendas of the Willendorf data-texts produce textual and micro-textual constructions that encourage dynamic, innovative personal activity, authorship, creativity, energy, engagement, and participation. They do this, in part, by utilising this small or large (depending on how it is linguistically constructed by the particular text), unique Palaeolithic artefact. Creative endeavours enticingly offer authorship of the artefact; that is, it can be attractive to a student that in creative endeavours she takes credit for her creation. The artefact itself assists this by means of its inspiration to potential artisans, artists, poets, and creative writers. In the process of pursuing artistic satisfaction and intellectual wit, discursive, organisational, and personal creative agendas, together with the artefact, also construct verbal and visual texts that produce effects. In keeping with the here-attributed creative-agenda notion of the uncharted, unforeseen effects will also always inevitably exist. Effects in addition to possible intended creative-agenda effects will inevitably always exist as well, in that effects are not limited or bound by anyone's control.

In Pursuit of Equality, Fairness, Freedom, Justice, Liberty & Other Emancipatory Objectives

This Willendorf artefact visually assists in constructing texts for the pursuit of discursive and personal emancipatory goals by being a protagonist in the

Willendorf also stands as a mascot for issues of childlessness, eating disorders, fatness and positive self-perception, pregnancy and addiction, and participates in transforming teaching (eg Kinchloe & Steinberg 1998: 178). Reflexively via their staunchness, Willendorf-attended emancipatory endeavours assist in spreading the image of Willendorf as a hero, an idol, and an inspiration. Willendorf performs well in these roles by possessing the capacity to be such a convincing inspiration. In the playful capacity of a paper doll, Willendorf acts as a role model for children and adults. Reflexively, plus-sized paper-doll heroes and activity books inspire the creation and promotion of other plus-
sized paper-doll heroes and activity books (e.g., Spangler 1995, Wann 1998: 129-147). Books and websites cite, condone, promote and sell such paper-dolls, unconventional to Western hegemony. These textual sites thereby promote personal acceptance and emancipation from size-discrimination, in a relentlessly size-conscious hegemonic culture.

This Willendorf artefact, as part of particular constructed counter-cultures, is an artefact about which it is potentially liberating to be knowledgeable. Knowledge of Willendorf potentially assists in discursive emancipatory goals such as disadvantage and discrimination. This knowledgeability is advantageous in order to provide alternate exemplars in acceptable ways of being, or to argue successfully with other ways of reconstructing and re-construing what it means to be normal. Knowledge of Willendorf potentially assists in personal emancipatory endeavours such as fairness, freedom, loving your belly, and feeling like a Goddess instead of feeling overweight (Angelfire 2004: http). As part of reconstructed counter-culture knowledge in the case of size-acceptance, exemplars and arguments are potentially required to do such things as to earn anonymity and secure freedom from concern, criticism, and ridicule as a plus-sized person. These, in turn, potentially assist with such things as fat pride and the acceptance of shape and size diversity.

Books, websites, and zines constructed and motivated by emancipation carry intended effects. These effects may include such things as positive self-perception and self-esteem. One of the emancipatory-agenda micro-textual indicators evident in the Willendorf data, intended to help accomplish this, is the term *BBW*. Two here-categorised emancipatory-agenda texts use the terms 'BBW' (Summer 1996: http) or 'big beautiful woman' (Coggins 2003: http), in liberal-humanist and New-Age discourses, respectively. While textual sites may have coined this term to offer like-minded people strength and support, as language-in-use it takes on a life of its own. For example, in addition to the effect of positive self-esteem, the term *BBW* micro-textually produces the effects of providing a euphemism for fat and the effect of tiresomeness from overuse (Coggins 2003: http).
Data texts other than here-categorised emancipatory-agenda texts also cite, condone, promote and sell paper-dolls unconventional to Western hegemony. Other data texts also use the term *BBW*. A popularising-agenda, liberal-humanist-discourse text (Lane 2001: 1, 3), for example, cites Willendorf as a paper doll and as a mascot for Wann's fat-acceptance movement. Three promotional-agenda websites (Airborne & Polack 2004: http; Fraser, M. L. 2002: http; Cornog 1998: http), in two feminist discourses and one liberal-humanist discourse, respectively, praise and promote Willendorf as a paper doll. The terms ‘BBW’ (Fortune City 1999: http) and ‘big beautiful [sic] women’ (joyceoando 2006: http) also occur in one popularising-agenda text and one commercial, both feminist discourses, respectively. Together these texts and this reflexivity produce the effect of constructing ‘fat pride’ (Cornog 1998: http), ‘anti-diet, size-acceptance, anti-size-discrimination, anti-eating-disorder, and size-diversity’ (Airborne & Polack 2004: http). They produce the effect of producing counter-culture power/knowledge. Discursive and personal emancipatory agendas produce textual and micro-textual constructions that reinscribe new ways of thinking about the body. They do this, in part, by utilising this open-ended Palaeolithic character. Emancipatory endeavours bravely work to reinscribe values. The artefact assists this by means of the commanding presence of its image and its ability to embody the spirit of a perceived culture that valued differently. In the process of pursuing equality, fairness, freedom, justice, and liberty, the artefact assists in constructing verbal and visual texts that produce effects. It is discursive and personal emancipatory agendas that Willendorf assists in these pursuits. Effects produced might include the prolongation of traditional activities such as paper dolls in an electronic age.

*In Pursuit of (Ac)Knowledge(ment), Credibility, The (Hegemonic) Truth, Understanding & Other Popularising Objectives*

As a popularising-agenda case in point, this Willendorf artefact visually assists in constructing texts for the pursuit of increasing human understanding and the hegemonic truth. News-update and encyclopaedia-style texts evidence this in their promotion of Western cultural information and knowledge regarding the
artefact. Willendorf assists in the attainment of discursive popularising goals by being a protagonist in the construction of hegemony's historical meta-narrative. Knowledge of Willendorf potentially assists in personal hegemonic goals such as being accurate, being correct, being in the right, and winning arguments. These, in turn, potentially assist with such things as having confidence, earning credibility, gaining hegemonic knowledge and understanding, and learning hegemonic facts. In using these Willendorf-featuring texts, archaeologies, encyclopaedias, histories, newscasts, and television programs promote a particular knowledge/power construction that Western hegemony condones.

Figure 7.6: Encyclopaedic Knowledge: Popularising-Intentioned (Micro)Textuality
Visually, five popularising-agenda texts (Husain 2001: 120, Husain 2003: 120, Molyneaux 1995: 17, Molyneaux 2002: 17, Tringham & Conkey 1998: 26) in four as liberal-humanist discourses and one scientific discourse, respectively, choose to use this Willendorf artefact as representative of something that hegemonic culture can explain, know, and understand. This textuality contributes to the popularising goals of human understanding and the hegemonic truth. Willendorf serves the interests of the texts by adding the artefact's well-known profile to the collection of subjects in the texts, while the text reflexively serves the interests of Willendorf ubiquity in providing these cameo appearances in appealing, current, good-looking, well-respected and knowledgeable books. Micro-textual effects also include construction of the way in which students think about what it is possible to know.

Books and websites constructed and motivated by popularity, like any agenda, carry intended effects. These effects may include such things as discovering what really happened, so to speak. A layout where verbal text closely surrounds a photographic image visually reinforces the idea that a textual site can put the important things about a particular artefact into words. This visually attractive contemporary style further reinforces the idea that within hegemony the student is in the capable, good, knowledgeable hands of authority. That authority dispenses the grand story of what a student can
know—all that is important to know—about a particular artefact. Reflexively, these newscast and encyclopaedic texts assist in the promotion of this Willendorf artefact. Rhizomatically, books and websites cite, condone, dispute, promote and sell other popularising texts. For example, a popularising-agenda, liberal-humanist-discourse text (Lane 2001: 2-3, 35) produces the effect of constructing knowledge/power that Western hegemony condones. It does this textually by citing Auel and Witcombe, creative and academic agendas, respectively, in two other liberal-humanist-discourse texts. Popularising agendas are not the only here-categorised agendas which verbally and visually work toward truth constructions in this manner, however. A here-categorised promotional-agenda, liberal–humanist-discourse text (*Niederösterreich – Das Weite Land* 2002a: 9, 2002b: 9) uses a similar layout.

Discursive and personal popularising agendas produce textual and micro-textual constructions that reinforce traditional ways of thinking about archaeological artefacts. They do this, in part, by utilising this deified, famous or infamous (depending upon how it is linguistically constructed by the particular text), well-known Palaeolithic figurine. Popularising endeavours attractively offer information and (hegemonic) knowledge. The artefact assists this by means of its interest to particular non-professionals and students. In the process of pursuing acknowledgement, credibility, the hegemonic truth, and human understanding, discursive and personal popularising agendas, together with the artefact, construct verbal and visual texts that produce effects. These effects, intended or not, include things such as the dispensation of what counts as reality by the authority of hegemony. They also include ways of thinking about the material world as definable. Appropriately, they include ways of thinking about the material world as, spoken in the words of hegemonic English language, *that which matters.*
In Pursuit of Attendance, Fame, Fortune, Notoriety, Prestige, (Re) Cognition, Sales & Other Promotional Objectives

This Willendorf artefact visually assists in constructing texts for the pursuit of discursive, organisational and personal promotional goals by being a protagonist in the construction of booklets, fliers, leaflets, and websites, and by being an object that attracts attention. Willendorf's appearance as an icon on floor plans is a promotional-agenda case in point. Knowledge of Willendorf potentially assists in promotional goals such as attracting audiences, clients, or viewers, and selling artwork. These, in turn, potentially assist with such things as fame, fortune, notoriety, prestige, and recognition. By its visual presence, Willendorf attracts attention. By providing a platform for Willendorf, promotional texts also reflexively attract attention to Willendorf. In this way, the artefact and promotional texts reflexively act as promotional agencies for each other.

Figure 7.7: Museum Guides: Promotional-Intentioned (Micro)Textuality
Visually, promotional-agenda, liberal-humanist floor plans (Golebiowski et al 2002: inside front cover, Naturhistorisches Museum 2001: 9) choose this Willendorf artefact to mark the Stone Age section of the Natural History Museum in Vienna. This textuality contributes to the promotional goals of providing a guide map and fostering Willendorf fame. A guide map effectively answers the oft-asked question of the location of the Venus within the museum. Promoting Willendorf fame, of course, also works to serve the interests of the museum. Micro-textually Willendorf thus represents the entire stone-age collection, including 'Fanny of Gaigenberg' (Naturhistorisches Museum 2001: 3), a Venus artefact billed as yet another 7,000 years older than Willendorf. This choice and usage of Willendorf potentially also produces the effect of constructing the way in which the general public thinks about what is to be considered the most noteworthy in the room.

Books, websites, and zines constructed and motivated by promotion, of course, also carry intended effects. These effects may include such things as advertising
artworks, causes, groups, institutions, locations, movements, museums, protests, and rallies. As with the other here-categorised endeavours, promotional endeavours occur in more than one agenda. Promotional discursive endeavours include things such as working towards the goal of parents not spanking their children (Mothering 1998: http, Hunt 1998: http, Granju 1999: 17) in two promotional-agenda, one emancipatory-agenda texts, respectively. All three of these texts are here categorised as liberal-humanist discourses. Another is working toward the goal of non-violence (Madsen 1999: http; Summer 1996: http; Willie 1999: http; Willie 2000: http; Roth, M. 1998: 16, 116-117; Shands 1998: 108-109, 113, 365) in one promotional-agenda, two emancipatory and two popularising, respectively. Two of these texts are here categorised as liberal-humanist discourses, and three feminist, respectively. Yet another is working towards Goddess awareness (Marewindrider 2001: http) in a promotional-agenda, feminist-discourse text. Knowledge of Willendorf potentially assists in personal promotional endeavours such as creating and selling unique, valuable artworks (Whitehorn 2001: http) in another promotional-agenda, feminist-discourse text.

Discursive, organisational and personal promotional agendas of the data texts produce textual and micro-textual constructions that foster causes. They accomplish this fostering, in part, by including in their constructions, as the particular text may construct, this sought-after, well-respected Palaeolithic artefact. Promotional endeavours utilise the fame and popularity of the artefact. Reflexively, the fame and popularity of the artefact simultaneously utilise promotional endeavours. In the process of pursuing attendance, fame, notoriety, recognition, sales, and other promotional objectives, discursive and personal promotional agendas, together with the artefact, construct verbal and visual texts that produce effects. In addition to the possible intended effects of encouraging particular thoughts about what is important, needed, or valuable, these unintended effects might conceivably include criticisms toward the promotions such as the disturbance of peace or the invasion of privacy.
The six agenda categories work to recognise motivating factors in the data texts. They accomplish this, in part, by representing graphics that, as a researcher in this investigation, I tend to read as visual examples of agenda-influenced textual and micro-textual constructions. Discussion within each agenda category works to suspend as far as possible ideas of categorical absolutes or permanency, and to highlight aggregate influences holding a multiplicity of possible readings. Some of the effects produced by constructing here-categorised academic-agenda Willendorf texts are, among other things, the effects of constraining as well as enabling student thought. In the commercial agendas, effects include particular ways of owning, thinking about, and using the artefact, as well as promoting and valuing both materialism and monetary gain. In the creative agendas, effects include the promoting and valuing of human thought, innovative energy, interconnections of mental and emotional sites, processes and the unknown, as well as proliferation of this Willendorf artefact as visual currency. In the emancipatory agendas, effects include new ways of engaging with the artefact as well as size-diversity acceptance. In the popularising agendas, effects include what counts as information as well as conventional means of dispensing that information. In here-categorised promotional agendas, effects include ways of thinking about what is important as well as the advertising of artworks, institutions, locations, and movements. Necessarily, the thesis represents all of these here-categorised intended and unintended additional effects through the lens of its own academic agenda.

The main political motivation in deconstructing these six agenda categorisations is for students to begin to map textual, micro-textual, verbal and visual effects. This deconstruction thus works to reinforce a perhaps new perspective of intentional effects. This perspective sees that textual sites, even though they intend certain effects in constructing their texts, cannot guarantee these effects. It does not see these effects as inevitable. The agenda in deconstructing these categorisations works to remind students of language and culture of a potentially useful postlinguistic position. This position is that while additional as well as intentional effects can not be guaranteed, an awareness
and a working perspective of their technologies are potentially beneficial, constructive, and empowering. Understanding that meanings are inextricably bound with the agendas of those producing and wielding power/knowledge, implicates students. The degree to which authoritative agendas are not in control, is the degree to which onus is not resting upon them. Reflexively, not only are we as students subject to the textual construction of meaning, but meaning-making is also subject to us. Whether or not we as students realise it, the stakes of these empowerments and responsibilities are high.
(Re)presenting Textual Multiplicity: Academic Willendorf Data

The discourse communities of academics—the academy as a whole, as well as each discipline—develop specific genres in order for members to interact and accomplish their goals. In a sense, these genres—whether they be, for example, research abstracts, lab reports, or certain styles of email messages—help define and perpetuate the academic disciplines and the bodies of knowledge they continue to develop and debate. (Wennerstrom 2003: 124)

This chapter works to analyse, postlinguistically, texts in this study here-categorised as having an academic agenda. This work includes analysing its own analysis, reflexively. The body of the chapter does this by using multi-voiced page-layouts. As the culminating chapter of the thesis, this chapter also works to include evidence of linguistic politics in its purview by using colour-coded fonts, virgules, parentheses and word strikeouts, as occurs in chapters four and five, respectively. The variety, of language and graphics styles of this multiplicity chapter, works to illustrate that having an academic agenda does not limit a textual site to a single style.
The body of this chapter represents data from the study in running columns or windows. Page 173 begins with a quintuple-voiced layout where the chapter represents collected data texts, from four different here-identified discourses, on the upper half of the page. The thesis's created reflexive analysis appears in a light-grey-mirror text-box on the lower half of the page. One of my earlier intentions for this present study, as noted in the introduction, was to include all of the collected here-categorised academic-agenda data texts in the thesis document, in their entirety. I intended to do this while adjusting my analysis on the lower half of the page to fit with that which appeared above it. My analysis on the lower half of the page still adjusts to fit with the rest of the representation, however due to space constrictions the collected data texts represented on the upper half of the page are a selection taken from the here-categorised academic-agenda data texts of the study, rather than all of them. Further, in order to fit, this selection is further reduced in some cases to excerpts. In spite of the flexibility afforded by these adjustments, the discourse categories of these selected academic-agenda texts still comprise differing amounts of data-text. Therefore, the page layouts adjust to quadruple, triple, and double voice as the chapter progresses, with the thesis's created reflexive analysis remaining constant on the lower half of the page.

The last page of the body of the chapter, page 188, juxtaposes two liberal-humanist-discourse data texts. These two data texts comprise excerpts from two editions of an art history textbook. The publication dates of these editions are 16 years apart. The politics that this juxtaposition works to show is a Western hegemonic cultural politics which implies that linguistic signification is an innocent transparent conveyer of a world somehow outside itself. Indeed, the existence of politically correct language, fought for by the persistence of feminist politics, indicates an admission by textual sites of Western hegemony that linguistic signification is neither innocent nor transparent. The juxtaposition of these two textbook editions shows evidence of this lack of innocence and transparency. Further, engagement with this juxtaposition inscribes this lack of innocence and transparency within a student's experience.
Female Figurines of the Paleolithic

The female figurines and bas reliefs of the Paleolithic are too familiar to require description. A great deal has been written about them, by many men and a few women, for more than a century. Yet the chief impulse has been to describe them as all the same: fitting a particular new theory which is said to cover all the known cases. These labels have ranged from the notion that they are all fat (I learned to call them 'fat ladies' in anthropology courses [see Nelson 1990]), but Willendorf, who is almost always used as representative, is in fact the

The Great Goddess... is the incarnation of the Feminine Self that unfolds in the history of mankind as in the history of every individual woman; its reality determines individual as well as collective life.

Erich Neumann

...The art of the initial stage, the Old Stone Age (the Paleolithic), looked altogether different from the art of the last prehistoric period, the New Stone Age (the Neolithic). It is a difference with which even the general public is familiar now. The art of the Old Stone Age, to which such works as the Altamira cave paintings and the Venus of Willendorf belonged, was often striking in the convincing lifeliness of the figures, in the illusion of bulging masses, and in the vivacity of movement...

...Another assumption, implied but obviously taken for granted, was even more important in our specific con-

...In Debbie’s next tray...she differentiates between the masculine and the feminine. She put a collection of masculine items on the right: a tiny bronze crusader, a stag, a lion and a rhinoceros. And a group of feminine items on the left: a mermaid, the Venus of Willendorf, a recumbent cow, a squaw holding a baby, a Greek mother goddess and a woman/tree. The overall scene has sexual overtones....
hegemony, and it focuses on the accuracy of content rather than on the diversity of these sens-
survives on an assumption of truth. The assumption is our learned focus as students of Western
the...snake is coiled) mixes with current action (as in the words animals...witness). This hidden-ness
works to recognise the constrictions and liberties of English language(s) in the construction of
text. Since Paleolithic man was so dominated by sensual impressions, Verworn suggested that the forms he
shaped, the images of beasts he painted, and the shapes of the women he carved,* flowed almost automatically
from his mind and memory, and crystallized in the actual and statues without reflection. That the prehistoric
artist did not reflect whether or not he should paint the beasts and carve the women, and what they should look
like was of course an assumption that cannot be proved independently. Once again it is based on an intuitive
imaginative reading of the works of art...

Verworn did not mention the Venus statuettes in this context; he restricted his observations to painting. One
should perhaps also mention that the Venus of Willendorf was discovered in 1906, only a few months before
Verworn presented his lecture, though other figurines of the same type had already been known earlier. There is
little doubt, however, that the principle of his explanation should also apply to the female figurines.

...The overall impression of Debbie’s next scene...is one of peace and calmness. Debbie called it a pastoral scene. Many
animals are coming to drink from the water on the right. Debbie put in a farmer at top center who could ‘take care
of all this.’ Then she placed a Venus of Willendorf, and put in among the animals at the top left and added, ‘The
farm is fertile.’ She put the Greek goddess next to the Venus and said that she had been thinking of her mother lately...

...In Debbie’s final tray...the blue beaded snake is coiled in the center, wearing a golden crown...Several animals from
previous trays witness this crowning...

In the beginning was the Mother.

We have no direct evidence, naturally, of just when and how Homo sapiens became a religious animal—that is, when he first began to symbolize abstractions in his mind and to worship, plead with and propitiate
them. Or in psychological terms, when he first became aware (to begin with unconsciously) of numerous archetypes which transcended his individuality.

But we do know when he began to express that awareness in art: in the Paleolithic or Old Stone Age, when he had become a tool-making animal. It
was then that he first produced what may be called cult-objects.

To quote Erich Neumann (The Great Mother, p.95): ‘Of the Stone Age sculptures known to us, there
are fifty-five female figures and only five male figures. The male figures, of youths, are atypical and poorly executed, hence it is certain that they had no
works to recognise the constrictions and liberties of English language(s) in the construction of
texts. The red-coded nouns and green-coded verbs on this page, for example, facilitate students
to see at a glance what is possible according to these textual sites. Here it is possible for a town
to make (feminist example), for a person to suggest (liberal-humanist example), for a mother
and an impression to be (new age and scientific examples, respectively), and for a nouns and
verbs to facilitate (post/structuralist example). Blue highlighting facilitates a student to keep focus
on the signification for which this study collected—or in the case of this very text, wrote—
the text as data in the first place. The passive voice, which pink highlights above, mixes with the
active voice in a way that goes unnoticed in normal, hegemonic, passive reading. In the scientific
evidence of past action (as in the clause the...snake is coiled) mixes with current action (as in the words animals...witness). This hidden-ness
survives on an assumption of truth. The assumption is our learned focus as students of Western
hegemony, and it focuses on the accuracy of content rather than on the diversity of these sen-
site (Nelson 1991a). We ask in each instance, is there any evidence to indicate who made them? What purposes are suggested by their numbers at a given site, and the conditions of their disposal? Is it possible to determine whether a particular statue represents reality (a particular woman; a body portrait?) or an ideal (is this how women should look)? How many figurines were found at a site, and disposed in what way or ways? The grand idea is a male path to scholarly attention, but should women be creating other paths, ones with more attention to detail and difference? Can we move away from the idea that nude women are for the gaze of men, but nude men are 'figures of authority'?

Stimpson 1993: 644-645

...Not even Stein's most ardent detractors can dismiss her, try though they might. Confronting such an alliance of body and literary activity, people, whether supporters or detractors, drew on two significance for the cult. This fits in with the secondary character of the male godhead, who appeared only later in the history of religions and derived his divine rank from his mother, the Goddess.

In primitive societies known to history, the male role in procreation was not realized. Intercourse and pregnancy both began with puberty, and there was no evident reason to regard one as the cause of the other. Women were believed to conceive from the light of the Moon or from ancestral spirits.

It was not surprising, therefore, that woman became the symbol of the Earth Mother. Both mysteriously produced life and nourished it. The Palaeolithic female sculptures (of which the so-called Venus of Willendorf, depicted at the head of this chapter, was typical) were powerful fertility symbols, with huge belly and breasts. They were not, as Palaeolithic human skeletons prove, faithful representations of living women but deliberate exaggerations of their life-
tence constructions. By the same agency, in the new-age example above (Farrar & Farrar 1987: 8) claims of what happened in the past reported in passive voice (such as the words was realised), alternate with claims of what happened in the past reported in active voice (such as the words intercourse...began). This alternation between passive and active claims, together with their unequivocal construction and delivery, ultimately adds to the authoritative sound of both.

Leaving the signification ultimately with a strike through it (as is also the case with the other eight strike-through occurrences in this very narrative), rather than deleting it completely, works to show the process of sentence construction as well. The edit itself is relevant to the reflexive analysis of this very text in that (rhizo)analysis, such as this (re)search employs, works to emphasise middles more than beginnings or endings (Alvermann 2000: 116). The middle in this case is the writing construction in progress.

In the feminist example on the following page (Stimpson 1993: 644), the text exhibits the clause a Venus von Willendorf. The use of the German word von works to add an air of authority
mutually contradictory sets of metaphors to depict her. The incompatibility of these sets itself reflects the difficulty, which Stein ultimately transcended, of having such a body devoted to such a cultural task.

The first set of metaphors domesticates Stein. Meant to praise, and to honor the monstrous lesbian as crafter, they also replace her securely within the woman's traditional domain of the home. Because Stein's fatness also evokes the association of the fleshy female body with fertility, a Venus von Willendorf, this taming language has an added resonance...

The second set of metaphors inverts such cozy portraits of Stein at home by the range. In them, she is beyond society and social control, beyond ordinary sexuality, and therefore, beyond the need for sexual control. If the first set of metaphors [sic] drains monstrosity of its threat by enclosing it, the second does so by casting it out and away from daily history...

creating and life-nourishing aspects.

Nor did Palaeolithic woman have the massive buttocks and tiny legs of the goddess statues. These evidently represented the goddess as immobile, seated on the Earth and identified with it.

The first deity that mankind conceived, then, was the Earth Mother. We shall consider her further in the next chapter: it is enough here to emphasize that a male deity was a later development. Early human society was inevitably matrilineal, since the male role in biological parentage was not realized. There is still argument about whether it was almost universally matriarchal, though some societies certainly were...

Kellermeier 2003: http

...And in what cultural context or ethnos did these lunar calendars arise? The Palaeolithic period was characterized by the development of Goddess worship on the European continent where much of the evi...
Paleolithic reliefs and figurines, such as the Venus of Laussel with a hand on her fat belly, are surely pregnant. Any ambiguity is removed by an image of the Neolithic goddess of Catal Huyuk, who sits upon her throne (furniture that may be a symbolic development of large buttocks, themselves perhaps symbolic of pregnancy) and who delivers between her legs the head of a child emerging from her sacred vagina...

**Emory University 1999:** http

...History of Art 101
Image restricted to Emory University
Number: 5
Artist: -
Title: Venus of Willendorf
Date: c.28,000-23,000 BC
Culture: Paleolithic...

**Helicon 1998:** http

...prehistoric art
Art that predates written records. The history of the fine arts - painting, engraving, and sculpture - be-

dence of lunar calendars has been found. This Goddess worship was marked by images of the sacred female as life giver with an emphasis on the vulva, breast, and buttocks and the use of red ochre paint representing menstrual blood (Marshack, p. 281-540; Eisler, 1987, p. 1-7; Gadon, 1989, p. 3-21) such as the Venus of Willendorf and Laussel...

**The Venus of Willendorf**

Small stone image painted with red ochre.
From Willendorf
Austria, 30,000 to 25,000 BCE.

---

**Grant, Gorin & Fleming 2002:** 249

...a similar debate has raged over Palaeolithic 'Venus Figurines'. These images of pregnant female figures have been found across Europe and are remarkably uniform in character and style. Most appear to be associated with heartshaped houses. They are made of a variety of materials including baked clay (Dolbor Vestonice), mammoth ivory (Lespugue) and limestone (Willendorf). Interpretations have ranged from mother goddesses through fertility symbols to primitive pornography...

**Jacobi 1978:** 347-348

...The personal association that Henry contributed to the prostitute was the 'Venus of Willendorf,' a little carved figure (from the Paleolithic Age) of a fleshy woman, probably a nature or fertility goddess. Then he added:

'The first heard that touching the buttocks is a fertility rite when I was on a tour through the Wallis [a canton in French Switzerland], where I visited ancient Celtic graves and excavations.

---

**In terms of the content of the pregnant/not pregnant dichotomy raised in some of the data texts, compare** the sentence excerpt *the Venus of Willendorf may be merely fat with health and not pregnant* in the liberal-humanist example on the previous page (Elder 1996: 350), with the excerpt *these images of pregnant female figures have been found across Europe* in the scientific example above (Grant et al 2002: 249). **Compare** particularly the difference in latitude of what textual sites offer freely to the reader by these clauses. In textual terms, this juxtaposition exemplifies how putting a claim in the adjectival position renders it very secure from challenge. In this position it is even more secure than in a straight declaration, for example the declaration *these images of female figures are pregnant*. It is as if the author has already bagged the claim. The textual site does not have the claim on the table. It is not open for debate. With the claim clearly situated in the author’s possession, a strategist must fight on a deeper level. Here a strategist works in the Foucauldian sense of the word strategy, where relations are of power rather than of meaning (Foucault 1980: 114). Here a strategist must fight on a personal or textual, academic, pedantic level, in order to discuss the particular binary signified with but one word in this position in the sentence.

The circular frame for the Willendorf image in the new-age example on the following page is noteworthy in that, as a micro-textual element, it offers a potential clue to that with which the text identifies. It offers a potential clue to the motives, affiliations and values to which the text...
categorised here as a Liberal Humanist discourse

gins around 40,000 BC in the Palaeolithic period (Old Stone Age). The oldest known rock engravings are in Australia, but within the next 30,000 years art occurs on every continent. The earliest surviving artefacts in Europe date from approximately 30,000-10,000 BC, a period of hunter-gatherer cultures. Small sculptures are generally of fecund female nudes and relate to the cult of the Mother Goddess; for example, the stone Willendorf Venus (Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna) about 21,000 BC. The murals of the caves of Lascaux, France, and Altamira, Spain, depict mostly animals...

...portable art
Examples of portable art include the limestone figurine of a corpulent female, the Willendorf Venus, found in Austria, and an ivory plaque from Malta, Siberia, which is worked with pits in spirals, and considered to be calendrical...

adheres. Contrast the feel that this grey spherical frame exudes with that of the black-and-white verbal and square frame of the time line in the liberal-humanist excerpt on the page 179 (Hume 2003: 43). Potential connections between the new-age movement and the universal symbol of the circle are spirituality, wholeness, and process. The circle is spiritual in that it is ‘the traditional symbol of eternity and the heavens’ (Thompson & Davenport in Kress & van Leeuwen 1996: 52). The New Age projects wholeness in that ‘the New Age bottom line can be stated in three words: “all is one”’ (Newport 1999: 4). This all-is-one perspective and the circle symbol connect in the movement and enclosure of the circle’s circumference; ‘the Ouroboros (the circle formed by a dragon biting its own tail) is to be found... in the Greek legend Hen to Pan (The One, The All) which explains how its meaning embraces all cyclic systems (unity, multiplicity and the return to unity...)’ (Cirlot 1971: 48). Interestingly, three organisational names in the new-age category of this study also exhibit associations with circles: Open Circles, Ancient Circle, and The Circle of the Great Goddess. Circle is also one of the names used for the basic unit of worship by pagans (Newport 1998: 227). Neo-paganism is ‘a special, relatively clearly circumscribed subculture within the new-age movement’ (Newport 1998: 214). A similar example from the data texts is the signifier ring in the website question: ‘Want to join the ring?’ (Circle 2000: http).

The clause the fact that, in the new-age example on the following page (Peterson 1999: http), is an interesting device in textual construction in terms of the simulacra and strategy perspectives raised on page 176 (Rosendahl 2007). Since everything in the domain of language in this perspective is a copy, and since copies are copies and not facts, there are, according to the

...portable art

A Willendorf Goddess figurine, possibly the most famous ancient fertility symbol

Life—a miraculous and incomprehensible phenomenon—literally poured forth from women’s bodies. The earth also gave life to plants and animals, and therefore, to people. Because they had the power to create and sustain life, women and the earth and all things spiritual were linked together. In dugs of pre-historic civilizations, archeologists have found...
Overview of Artistic Periods

PREHISTORY

Prehistory simply means that there was no written history. The Chinese, Egyptian, Indian, Mesopotamian, and Sumerian civilizations developed in great river valleys from 35,000-15,000 BC. It was not until the discovery of the Rosetta Stone in 1799 by scholars who accessed ancient records.

Post/structuralist perspective to which this (re)search site adheres, no facts in this the communicative domain to which discourses are necessarily confined. The clause the fact that in this perspective has no direct access via language to some intact original; rather, postlinguistically it signals a power play in the war for control. The struggle ensues for the position to dictate on a macro level that which Western hegemony ostensibly values, namely truth and reality. The struggle ensues on a meso, or middle, level (Campbell 1991: 71), to define those dictated values, and on a micro level to reinforce those dictated values.

In the immediate clause signifying the artefact, Venus is the most traditional term that textual sites use in the noun position. It is used in this position in three instances in the data texts above (highlighted in blue font). Two alternate nouns are figurine exhibited in the New-Age example on the previous page (Peterson 1999: http) and the noun artefact in this very paragraph. The noun position is important in textual strategies, of course, because it is what the text is saying that the thing, which it is talking about, is. Venus as a name has come to signify 'all obese Palaeolithic statuettes of women' (Witcombe 1999, 2005). The signifiers figurine and artefact, in contrast, work to move away from foregrounding the sexual aspects of the artefact, and toward more general objectification. These signifiers emphasise physicality, and fit with the academic and scientific foci of tangibility and observable mechanism. These more impersonal, less intimate, less familiar noun choices suggest a greater distance from the thing discussed, creating a greater sense of control. These choices set the scene for the various sorts of traditional analytic work that the texts are undertaking.
companied Napoleon to Egypt, and its translation in 1921, that Egyptian Hieroglyphs could be accurately translated. Among the oldest European discoveries were grave artifacts such as the Venus of Willendorf approximately 30,000 years old, and cave paintings from 15,000 to 10,000 BC...

Survey of Sculpture: Important Works of Art
...AUSTRIA Prehistoric Venus of Willendorf, c. 25,000-20,000 BC, Museum of Natural History, Vienna...

Komunyakaa 1998: http

VENUS OF WILLENDORF
by Yusef Komunyakaa

She's big as a man's fist,
Big as a black-pepper shaker
Filled with gris-gris dust,
Like two fat gladiolus bulbs

Grown into a burst of twilight,
Lumpy & fertile, earthy
& egg-shaped, she's pregnant
With all the bloomy hosannas

Of love-hunger. Beautiful
In a way that forces us to look
At the ground, this squat
Venus in her braided helmet

...Examples on display here include a reindeer engraved on an eagle bone (display case 4) and a limestone figurine of a naked woman, the so-called 'Venus of Willendorf'...

Maringer 1960: viii, 108-114, ill. 33

List of Illustrations

33 The Venus of Willendorf, a limestone statuette carved by the Aurignacian mammoth hunters of Austria, represents a mature woman with her hair arranged in the shape of a beehive. She wears a scalloped bracelet and shows traces of having once been painted in red.

...But for realism and plastic vitality, the famous Austrian 'Venus of Willendorf' eclipses all others...It is a limestone carving about 4 inches high, still showing traces of paint.

Compare the clause her braided helmet in the liberal-humanist example above (Komunyakaa 1998: http), the clause hair arranged in the shape of a beehive (Maringer 1960: ill. 33) in the scientific example above, and the clause the spiral of a twined coiffure carved as a zigzag motif (Marshack 1995: http) in the scientific example on the following page. Two name a noun not inherently part of the human body: helmet and spiral, respectively, modified by words associated with hair: braided and coiffure. The third works the other way around, naming the noun hair associated with a word...
not inherently part of the human body: beehive. Compare these with the image presented in the Marshack example above. From this perspective, the image is convincingly a helmet, a spiral, or a beehive shape. However, from a perspective looking down on the top of the head as in the illustration attending this very paragraph (Hitchcock 2003: http), the design convincingly fits a concentric-circle pattern (Curtis 2003: http; Koeller 2000: http; Spic 2000: http; Witcombe 1999: http, 2005: http). Other descriptions regarding this feature as hair include braided (Sones 2004: http), corn rows (Henke 2000: 174; Campbell, R 1998: http; Lane 2001: 3), curls (Abaxion 2003: http; Sacred Source 2003: http, 2006: http; Satzl 2005: http; stadler 1998: http; Taylor 1997: 121), plaited (Witcombe 1999: http), and ‘tight circular ringlets’ (McDermott 1995: http).


Willendorf Top View
(Hitchcock 2003: http)

The point perspective here, again, is not one of meaning, but one of strategy. The perspective here, for a Foucauldian-informed student, encourages learning both to suspend judgement and to read visual and verbal texts critically for her/him/self. The act of looking is post/structurally important, from this (re)search site’s educationalist and
Some scholars have thought that the large posteriors of the Palaeolithic and Neolithic figurines are intentionally pornographic (Absolon, 1949) or erotic (Onians, 1978).

Others regarded them as barbaric ideals of beauty. It is my contention that it is the shape of a sculpture or engraving and the association of symbols, such as engraved or painted signs over the buttocks, that reveal its symbolic meaning. The associated symbolism of the egg or double-egg is attested in the European Copper Age, particularly by pictorial painting on Cucuteni vases of the early fourth millennium B.C. (fig. 12). The symbolic intention can be seen in the famous Perigordian-Gravettian 'Venus', their buttocks and breasts shaped like double-eggs. One of the best examples of this symbolism is the 'Venus' from Lespugue, southern France (fig. 15). The 'Venus' of Willendorf (not illustrated), those from Grimaldi in Italy (fig. 14) and Gagarino in Russia (fig. 15) are similarly shaped. Within the buttocks of one Magdalenian engraving is a circle, probably an egg (fig. 16). Hundreds, if not thousands, of Magdalenian, Neolithic, and later images with exaggerated posterior reiterate again and again the cosmic myth of the Goddess as a water bird, carrying an egg or a double-egg in her body.

Various abstracted female, human, and bird forms are continuous from the Magdalenian epoch through the post/linguistic perspective. This act comprises looking ever mindfully at the merits of evidence exhibited in each particular textual case, and continually looking for more. The perspective here is to seek new types of potential linguistic sources. It is to (re)cognise textual ammunition and strategies for consciously chosen agendas. From a post/structuralist position the book on meaning never closes because from this position 'meaning is plural' (Weedon 1987: 106). Here, effects of discourse are constantly slipping and open to continuous redefinition. In this way, effects of discourse are often open to choice and ever open to contestation and resistance.

In keeping with the noun Venus being the most traditional, as noted on page 179, the clause the Venus of Willendorf is still the dominant verbal signifier for this Willendorf artefact. Fittingly, the dominant data-text discourse category, liberal humanism, is the discourse that uses this dominant signification the most. Reflexively (ie one feeds into the other), this is perfectly quite in keeping with 'classic liberal humanism' (Weedon 1987: 80), which itself is still the dominant variety of humanism. Many of the data texts add adjectives to this traditional signification (eg the adjective ubiquitous in the liberal-humanist example on the following page). The precise clause the 'Venus' of Willendorf in the liberal-humanist example above (Musès & Campbell 1991: 37) is particularly interesting in that it uses the traditional noun Venus to signify the artefact while simultaneously calling it into question. In employing quotation marks, the text simultaneously criticises the familiar signifier and exhibits, in an Althusserian sense (Weedon 1987: 30), the thing categorised here as a Liberal Humanist discourse

categorised here as a Scientific discourse

categorised here as a Post/Structuralist discourse
Neolithic, Chalcolithic, and Copper Age; thus a series of Upper Palaeolithic figurines depicts nothing but the buttocks, the upper and lower parts of the body reduced to cones, and small carvings or pendants in the shape of buttocks or in double-egg form continue down to the Maltese culture of the fourth millennium B.C. In Cu cu tenian and Minoan art, the buttocks symbol became fused with the double-fruit symbol (fig. 17). In European folklore to this day, the symbol of a double-fruit, double-leaf, or double-car signifies good luck and fertility.

Nelson, R.S. 1997: http

The denial of history to the cultures discussed in the earlier versions of the Jansons' first chapter and the positioning of this material at the beginning, like the placement of Asian and American art at the end in the 'Postscript' of the early editions of the Jansons' book, or the literally eccentric position given Byzantine art in 'The Ancient World,' are all examples of allochronism. Far from lacking history, the peoples and arts included in the former versions of chapter I have a longer history than the rest of the entire book. The artifacts surveyed here range from cave paintings in Spain and France and the ubiquitous Venus of Willendorf (15,000 to 10,000 B.C.), Stonehenge in England (second millennium B.C.), Nigerian bronzes (twelfth and sixteenth-eighteenth centuries A.D.), masks from Tennessee, Alaska, Cameroons, New Britain, and Switzerland (A.D. 1000 to twentieth century), and, lastly, to a present-day Navaho sand-painting ritual in Arizona.

...Much that has been written on the significance and function of Upper Paleolithic female images involves some analogical or symbolic hypothesis as to why they depart from an otherwise objective realism. One enduring approach resolves the conflict by identifying this recurrent incongruity with anomalous or unusual categories of visual information. Whether scholars have found the Negroid race in Europe (Piette 1902:773), extremes of the female life cycle (Rice 1981), enlarged or hypertrophic breasts (Harding 1976), or obesity and the physiological consequences of maternity (Duhard 1993a, b), the possibility of observational exactness has excerted perennial appeal—although sometimes with peculiar consequences. For example, Piette (1902:775) saw enlarged fatty buttocks in a piece from Grimaldi and institutionalized a long...

...They are unquestionable, texts may be promoting the denial of histories, or indeed herstories. That is, by not offering any space at all for alternatives or for multiplicity concerning a culture, texts in effect, may be denying histories and herstories to that culture.
lasting fascination with the unusual condition of steatopygia. Although having little in common beyond amplexeness, the posterior of subsequent discoveries at Willendorf and Laussel in 1908, Lespugue in 1922, and Savignano in 1924 fueled the lamentable tendency to see all prehistoric peculiarities of the buttocks as steatopygous...

**FIG. 1.** [left] Anatomical distortions encountered in Pavlovian-Kostenki-Gravettian figurines (redrawn after Leroi-Gourhan 1968a: 90), showing the relationships Leroi-Gourhan called the ‘lozenge composition’: an abdominal circle with a diameter defined by the greatest width of the image (a, b), the incorrect proportions seen in the upper and lower body (c, d), the unnatural elevation of the vertical midpoint and greatest width of the female body (a-h), and the representation of what should be half of the body (pubes to ground) as being closer to one-third the total length (e, f, g). a, Lespugue; b, Grimaldi ‘lozenge’; c, Kostenki no. 3; d, Gagarino no. 1; e, Willendorf no. 1; f, Laussel ‘woman with the horn’; g, Dolni Vestonice no. 1; h, Gagarino no. 3.

...Early this century, ethnographic observations encouraged the equally pervasive idea that all prehistoric art was involved with hunting and fertility magic (Reinach 1903). Originally focused on parietal art, the hypothesis was extended with subsequent recognition of humans among the animals. Barely recognizable Magdalenian ‘anthropomorphs’ with animal and human features and exuberantly female PKG-style figurines were thought alike ritually engaged in ensuring the success of immediate and future hunts (Bégouën, 1929a, b; Breuil 1952; Reinach 1903; Saccasyn-Della Santa 1947: 9-21). With or without the magical element, the idea that PKG-style exaggerations signal a symbolic interest in fertility and fecundity has been very influential (Abronova 1967b, Burkitt 1934, Pales and de St.-Pereuse 1976, Ucko and Rosenfeld 1967)...

**FIG. 3.** [right] PKG-style figurines in profile, showing common massing of three-dimensional forms, including elevated buttocks relative to tailbones (a, b, c). a, Grimaldi ‘yellow steatite statuette’; b, Willendorf no. 1.; c, Lespugue; d, Gagarino no. 3; e, Gagarino no. 1; f, Kostenki no. 1.

...Standing erect with the head bowed presents to a woman’s eye a strongly foreshortened view of the upper frontal surface of the thorax and abdomen, while the breasts, being close to the eyes, will loom large in the visual field. Creation from this perspective provides a parsimonious explanation for the voluminousness and distinctive pendulous elongation routinely observed in the breasts of PKG-style figurines. When looked at from above, as a woman observes herself, the breasts of PKG-style figurines assume the natural proportions of the average modern woman of childbearing age. For example, the dimensions of the breasts of the off [sic]-illustrated Venus of Willendorf are comparable to those of a 26-year-old mother-to-be with a 34C bust (see fig. 5)...

D o u b l e  -  V o i c e d  P a g e - L a y o u t

The McDermott example above (1995) signifies the artefact with the words Willendorf no. 1. This distinguishes the artefact from Willendorf Venus numbers two and three attending this very paragraph (Neugebauer-Maresh 1995: 69-70). Western hegemony also found these artefacts, sketchily rendered as they are, at the Willendorf site, and recorded them with the scientific community. Another example of this differentiation is the clause the Willendorf I figure (Cook 1995: http) in one of the scientific excerpts on page 175. The clause the ubiquitous Venus of Willendorf in the liberal-humanist example on the previous page provides the same function since the other two artefacts found at Willendorf are not ubiquitous.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Willendorf Venus II</th>
<th>Willendorf Venus III</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

categorised here as a **Scientific discourse**
...Also, the dual role of hands and arms as both agent of fabrication and model could relate to their variability and infrequent representation. Being in constant motion, they have no fixed point of regard in the visual field and perhaps in human memory. When arm and hands are crossed over the breasts, they present their narrowest aspect to the eye in an edge-on view, which suggests a rational origin for even the unusual thin ‘filiform’ or threadlike arms of the well-known pieces from Lespugue and Willendorf 16...

FIG. 5. [left] Autogenous visual information of the upper body. Top, photographic simulation of what a six-months-pregnant 26-year-old Caucasian female of average weight sees when looking down while standing erect; bottom, same view of Willendorf no. 1 (cast).

An intermediate regional variation in self-inspection routines of the posterior is perhaps preserved in the arbitrary horizontal notch located immediately above the bottom edge of the atrophied ‘buttocks’ of the Venus of Willendorf. This blunt geometric feature, which makes no anatomical sense from any point of view other than the self-viewing, is optically transformed into a highly naturalistic foreshortened image of the lower back above a properly positioned tailbone carried above an oblique sliver of foreshortened buttocks (see fig. 10).

FIG. 10. [left] Autogenous visual information of buttocks as seen under the arm. Top, photographic simulation of modern woman’s view; bottom, same view of Willendorf no. 1 (cast).

...Although this hypothesis relies on visual evidence for its demonstration, tactile and somato-sensory information would certainly have contributed to any act of self-representation. Although it is virtually impossible to demonstrate such a role experimentally, tactile knowledge could easily have operated to fashion features which could not be seen from a self-viewing perspective. Representations of hair, for example, are often encountered among these images, and while the long tresses seen in vertically engraved lines at Lespugue can descend into the visual field, close-fitting coiffures such as the checkerboard or quadrillage pattern worn by the Grimaldi ‘Negroid head,’ the ‘Brassempouy lady,’ and a small relief from Laussel could not have been seen by their owners. This would also have been the case with the tight circular ringlets apparently favored farther east, as seen at Willendorf, Pavlov, Kostenki, Gagarino, and Avdeev (Delporte 1993a:figs. 7, 19, 44, 95, 128, 155a, 168, 174, 183)...

These delimiting signifiers work to invoke a sense of expertise and authority for textual sites that include these added sidelights of information commentary. This very text does this as well by exhibiting its knowledge of and access to photographs of Willendorf Venuses two and three. In the drawings of the McDermott text on the previous page (1995), the vertical and horizontal axes embody the visual device of dividing each image into quarters. This allows a student to compare easily, a particular segment of one drawing with the same segment of another. This device works much the same as the colour-coding device of this very text. By means of its care, consistency and repetition, the exhibition of these analytic visual guides also adds a sense of expertise and authority to a text. The inclusion of letter or number sequences in the McDermott example above is a similar micro-textual element that adds to a sense of the author’s thoroughness, control, and accuracy. The close-up images further add to this sense of expertise and authority. They do this by showing the reader where to look and by validating that there is something relevant there for the reader to find.

The textual construction MAN DEPICTS HIMSELF in the first scientific example on
un and this is a riddle. figurines flaunts knowledge. Like the academic convention of parenthetical referencing, it is also another example of appealing to the expertise of others. Following page | Megaw & Jones 1972: 86-87 |

MAN DEPICTS HIMSELF. Although we have already seen that even chimps are capable of artistic expression, no art survives from before the Upper Palaeolithic era. Among the earliest and most remarkable art is the range of abstract female statuettes termed, with little regard to modern standards of beauty, 'Venus figurines'. These are associated with various local groups of the Gravettian culture stretching from France to Austria, Czechoslovakia and Russia. All stress sexual characteristics and some of them are pregnant. Facial features are reduced to a minimum. We may compare a figurine from Dolni Věstonice made from a fire-hardened mixture of powdered bone and clay (164), the rear view of a damaged mammoth ivory figurine from Lespugue, France, with long hair (165), a pregnant figure in steatite from the Grimaldi caves (IGEs), and a figurine, not unlike the famous Venus of Willendorf in Austria from the Kostienki mammoth hunters' camp in south Russia, (167) and (168). Contrasting with these representations are some more highly stylized examples from Ma'at'a beside Lake Baikal in Siberia (169). The 'Venuses' have been regarded as evidence of man's preoccupation with fertility and birth; they may equally be Palaeolithic pin-ups. There are occasional male representations, such as the unique jointed doll of mammoth ivory found with a man buried in Brno in central Czechoslovakia (170). Although there is no definite portrayal in Palaeolithic art, some pieces seem to come close to it as, for example in a tiny inch-and-a-half high ivory head from Brassempouy in the south west of France (173)...

Miller & Gur 2002: http

A unified biological and spiritual developmental path might be represented in Groeschel's (1983) formulation of adolescence as an inherent window of 'spiritual awakening,' reflected in a vast array of religious ceremonies marking puberty as the entree into religious adulthood (Richards and Bergin, 2000). While we know of no other quantitative research to address the impact of puberty on religiosity in females, a cultural-historical link between secondary sexual characteristics and spirituality dates back to the earliest representation of the human form, the fertility goddess Venus of Willendorf. Upper Palaeolithic era 25,000-20,000 B.C.E. in Central Europe (Croix and Tansey, 1986). The psychological anthropologist Motz (1997) posits that the enormous fecundity of the spherical Venus of Willendorf represents Palaeolithic knowledge of the confluence between secondary sexual characteristics, sexuality, and spirituality in females.

Neugebauer-Maresch 1995: Cover, 2, 6, 67-68


this page (Megaw & Jones 1972: 86) is particularly interesting in juxtaposition with the obviously female characteristics of Willendorf. This data text does not illustrate the Willendorf artefact but does go on to mention it. With the clause: the riddle of the misshapen Venuses on the following page (Prideaux 1973: 98), this textual site constructs the position that the Venus figurines are misshapen and that this is a riddle. Saying that archaeologists call these statuettes Venus figurines flaunts knowledge. Like the academic convention of parenthetical referencing, it is also another example of appealing to the expertise of others. Parenthetical referencing, however, is post/linguistic in that it makes connections to particular sites rather than to a group of people in a particular professional capacity. Thereby, this here-categorised scientific textual site appeals to archaeologists as experts, adding power to the text. It also, thereby, adds a feeling of the textual site's own expertise for having and including this knowledge in the text. Szombathy's 1908 journal notes on the following page were likely not written with publication of the notes themselves in mind, and yet as extant written evidence those notes become potential fodder for peoples' subsequent agendas. This is an example of how texts, once born, can go on to live a life of their own. The multiple perspectives of the photos above (Neugebauer-Maresch 1995: 68) give an in-
The Birth of Fine Art
The Riddle of the Missshapen Venus

Among the most intriguing relics of Cro-Magnon handiwork are the statuettes archaeologists call Venus figurines because of their curvaceous depiction of the female body. Some 60 have been found scattered from France to Siberia yet all, like the five shown here, were made 20,000 to 27,000 years ago, and most display the same motherly figure. The significance of the Venuses is disputed, but most experts think they are fertility symbols, images of a mother-goddess revered by the Cro-Magnons as the source and protector of all things good. She was the bearer of children, keeper of the home, guardian of the hunt and may even have been considered the ancestor of the human race.

Soffer, Adovasio & Hyland 2000: http

...Research on Gravettian textiles and basketry informs our understanding of Upper Paleolithic ideology and yields new insights on one component of Stone Age material culture—the ‘Venus’ figurines. Detailed studies of a series of figurines indicate the presence of at least three types of dressed female depictions. These include several types of headgear, various body bandeaux, and at least one type of skirt. Using data from Europe, we argue that the garments portrayed were made of plant fibers and that their exquisite detailing reflects the important role played by textiles in Upper Paleolithic cultures. The iconography also associates these technologies with women as well as with power, prestige, and value...

Szombathy 1908: journal notes

7 August. Willendorf
Dir H.H. Dr Bayer is D Obermaier erfrischt am Werke, vir Schichte II abjagrahm, wurst sir schon uber Dir Halfte dir Langer hinoos sind. 7 bolost einzilne Flaken und aneiner Stella eine 40 cm trife Herdgube - Thot 5 in 6 Fundstelle von N 7. Grabingsstelle von O Normalys. 8. Unteres Stimeinde am Ensehenbe 1 von N. In meiner Gegenwart, da ich no Dr B. Hinsahen, traf 1 arbeiter beim sorgfaltigen abgraben Dir Kulturschichte 9 auf 1. Völlig gut erhaltene Steinfiguren, ein stiloppyges Weile das ich aershob - Kihlenschicht ca 25 cm Kultursh. Figuren - 12 cm

Academic Agenda

...dication of just how much a single perspective inevitably leaves out. If it is an unknown object, the (re)searcher/reader cannot possibly hope to fill in all the richness of detail left out in omitting the plethora of possible additional perspectives. This analogy is also appropriately applicable to perspectives rendered by verbal texts. Micro-textual examples serving as evidence of multiple verbally constructed perspectives in the texts above are the varying languages—namely visual, English, and German. A visual-text example is the man in the photograph on the previous page (Neugebauer-Maresch 1995: 2) drawing attention to his own perspective via the camera at his eye. While it is of course interesting to have a reading knowledge of German in analysing the data texts in that language, there is also an advantage in not having this knowledge. This advantage is the potential to see textual detail more abstractly. In this more abstract reading, ironically, the detail concerning accepted meanings does not encumber a student. This is an example of this (re)search site’s idea(l) of critical literacy, of being open to the possibilities of reading. This idea(l) embodies emancipatory post/structuralist critical discourse analysis in its core version: an ability to resist things assumptive, presumptive, hidden, silenced, or embedded, along with the vitality to work continuously in finding ways to scrutinise anew and to view afresh.
There are small sculptures in the full round representing the female figure (called Venus figures by archeologists), an exception to the rule of exclusion of the human figure from the cave artist's vocabulary of forms. Perhaps the most famous of these is the Venus of Willendorf (FIG. 1-1), a figurine of a woman that is composed of a cluster of almost ball-like shapes. The anatomical exaggeration suggests that this and similar statuettes served as fertility fetishes; the needs for game and human offspring were one in the dangerous life of the hunter. But again the artist's approach to the human figure differs from that to animals. He obviously does not aim for that heightened realism so characteristic of his animal representations; facial features, for instance, are seldom indicated in these statuettes, and in some specimens not even the heads are shown. Evidently the artist's aim was not to show the female of his kind but rather the idea of female fecundity; he depicted not woman but fertility.

Temporal Juxtaposition

The intention of the above juxtaposition (de la Croix & Tansey 1970: 22-25, 34-35; de la Croix et al 1991: 26, 35-36) is to graphically illustrate the constructed nature of written text. This juxtaposition shows that the tools and means at a textual site's disposal can constrain and influence what the text potentially communicates. The 1975 publication is in black and white and presents a quite dark photographic image of the artefact itself. The 1991 publication is in colour and presents a photographic image of the artefact with such a different visual texture that it looks as though the artefact is made of a different material altogether. The juxtaposition shows the malleability of written text in that phrasing options, demonstrated in red font, readily lend themselves to new wording. The politically correct change from the word he to the word they is one example. Later in the same sentence, the textual site leaves one occurrence of the word his behind, evidencing the editing process itself. The term cave artist is in itself an interesting generalisation in that the Willendorf artefact, for one example at least, was found in the Wachau of Austria. The last time I was there the Wachau was a flat valley bed with a river running through it, with no sign of caves. Text construction, limited by space and time as all communication mediums are, is such that in order to get an overview, a sometimes misleading perception of detail is passed along. Changing from 'in some specimens not even the heads are shown' to 'not even the heads are shown in some specimens' is interesting in that it highlights construction choices. These differences exhibit that, whether or not the subject about which the text is speaking has changed, the text itself has changed.
As explained in chapter three, the research methodology of these juxtapositions utilises the poststructuralist strategies of rhizomatics (Deleuze & Guattari in O'Riley 2003: 21), narrative chance (Vizenor in O'Riley 2003: 21), and chance operations (Cage in O'Riley 2003: 21, O'Riley 2003: 22). The methodology is reflexively modelled on an earlier research-representation layout (Lather & Smithies 1997).

The body of this chapter has worked to show the politics of academic texts speaking as authorities about and for other textual sites (Lee 2000: 194). In the process it has shown that all forms of discourse analysis generate texts about texts (Luke in Lee 2000: 197). It has shown that, postlinguistically, in representing text, no text repeats the texts about which it speaks. Rather, in commenting upon a text, an academic text is creating new simulacra. These simulacra are the multiplicity inherent in representing text. These simulacra are the multiplicity inherent in the here-categorised academic-agenda Willendorf data. These simulacra are the multiplicity inherent in linguistic signification.
...Responding to the call of concerns such as these enlarges education, multiplies it across disciplinary boundaries, encourages it to examine its attachments and limits, and reinvigorates it to such an extent that it might, indeed, become unrecognizable. We believe that it must... (St. Pierre & Pillow 2000: 9)

This chapter closes the thesis by reviewing what the investigation has learned for critical-literacy perspectives with its Willendorf readings. This review includes the arguments and aspirations of the thesis, and its emancipative-praxis strategies for readers and students, both those that worked and those that did not. The chapter reconsiders the implications for readers and students, of the use of Willendorf-oriented words and images to colonise, frame, isolate, and literally re-present the object. It reconsiders the implications for readers and students that, by and large, the Willendorf data texts build upon learned sociocultural assumptions to accomplish this colonisation. The chapter recapitulates that postlinguistic perspectives, in contrast, work to navigate within and between acknowledged multiplicities and complexities (Gore 1993: 61) in sociocultural contexts.
Acknowledgement and navigation of multiplicities and complexities are part of the call of concerns to which the opening quotation for this chapter refers. Concerns of becoming and process over questions of being and ontology are also part of this call, as are concerns of subjectivity and agency. The call further comprises concerns of reading, writing, and discursive power, and it includes concerns of binary thinking, desire, and difference (Peters in St. Pierre & Pillow 2000: 9). In the juxtapositions of chapter four, the clustering of chapter five, the discursive identities of chapter six, the agenda motivations of chapter seven, the represented multiplicity of chapter eight, this thesis has endeavoured to manifest its postlinguistic-praxis approaches to these, its poststructuralist educational concerns.

**(Blue Fonts & ) The Elusive Signified**

In this research I employed strategies to exhibit that a signifier is not that which it signifies. All of these strategies appear in this present version of the thesis. The ways in which it was not possible to put these strategies into practice here was in terms of scope. That is, it was not possible to include these strategies consistently throughout the document. This was due both to space constraints and to comprehensibility issues.

These strategies included flagging (with a blue font) instances of text in chapter four and chapter eight that, in one way or another, implied the Willendorf artefact itself. This strategy developed from an interest in seeing, more tangibly, my own verbal construction at work. (This initial strategy is seen in chapter eight, where the main noun of a sentence is flagged in red, the main verb in green, and the passive voice in pink.) The wide range of disparate signifiers, each working to signify the very same famous Willendorf artefact in different contexts and via different technologies, works to belie the unspoken, unadmitted, Western hegemonic implication that a signifier transparently carries its signified. This wide range, too, works to belie the unspoken, unadmitted, Western hegemonic implication that a signifier has the ability to be a fact. It further works to strengthen my poststructuralist perspective in this research, which recognises that while the subject of this thesis was the famous
Willendorf artefact, that artefact itself was never here. Listed together in alphabetical order, the verbal-Willendorf-name signifiers from chapter four and chapter eight are:

1. a single artefact
2. a Venus of Willendorf
3. a Venus von Willendorf
4. A Willendorf Goddess figurine
5. an unknown artefact
6. artefact
7. clay fertility sculpture
8. der Venus I
9. der Venus von Willendorf
10. discovery at Willendorf
11. Figurchen
12. figure from Willendorf
13. Frau Willendorf
14. it
15. Itsel
16. Little Willendorf
17. Ms Willendorf
18. one of the so-called Venus figurines
19. She
20. Small stone image from Willendorf
21. statuette
22. the (Arte)Fact
23. the (Arte)Fact itself
24. the 'Venus of Willendorf'
25. the 'Venus of Willendorf'
26. The 'Venus' of Willendorf
27. the amusingly recognizable fat figure of Willendorf
28. the artefact
29. the artefact itself
30. the famous artefact
31. the famous Austrian 'Venus of Willendorf'
32. The famous Venus of Willendorf
33. the fertility goddess Venus of Willendorf
34. the intended artefact
35. the limestone Willendorf figurine
36. the misshapen Venus
37. the object
38. the off [sic]-illustrated Venus of Willendorf
39. the so-called 'Venus of Willendorf'
40. the so-called Venus of Willendorf
41. the spherical Venus of Willendorf
42. the stone Willendorf Venus
43. the tight circular ringlets at Willendorf
44. the ubiquitous Venus of Willendorf
45. the Venus
46. the Venus figurine
47. the Venus of Willendorf
48. the Venus of Willendorf
49. the very artefact
50. the very same artefact
51. the well-known piece from Willendorf
52. the Willendorf (Arte)Fact
53. the Willendorf I figure
54. the Willendorf artefact
55. the Willendorf figurine
56. the Willendorf figurines
57. the Willendorf Venus
58. this artefact
59. this famous object
60. This single artefact
61. this Willendorf (Arte)Fact
62. this Willendorf artefact
63. Venus
64. 'Venus of Willendorf'
65. Venus of Willendorf
66. Venus-of-Willendorf
67. Vollig gut erhaltenes Steinfigurchen
68. Willendorf
69. Willendorf
70. Willendorf no 1
71. Willendorf, Venus I
72. Willendorf-artefact

These verbal signifiers occupy a wide range of grammatical roles. These roles include, for example, the positions of adjective, noun, and pronoun. Some are merely adjective or adverb components, such as the adjective-component Willendorf in the signifier Willendorf-inspired images. This type of construction also appears in other data texts, for example the adjective-component in the clause the numerous "Venus of Willendorf"-style figurines (Shales, Hatchwell & Bell 2001: 90) or the clause the Kostenki-Willendorf group (Sinclair 1996: http) and the adverb/verb-component in the phrase I will willendorf-waddle across the room (Roth, G. 1993: 108).

Some of the blue-flagged verbal signifiers from this study are components of website addresses, such as the signifier venus-willendorf. Some are entire extended phrases, such as the amusingly recognizable fat figure of the Venus of
Willendorf. This particular phrase includes the noun figure, its definite article the, its adjectives recognizable and fat with their adverb amusingly, and the noun figure's modifying clause of the Venus with its own identifying clause of Willendorf. Additionally, some of the flagged clauses include the reflexive signifier itself. This wide range of roles serves to strengthen my postlinguistic perspective in this research that language is a constructible and malleable resource. It serves to belie the yet pervasive Western hegemonic assumption that language is an innocent and transparent carrier beyond accountability or question (Weedon 1987).

A second strategy was a dialogue-bubble juxtaposition highlighting that the Willendorf data texts collectively evidence origin dates for this Willendorf artefact that vary by as much as 27½ thousand years. According to Aristotelian logic, if these signifiers were that which they signify, then it originated over 27½ thousand years ago. Perhaps this is the case. It depends upon how a student defines the word origin. The creation of new strategies, such as signifier-flagging and dialogue-bubble juxtaposition, has the advantage of seeing afresh and affords the opportunity to customise them to one's particular purpose. The creation of new strategies has the disadvantage, however, of taking much more textual time and space to introduce, explain, and justify them. In spite of this extra effort, these strategies may still not be easily read by the very students and readers one is hoping to benefit. There is the additional disadvantage in the case of dialogue bubbles in a serious doctoral thesis that they may undermine its credibility by looking like they belong in a comic book rather than in a thesis manuscript.

A third strategy involved working to appropriate an existing hegemonic, academic strategy. This strategy elects single images and constructs chapter sections that illustrate patterns which can be recognised in the data. Chapter five utilised this strategy to highlight discursive occurrences not evident with the artefact itself. According to the rules of language and logic (Kalamazoo College 1975: 92), if these signifiers were that which they signify, then the artefact itself shows Barbie, planet earth, and rainbows. Perhaps this is the case. It depends upon how a student defines the word shows. Similarly in
chapter six, single images were selected and chapter sections were constructed to highlight discursive influences and agenda motivators that formed patterns in the data. According to Aristotelian logic, if the signifiers chosen by the various discourses were that which they signify, then all of the signifiers would be the same. Perhaps they are. It depends upon how a student defines the word *same*. Appropriation of existing strategies has the advantage of an ease of clarity and comprehensibility in that they are what students and readers have learned to expect. Appropriation of existing strategies has the disadvantage, where emancipatory concerns are involved, of re-inscribing the very assumptions and norms that one may not wish to actively support.

By means of these analyses, this investigation supports the poststructuralist-theory perspective (Weedon 1987) that a signifier is not significant in the way current Western hegemony traditionally implies. A signifier, Willendorf or otherwise, is significant in that its existence and performance have the potential to produce effects. It is not significant, however, as the signified itself. Rather, like our efforts to encapsulate it, the signified remains at large. Instead of a scenario where students must continually succumb to a static world, postlinguistics offers a world where students must continually recharge their efforts, as well as that which they signify, with what power they have at their discretion.

As with all things from a poststructural perspective, there are both advantages and disadvantages to a student's changing her or his point of centre from a static world to a scenario where self-observation affects that very scenario. One of the advantages is reclaiming a student's power from working to build perhaps someone else's idea of the world, to working to build her or his own idea of the world. One of the disadvantages, of course, is that a student may well not know her or his own idea of the world. As a researcher in the investigation, I learned that though my postlinguistic perspective of education does not tell a student the answer to this, it does offer options. Another disadvantage of changing from a static worldview to a poststructuralist perspective has to do with detrimentally competing and conflicting ideas of the world. A further disadvantage of changing from traditional to postlinguistic
perspectives, of course, has to do with competing and conflicting ideas of what is detrimental. I learned through the research that although my postlinguistic perspective of education does not tell a student the answer to these competing and conflicting ideas, it does encourage seeking ways to explore them.

As discussed in chapter one, the point of investigation for this research has been not only to explore perspectives concerning the Willendorf artefact, but also to explore ways of knowing. There were five emancipative-praxis strategies devised in the course of this study for readers and students that were not possible to put into my textual practice here. They include a single-page table of contents, double-sided pages, a set of verbal-analysis illustrations in chapter five, Willendorf-image-laden chapter cover pages, and the inclusion of an afterword. It is not that these were impossible to put into textual practice, but that overall they were counterproductive.

One of the ways of knowing, that I was able to put into my textual practice here, involved the juxtapositions of chapter four which worked to reassess exclusively straightforward notions of reading and writing. These juxtapositions worked to explore influences and effects evident at reading and writing sites. One of the types of recognitions yielded by this exploration was, for example, that the presence of words such as *only* has a tremendous effect on the ability of a textual site to position a reader or student. The juxtapositions of both chapter four and chapter eight also yielded other types of recognitions concerning discursive power. One of these types of recognitions was the vulnerability of the singular-truth-assumption texts in multiplicity. Chapter four yielded this recognition by contrasting single statements with disparate multiple statements on the very same type of Willendorf statistic. Chapter eight yielded this recognition by contrasting two editions of the same art history publication (de la Croix & Tansey 1975: 22-23, de la Croix et al 1991: 26).
One of the ways of understanding explored in the thesis involved the cluster patterns of chapter five, which worked to highlight the subjectivity evident at textual sites. This postlinguistic exploration yielded the finding that words such as *discovery* and *originally* point directly to the subjectivity of Western hegemonic culture, because they have directly to do, not with Willendorf's civilisation, but with Western hegemony's. Ways of understanding explored by this thesis further included use of the virgule and parentheses in chapters five and eight and in thesis headings throughout the document, which worked to problematise the binary thinking evident in English language formation. Recognitions regarding binary thought also included that textual sites, which construct texts confining students to binary options, disadvantage those students. Ways of understanding explored by the investigation included not only the traditional scientific analysis of isolating selected data, but also the ongoing processes of learning, within the investigation itself.

Chapter six explored the discursive patterns identified in the Willendorf data. These identifications worked to highlight processes of becoming, difference and reflexivity in the identity formation evident at textual sites. One of the ways that exploring these identifications highlighted the process of becoming, was in citing sources indicating that the English language did not always have words such as *herstory, feminism,* and *scientific* at its disposal. Exploring these identifications highlighted difference over reference, for example, by showing how the thesis's discourse categories, such as its New-Age category, both are and are not the case. The chapter highlighted reflexivity, for example, by recognising the part older discourses play in providing traditional learning platforms and linguistic building blocks for newer discourses.

Chapter seven explored the agenda motivations identified in the Willendorf data. These identifications highlighted processes of desire and agency evident at these textual sites. One of the ways that exploring these identifications highlighted the process of desire was in recognising a colour discrimination issue exhibited by some of the data texts. This recognition highlighted desire in both the construction of text and in construction of the body. This exploration of identifications yielded findings regarding the process of agency, such as the
recognition that the motivations a student knows best are her or his own. Because not all motivations are appropriate to overt expression, personal research experience by a student is all the more valuable. As the researcher in this investigation, I learned that because not all motivations can be overt under current political pressures, students can only read them through their own experience, or reflexive praxis. By means of this research, I reconstituted my perspective that these motivations are not available for reading via traditional text.

The ways of knowing explored in this thesis culminated in the multiple-text representations of Willendorf data in chapter eight. This chapter worked to problematise bids by textual sites for essentialism and authority. This exploration yielded the experience in this research project, that there is extremely limited space in which to push the boundaries of essentialism and authority under the present overriding Western hegemonic linguistic assumption of single truth. Chapter eight also worked to highlight the reflexivity and simulacra evident in textual representations. This yielded the experience, within this investigation at least, that reflexivity is prevalent and that simulacra are pervasive. Whether or not they are prevalent and pervasive for educationalists depends upon whether or not educationalists choose to inhabit these phenomena.

_Education & the (View)Point(s) of Knowledge (about this (Arte)Fact)_

In this reflexive investigation I learned that the very means that are linguistic are also the very means that are postlinguistic. I learned that it is not the analysis that changes so much as the assumptions behind doing that analysis. In this way the argument for not making a case and for not telling students what they think becomes not argument, but openness to new assumptions and new ways of learning encouraged by our actions as educators.

As reiterated in the introduction to this chapter, the point of knowledge for the purposes of this research has been, not merely to gather, store, reframe,
colonise, and dispense knowledge about this Willendorf artefact, but importantly to educate in terms of additional ways of interacting with knowledge. In this thesis, these additional ways included interacting with knowledge, not merely as a thing one can possess, but also as a process, a journey, and an exploration (O’Riley 2003). These additional ways include assumptions about knowledge that are multiple, and dependent not upon enforced single truth, but upon a student’s perspective or position in the open-ended cycle of learning. Analysing and recognising ways of knowing, in themselves, are important steps in this process.

This thesis worked to open the way for thinking about new ways of knowing by destabilising current assumptions about the ability of statements to be true and accurate. The thesis worked to destabilise such current assumptions by offering juxtapositions in the signifier illustrations of chapter four, for example. Clearly not all of these signifiers are true and accurate according to current assumptions of single truth. Therefore the question arises whether or not educators are correct in assuming that any of these signifiers should be promoted as true, to the exclusion of the others. If educators are not correct in such thinking, the question then is whether or not educators should be proceeding to promote these single truth assumptions through their language. If they should not be promoting these assumptions through their language, then a further question arises as to whether or not educators should work to actively change their language in conjunction with their changing thinking. If indeed they should actively change their language, the question then becomes where they should start. The answer, in keeping with Foucault’s technologies of the self (1988c), is that they should start with themselves. For educationalists this means whatever educationalist work they are currently doing. At the moment, for example, my work includes doctoral research; in the past it has included art education. Fortunately or unfortunately there are no recipes for Foucauldian or postlinguistic work (Kendall & Wickham 1999: 30, Threadgold 2000: 40). Each educator, just as each student in their turn, must begin where they are in accordance with their own reflexive encounters and re-encounters with their practice (Lather 1994: 42).
Through handling and storing the Willendorf data, as the researcher in this investigation, I reconstituted my understanding that possessed knowledge is not dynamic knowledge. I reconstituted my understanding that inactive, static knowledge tends to be ignorant knowledge. I recognised this to be the case in that once I considered data and knowledge to be captured I tended to proceed to ignore it. In the case of handling the data and editing the thesis however, knowledge interaction never lost its vitality. Knowledge continued to develop and grow with every renewed textual engagement. This relates to my earlier comment about experience as a way of knowing, over (or at least in addition to) reading as a way of knowing.

The ways of knowing explored by this thesis contribute to enlarging education by exploring not only what the words of a doctoral thesis or its textual data are enabling and constraining, but also what their sentence structures are enabling and constraining. They contribute to enlarging education by exploring not only what the visuals of a doctoral thesis or its textual data are enabling and constraining, but also what their formats are enabling and constraining. These are formats such as the two-dimensionality of the traditional page, for instance, or the more recent embedded internet links of the World Wide Web. These expanded ways of knowing contribute to enlarging education by exploring not only what the arguments of a doctoral thesis or its textual data are enabling and constraining, but also what their strategies, such as citing the authorities of others, are enabling and constraining.

The ways of knowing explored by this thesis multiply education across traditional boundaries by bringing the conventional textual domains of the visual arts to a doctoral thesis. Conversely, these ways of knowing multiply education across traditional boundaries by working to bring the conventional textual domains of a doctoral thesis to the visual arts. They encourage education to examine its attachments and limits by provoking its basis, not only for its language, but also for its larger assumptions of thesis argument. This relates to research not only for education, but also as education.
From a reading-images perspective (Kress & van Leeuwen 1996), the varieties of Willendorf images in this study are an obvious reminder that perspectives are multiple. From my art-education perspective they serve as illustrations of different points of view concerning this Willendorf artefact. They serve as an analogy for varying perspectives. In showing obvious multiplicity through their variety, these graphics suggest the idea that students might also be able to create their own perspective, or choose one of the many already in use. The graphics serve as a tangible reminder that students might not only choose between particular existing perspectives, but also question those perspectives by juxtaposing them with alternative perspectives or new perspectives of their own. This is relevant to a summation of my postlinguistic points of view within the research, in that both these visual-arts and postlinguistic perspectives work to promote deconstruction, critical discourse analyses, and the acknowledgment of ongoing interactions.

Though students may know intellectually that their own interactive research experience is a richer way of understanding than reading the authority of others, practicing this recognition serves to reinvigorate education. This connects to the way in which learning relates not just to students' minds, but also to the materiality of other aspects of their lives. Expertise and authority remain an integral part of interactive postlinguistic research for me as a student and an educator, but they are only part of the story. As a student researcher in this investigation I learned that performing research potentially reinvigorates students, by the way in which it reinvigorated me as a student. I learned that this practice reinvigorates students by encouraging them to recognise the part they play in reconstituting their own subjectivity every time they speak, think, read or write. I further learned that this practice reinvigorates education by encouraging students to recognise the part they play in reconstituting, not only their own subjectivity, but also the subjectivity of education.

The Role of Power in Education

As noted in chapter one, one of this thesis's interventions for educationalist practice is the opportunity of students and learning facilitators to participate
intelligently and meaningfully in power/knowledge constructions. As an educational researcher I used traditional academic strategies in an effort to empower this present thesis. These strategies included citing experts in the emerging field of postlinguistics. The thesis also used the postlinguistically appropriate academic strategy of juxtaposition. These included juxtapositions of texts by time, by author, by country of publication, and by format type. They also included juxtaposition of the thesis own writing about its Willendorf data, with some of those very texts it was analysing.

As indicated earlier, the ways in which this text was successful in integrating its postlinguistic educationalist praxis were in the juxtapositions of chapter four, the clustering of chapter five, the discursive identities of chapter six, the agenda motivations of chapter seven, and the represented multiplicity of chapter eight. Some of the ways in which this text was denied its postlinguistic experimentations were in its double-sided pages, its chapter cover pages, its single-paged contents page, its inclusion of sources that are under credibility-fire themselves, and its inclusion of sources from epistemologies considered too far removed from the investigative territory of this thesis. Therefore, these less successful devices were abandoned.

With the research data, I thus reconstituted my understanding that an ideal role for power in education is the empowerment of perspectives for education that promote dynamic, present, personal and cultural forms of learning, rather than the conscious or inadvertent empowerment of perspectives that enforce authoritarian, exclusive, historical, and static forms of teaching. Working with the data supported this understanding in that my most valuable learning, as the researcher of the investigation, came not from the most reputable authority, but from my own self-driven curiosity. This curiosity sought what the demands, ideals, influences, and agencies active at the nexus of the thesis document would and could construct within the constraints, limits, pressures, and parameters of the study.
The implications of Willendorf Readings for Education

The fulfilment of student and educator potential for which I argued in this thesis relates to the trust, supervision, guidance, and support of students (by educators) in not only knowing themselves according to the Delphic maxim *know thyself* prioritised by Western culture, but also caring for themselves in the old-Greek and Foucauldian sense (Foucault 1986b, Olssen 2006: 34). In this Foucauldian perspective, one's sense of self includes one's place within historically specific discursive relations and social practices. My position in this thesis in regard to these relations and practices thereby involved utilising Foucauldian theory (Weedon 1987: 22), critique (Marshall 1996), and methods (Kendall & Wickham 1999). My position was informed by Foucault's considerations of technologies of the self (1988c), care of the self (1986b), and individual ethics where 'one turns one's life into something that others can respect and admire' (Dreyfus 1997).

Such fulfilment of potential was seen as important for education to support in this particular way because its open-endedness offers far-reaching options for learning and intellectual growth. By means of deconstructive critical-literacy praxis, Derrida's *differance* thereby applied not only to signifiers in language (Weedon 1987: 25), but also to individuals in society. That is to say that from a poststructuralist perspective, individuals are not who they are in isolation: unique, fixed, and coherent (Weedon 1987: 32), but rather their subjectivities and identities can only be defined through a constant process of juxtaposition with other individuals (Weedon 1987: 33). Thereby any approach to education was seen to be a (complex and multiple, Gore 1993: 61) sociocultural one. In these senses of the discursive subjectivity and consciousness of self (Weedon 1987: 106) and the relativity of perspectives in social contexts, I argued in this thesis (by means of my learned and required singular perspective) that just as there is no other approach to literacy than a sociocultural one (Gee 1997: xvi), there is no other education than that of knowing who we (individuals in society) are in relation to each other. Rather than telling others who they are, and even rather than telling ourselves who we are, my position as an educationalist researcher in this thesis has been that we would learn much.
more, and the quality of that learning would be much richer, if we inquired. For me communicating knowledge of who we are in relation to each other (not just in terms of power, but also in terms of ideas, beliefs, experiences, and perspectives), together with an open-endedness in that knowledge, enable the very possibility of education as 'human learning in its full range' (Bereiter & Scardamalia 1998: 487).

Having explored literature concerning the famous archaeological artefact from Willendorf, I believe that the implications for reinvigorating education through postlinguistic praxis forums are immense. One of the most important things I learned from this investigation was the literal re-enforcement that occurs reflexively when another's work is referenced, or indeed when one's own work is referenced. While this insight may seem intuitively obvious, seeing it in action upon counting Willendorf name-signifier occurrences in chapter eight was most enlightening. For education this implies having a more conscious hand in what we as educators construct via our linguistic actions. In this investigation I thus re-cognised reflexivity as a powerful and intensifying force in social constructions. In terms of simulacra this is therefore a crucial component in understanding the construction of social assumptions via the construction of text. In other words, we are contributing to the very worlds in which we must study, by the linguistic decisions we as educators and students make.

It is not for students, learning facilitators, and educationalists to decide what education should be. It is not for students, learning facilitators and educationalists to decide what education will be. It is not even for students, learning facilitators and educationalists to decide what education is able to be. According to the perspectives of postlinguistics, the effects of interaction with these educationalist issues are unpredictable. It is the place of students, learning facilitators, and educationalists, however, to decide the directions in which to move their own individual options, their own accesses to communication, and their own accesses to power. Like the wish recipient who reflexively used the first of his three granted wishes to wish for more wishes, they may decide to use what power they have to empower themselves with
more power. They may likewise decide to use their access to communication to extend current limits of communication. They may thus use what options they have to opt for more options.

Because postlinguistically the influences of power are inescapable, for here, for now, for readers of the thesis, for potential readers of the thesis, for students of the thesis, and for me as a student of the thesis, I recognise that power empowers. I also recognise that educational forums often use power reflexively to increase their power to dictate ownership. While some power must necessarily be reserved for preserving power, educational sites might use their discretionary power, not to increase nor to dictate power, but consciously and carefully to explore, to offer, and to augment ever-further, ever-reconstituted learning opportunities.

Closing (View) Points Summary

Willendorf Readings: Post/Linguistic Praxis for Education has worked to address determinative issues in education, with a view to greater understanding and emancipatory intervention of potentially discriminatory linguistic practices in educational forums. In the course of taking up challenges of praxis posed by leaders in the field of feminist poststructuralism, this research came to a place where it reflexively made a case for not having to make a case. As the researcher in this investigation, I found that there were indeed potentially discriminatory linguistic practices within its Willendorf data texts. This included chapter eight of the thesis as a data text. The politics of the thesis, however, precluded its ultimate break with its own foundation of authority. The more exploratory micro-textualities and layouts that were developed for the thesis worked to show the construction of text, but also potentially jeopardised the thesis’ clarity, comprehensibility, and readability. These potentially undermined the ability of the thesis to convince as the political doctoral document that it is. Its authoritative/explorative schizophrenia, and thereby its schizophrenic praxis, remains unresolved.
This is the research's unseen reef in the postlinguistic sea of reflexive praxis, which was there from the inception of the study nine years ago (Rosendahl 1998c: 25-26) and continues to reappear in additional guises, no matter where one tries to start or where one tries to finish. The hypocrisy and lip service involved in such a stance (eg of making a case for not making a case) permeate the educationalist assumptions and actions of this thesis at every turn. These contradictory concerns entail widening the purview of education in terms of what it is that constitutes valid study, valid presentation, and valid representation. These concerns are vital to education in that students and educators may be unaware of the implications of their actions through the language involved in these educational activities. This awareness is of particular importance to educationalist forums because, technically, educationalist forums are where we as students formally learn to learn.

Part of my initial intention in mobilising postlinguistic praxis by means of the thesis was to promote a critical literacy allowing multiple perspectives, empowerment, and choice of discourse within educationalist forums. Reflexively, as an educationalist researcher, I learned about the inherent cross purposes involved in transforming my educationalist values into lived textual practice. This oddly entailed not only the traditional interrogating in order for the ability to tell, but also telling in order for the ability to question.

In exploring the contradictions and paradoxes between authority and investigation from the perspective of current Western hegemony, I experienced the dangers of moving too fast in a new direction. From a perspective-oriented praxis, according to my interpretation of praxis, this thesis has yet to be a do-as-I-do praxis. That is, it has yet to move from a foundation of authority as a basis of teaching, to a value of open questioning as an integrated praxis of learning.

The possibilities of exploration await communication.
...the job will be a long one. All the longer, no doubt, as it is in the nature of power—particularly the kind of power that operates in our society—to be repressive, and to be especially careful in repressing useless energies, the intensity of pleasures, and irregular modes of behaviour. We must not be surprised, then, if the effects of liberation vis-à-vis this repressive power are so slow to manifest themselves...

(Foucault 1978/1990:9)
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Willendorf Images in MS Windows

These images are titled by year of publication, author, year letter if more than one, page numbers, assigned discourse, assigned agenda, image number if more than one, and that it is an excerpt if applicable.

A key to discourse and agenda abbreviations appears in appendix G.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Discourse</th>
<th>Agenda</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>Burkitt</td>
<td>1933 Sci Ac</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Maringer</td>
<td>1960 Sci Ac</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>Ross p.35</td>
<td>1961 Lib Pop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Janson+ p.5</td>
<td>1968 Lib Pop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Prehistoric Man p.666</td>
<td>1971 Lib Pop</td>
<td>excerpt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Prideaux p.98</td>
<td>1973 Sci Ac</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>de la Croix+ p.24</td>
<td>1975 Lib Ac</td>
<td>excerpt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>de la Croix+ p.25</td>
<td>1975 Lib Ac</td>
<td>excerpt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>de la Croix+ p.34</td>
<td>1975 Lib Ac</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>Stone ill.1</td>
<td>1978 Fem Em</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Auel p.x</td>
<td>1983 New Ac</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Farrar+ p.7</td>
<td>1987 Sci Ac</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Gadon inside front cover Fem Pop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Gadon inside back cover Fem Pop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Gadon p.6</td>
<td>1989 Fem Pop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Gadon pl.31</td>
<td>1989 Fem Pop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Page/Section</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Gadon</td>
<td>1989 Gadon pl.32 Femp Pop</td>
<td>pl.32 Femp Pop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>Austen</td>
<td>1990 Austen p.5 Femp Pop</td>
<td>p.5 Femp Pop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Baring+</td>
<td>1991 Baring+ p.10 Lib Pop 1</td>
<td>p.10 Lib Pop 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>de la Croix+</td>
<td>1991 de la Croix+ p.26 Lib Ac 1 excerpt</td>
<td>p.26 Lib Ac 1 excerpt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>de la Croix+</td>
<td>1991 de la Croix+ p.36 Lib Ac</td>
<td>p.36 Lib Ac</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Strickland</td>
<td>1993 Strickland p.4 Lib Pop</td>
<td>p.4 Lib Pop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Conser+</td>
<td>1993 Conser+ p.97 Fem Em</td>
<td>p.97 Fem Em</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Lord</td>
<td>1994 Lord p.77 Lib Pop</td>
<td>p.77 Lib Pop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Amido</td>
<td>1995 Amido postcard Lib Pro</td>
<td>postcard Lib Pro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Honour+</td>
<td>1995 Honour+ p.5 Lib Ac</td>
<td>p.5 Lib Ac</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Marshack</td>
<td>1995 Marshack http Sci Ac 1</td>
<td>http Sci Ac 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Willendorf Data Text Lists**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Taylor</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Lib Pop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Brennan</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Lib Pop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Christ</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Fem Pop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Kollman</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sci Ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Kollman</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Sci Ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Natur</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>Lib Com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Pond</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>Lib Em excerpt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Reichstein</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>New Pop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Smart</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Lib Pop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Stadler</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Sci Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Stadler</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Sci Pro 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Tringham</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Sci Pop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Wann</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>New Em</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Wann</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>New Em</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Wann</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>New Em</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Wann</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>New Em</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Wann</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>New Em</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Wann</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>New Em</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Wann</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>New Em</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Wann</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>New Em</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Wann</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>New Em</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Wann</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>New Em</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Arizona Daily</td>
<td></td>
<td>http Lib Pop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Blessed Bee</td>
<td></td>
<td>http New Com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999 Broom Closet</td>
<td>1999 Broom Closet</td>
<td>1999 Che Designs</td>
<td>1999 Clair p1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Com 1</td>
<td>http</td>
<td>http New Com</td>
<td>Lib Pop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1999 God+</th>
<th>1999 Goddess</th>
<th>1999 Great Mother</th>
<th>1999 Hawkdancing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>http Fem Pop</td>
<td>http New Com</td>
<td>http New Pop</td>
<td>http New Com 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1999 Hawkdancing</th>
<th>1999 Hawkdancing</th>
<th>1999 Hoving p.27</th>
<th>1999 Jai Bhagavan+ a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>http New Com 2</td>
<td>http New Com 3</td>
<td>Lib Pop</td>
<td>http New Com</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1999 Jai Bhagavan+ b</th>
<th>1999 Jai Bhagavan+ b</th>
<th>1999 Jai Bhagavan+ b</th>
<th>1999 Jai Bhagavan+ b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>http New Com 1 excerpt</td>
<td>http New Com 2</td>
<td>http New Com 3</td>
<td>http New Com 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lib Com</td>
<td>Lib Pro</td>
<td>Lib Pop</td>
<td>http New Com</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>http New Com</td>
<td>p.60 Post Cre 2</td>
<td>p.60 Post Cre 2</td>
<td>p.60 Post Cre 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>URL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Mother's House</td>
<td><a href="http://New">http://New</a> Pop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Museum Shop</td>
<td><a href="http://Lib">http://Lib</a> Com</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Museum Shop</td>
<td>replica <a href="http://Lib">http://Lib</a> Pro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Peterson, L</td>
<td><a href="http://New">http://New</a> Ac</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Quantum Alchemy</td>
<td><a href="http://New">http://New</a> Com excerpt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Rainbow Crystal</td>
<td><a href="http://New">http://New</a> Com 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Rainbow Crystal</td>
<td><a href="http://New">http://New</a> Com 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Roberts p.45</td>
<td>Lib Pop excerpt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Smyth</td>
<td><a href="http://New">http://New</a> Com 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Smyth</td>
<td><a href="http://New">http://New</a> Com 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Snake &amp; Snake Envy</td>
<td><a href="http://New">http://New</a> Com</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Statuary</td>
<td><a href="http://New">http://New</a> Com</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Talaria</td>
<td><a href="http://Lib">http://Lib</a> Com</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>University of N+</td>
<td><a href="http://Lib">http://Lib</a> Pop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Uzgalis a</td>
<td><a href="http://Sci">http://Sci</a> Pop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Uzgalis b</td>
<td><a href="http://Sci">http://Sci</a> Pop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Wann</td>
<td><a href="http://New">http://New</a> Em 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Wann</td>
<td><a href="http://New">http://New</a> Em 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Wilcombe</td>
<td><a href="http://Lib">http://Lib</a> Ac 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Wilcombe</td>
<td><a href="http://Lib">http://Lib</a> Ac 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Wilcombe</td>
<td><a href="http://Lib">http://Lib</a> Ac 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Wilcombe</td>
<td><a href="http://Lib">http://Lib</a> Ac 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Wilcombe</td>
<td><a href="http://Lib">http://Lib</a> Ac 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1999 Witcombe http Lib Ac 6
1999 Witcombe http Lib Ac 7
1999 Zell, MG a http New Com
1999 Zell, MG b p.1 New Com

2000 AEIOU+ http Sci Pop
2000 Chandler p.145 Lib Pop
2000 Chang http Sci Pop 1
2000 Chang http Sci Pop 2

2000 Chang http Sci Pop 3 excerpt
2000 Cheyne http Sci Pop
2000 Craig videotape excerpt Sci Pop
2000 Delson+ p.521 Sci Pop

2000 Grey http Lib Cre
2000 Koeller http Sci Pop
2000 O'Connell front cover Lib Pro
2000 O'Connell p.1 Lib Pro

2000 O'Connell p.3 Lib Pro
2000 Rudgley pl.xxi Lib Pop
2000 Steves+ p.3 Lib Pro
2000 Venus http Lib Pop

2000 Welie p.4 New Com
2000 Willendorf+ http New Em 1
2000 willendorf+ http New Em 2
2000 World's Oldest http Sci Ac
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Encolom+</td>
<td>http Lib Ac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Fugitive Colors</td>
<td>http Lib Pro 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Fugitive Colors</td>
<td>http Lib Pro 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Fugitive Colors</td>
<td>http Lib Pro 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Fugitive Colors</td>
<td>http Lib Pro 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Fugitive Colors</td>
<td>http Lib Pro 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Fugitive Colors</td>
<td>http Lib Pro 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Husain</td>
<td>p.120 Lib Pop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>klik-klok</td>
<td>http Lib Com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Ladle</td>
<td>p.204 Lib Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Marewindrider</td>
<td>http Fem Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>McElvaine</td>
<td>p.136 Lib Pop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Melanie</td>
<td>http Fem Com 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Melanie</td>
<td>http Fem Com 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Melanie</td>
<td>http Fem Com 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Melanie</td>
<td>http Fem Com 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Natur+</td>
<td>p.9 Sci Pro excerpt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Ofek</td>
<td>p.188 Lib Pop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Piel</td>
<td>p.401 Lib Pop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Whitehorn</td>
<td>http Fem Pro 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Whitehorn</td>
<td>http Fem Pro 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Wosk</td>
<td>p.232 Fem Pop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Pieler</td>
<td>p.401 Lib Pop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Curtis DVD</td>
<td>Lib Em 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Curtis DVD</td>
<td>Lib Em 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image 1" /></td>
<td>2002 Curtis DVD Lib Em 3</td>
<td>2002 Gale+ inside front cover Lib Pro excerpt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image 2" /></td>
<td>2002 Gole+ p.21 Lib Pro</td>
<td>2002 Molyneaux p.17 Lib Pop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image 3" /></td>
<td>2002 Nieder+D+ a p.9 Lib Pro</td>
<td>2002 Nieder+D+ b p.9 Lib Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image 4" /></td>
<td>2002 Pomaska p.2 Lib Com 1</td>
<td>2002 Pomaska p.2 Lib Com 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Image 5" /></td>
<td>2002 Schechner p.190 Lib Pop</td>
<td>2003 Abaxis http New Com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Image 6" /></td>
<td>2003 AEIOU+ http Sci Pop 1</td>
<td>2003 AEIOU+ http Sci Pop video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="Image 7" /></td>
<td>2003 Broom Closet http New Com 1</td>
<td>2003 Broom Closet http New Com 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image8.png" alt="Image 8" /></td>
<td>2003 Curtis http Lib Em 1</td>
<td>2003 Curtis http Lib Em 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image9.png" alt="Image 9" /></td>
<td>2003 Curtis http Lib Em 3</td>
<td>2003 Curtis http Lib Em 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image10.png" alt="Image 10" /></td>
<td>2003 Curtis http Lib Em 5</td>
<td>2003 Curtis http Lib Em 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image11.png" alt="Image 11" /></td>
<td>2003 Curtis http Lib Em 7</td>
<td>2003 Curtis http Lib Em 8 excerpt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image12.png" alt="Image 12" /></td>
<td>2003 Curtis http Lib Em 9 excerpt</td>
<td>2003 Curtis http Lib Em 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2003 Curtis http Lib Em 11 excerpt
2003 Curtis http Lib Em 12 excerpt
2003 Curtis http Lib Em 13 excerpt
2003 Curtis http Lib Em 14 excerpt

2003 Curtis http Lib Em 15 excerpt
2003 Diane http Lib Pro
2003 Diva's Designs http New Com 1

2003 Diva's Designs http New Com 2
2003 Diva's Designs http New Com 3
2003 Fugitive Colors http Lib Pro
2003 Hitchcock http Lib Pop 1

2003 Hitchcock http Lib Pop 2
2003 Hitchcock http Lib Pop 3
2003 Hitchcock http Lib Pop 4
2003 Hitchcock http Lib Pop 5

2003 Hitchcock http Lib Pop 6
2003 Hitchcock http Lib Pop 7
2003 Hitchcock http Lib Pop 8
2003 Hitchcock http Lib Pop 9

2003 Hume p.18 Lib Ac excerpt
2003 Husain p.120 Lib Pop
2003 Kellermeier http New Ac
2003 Korean+ http Lib Pop

2003 Land+ http Lib Pop 1
2003 Land+ http Lib Pop 2 excerpt
2003 Lipp p.153 New Pop
2003 Medieval Mayhem http New Com 1
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>http New Com 2</td>
<td>http Fem Com 1</td>
<td>http Fem Com 2</td>
<td>http Fem Com 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>http Fem Com 4</td>
<td>http Fem Com 5</td>
<td>http Fem Com 6</td>
<td>http Fem Com 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>http Fem Com 8</td>
<td>http Fem Com 9</td>
<td>http Fem Em</td>
<td>http Lib Com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>http Lib Pro 1 excerpt</td>
<td>http Lib Pro 2</td>
<td>http Lib Pro excerpt</td>
<td>http Lib Pro excerpt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poster Lib Pro</td>
<td>T-shirt Lib Pro</td>
<td>http Fem Corn</td>
<td>p.131 Lib Pop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>http New Com</td>
<td>http New Com 1</td>
<td>http New Com 2</td>
<td>http Lib Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendices

**Willendorf Data Text Lists**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2004 catrepreneur http Lib Com 1</th>
<th>2004 catrepreneur http Lib Com 2</th>
<th>2004 catrepreneur http Lib Com 3</th>
<th>2004 catrepreneur http Lib Com 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004 Fowle http Lib Pro</td>
<td>2004 Lynx UK http Lib Com 1</td>
<td>2004 Lynx UK http Lib Com 2</td>
<td>2004 Lynx UK http Lib Com 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 Lynx UK http Lib Com 4</td>
<td>2004 Lynx UK http Lib Com 5</td>
<td>2004 Lynx UK http Lib Com 6</td>
<td>2004 McClintock http Lib Cre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 Restaurant+ a menu Lib Com</td>
<td>2004 Restaurant+ b building Lib Com</td>
<td>2004 Sones http Lib Em</td>
<td>2004 Stamp Act http Lib Com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004 Verschöner+ a key ring Lib Pro</td>
<td>2004 Verschöner+ b statue Lib Pro</td>
<td>2004 Verschöner+ c sign Lib Pro</td>
<td>2004 Verschöner+ d sign Lib Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Wabi Sabi</td>
<td>New Cre 1 excerpt</td>
<td>Lib Ac 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Wabi Sabi</td>
<td>New Cre 2 excerpt</td>
<td>Lib Ac 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Satzl</td>
<td>http Lib Com 3</td>
<td>New Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Satzl</td>
<td>http Lib Pop 1</td>
<td>New Com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Verschöner+</td>
<td>sign Lib Pro</td>
<td>New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>witchshop</td>
<td>http New Com 2</td>
<td>Lib Pro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>witchshop</td>
<td>http Lib Pro</td>
<td>New Com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>witchshop</td>
<td>http Lib Pro</td>
<td>New Com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>witchshop</td>
<td>http Lib Pro</td>
<td>New Com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>witchshop</td>
<td>http Lib Pro</td>
<td>New Com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>witchshop</td>
<td>http Lib Pro</td>
<td>New Com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>witchshop</td>
<td>http Lib Pro</td>
<td>New Com</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005 Witcombe</td>
<td>2005 AEIOU+</td>
<td>2006 Amazon+</td>
<td>2006 Amazon+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib Ac 7</td>
<td>Sci Pop</td>
<td>Lib Com 1</td>
<td>Lib Com 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 Amazon+</td>
<td>2006 Amazon+</td>
<td>2006 Amazon+</td>
<td>2006 Amazon+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib Com 3</td>
<td>Lib Com 4</td>
<td>Lib Com 5</td>
<td>Lib Com 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 Arizona Triad</td>
<td>2006 Bahn</td>
<td>2006 Henes</td>
<td>2006 Henes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>http Lib Pop</td>
<td>http Lib Pop</td>
<td>http New Com 1 excerpt</td>
<td>http New Com 2 excerpt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 Henes</td>
<td>2006 Henes</td>
<td>2006 Henes</td>
<td>2006 Henes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>http New Com 3 excerpt</td>
<td>http New Com 4 excerpt</td>
<td>http New Com 5 excerpt</td>
<td>http New Com 6 excerpt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 Henes</td>
<td>2006 Henes</td>
<td>2006 Henes</td>
<td>2006 Mandarava</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>http New Com 7 excerpt</td>
<td>http New Com 8 excerpt</td>
<td>http Fem Com</td>
<td>http New Com 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 Mandarava</td>
<td>2006 Mandarava</td>
<td>2006 Mandarava</td>
<td>2006 Nieder+M+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>http New Com 2</td>
<td>http New Com 3 excerpt</td>
<td>http New Com 4 excerpt</td>
<td>http Lib Pro excerpt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendixes</td>
<td>Willendorf Data Text Lists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.175 Post Ac 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.175 Post Ac 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.175 Post Ac 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.175 Post Ac 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.176 Post Ac 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.176 Post Ac 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.176 Post Ac 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image8.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.176 Post Ac 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image9.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.180 Post Ac 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image10.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.180 Post Ac 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image11.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.181 Post Ac 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image12.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.181 Post Ac 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image13.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.181 Post Ac 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image14.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.181 Post Ac 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image15.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.181 Post Ac 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image16.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.181 Post Ac 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image17.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.184 Post Ac 19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image18.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.185 Post Ac 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image19.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.185 Post Ac 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image20.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.186 Post Ac 22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image21.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.186 Post Ac 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image22.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.186 Post Ac 24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image23.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.186 Post Ac 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image24.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.186 Post Ac 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.187</td>
<td>Post Ac 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.187</td>
<td>Post Ac 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.187</td>
<td>Post Ac 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.188</td>
<td>Post Ac 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.188</td>
<td>Post Ac 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.189</td>
<td>Post Ac 32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.189</td>
<td>Post Ac 33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.189</td>
<td>Post Ac 34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.189</td>
<td>Post Ac 35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.189</td>
<td>Post Ac 36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.189</td>
<td>Post Ac 37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.189</td>
<td>Post Ac 38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.189</td>
<td>Post Ac 39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.190</td>
<td>Post Ac 40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.190</td>
<td>Post Ac 41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.190</td>
<td>Post Ac 42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.190</td>
<td>Post Ac 43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.190</td>
<td>Post Ac 44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.190</td>
<td>Post Ac 45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.190</td>
<td>Post Ac 46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.190</td>
<td>Post Ac 47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.190</td>
<td>Post Ac 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Rosendahl p.190</td>
<td>Post Ac 49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

Types of Willendorf Images, Products & Sources

References include occurrences in the data texts and citations of occurrences by the data texts.

- Bracelets (Henes 2006: http)
- Candle Holder (Quantum Alchemy 1999: http)
- CD Cover (Gass 1993)
- Chocolate (Jai Bhagavan 1999b: http, Sacred Source 2003: http)
- Creative Writing (Fisher 1995: http, Komunyakaa 2001: 17)
- Dress Ties (Naturhistorisches Museum 2003c: http)
- Drum (Sacred Source 2006: http)
- DVD Label (Curtis 2003: http)
- Earrings (Henes 2006: http, Sacred Source 2003: http)
- Earth Globes (Hawkdancing 1999: http)
- Floor Plans (Golebiowski et al 2002: inside front cover, Naturhistorisches Museum 2001: 9)
- Gemstones (Witchshop 2004: http)
- Internet Blogs (Big Fat Blog 2005: http, Wabi Sabi 2006a: http)
- Jewellery Pieces (Amazon.com 2006: http [image 1], Che Designs 1999: http, Fowle)
- Journal Notes (Szombathy 2003)
- Mascot (Fugitive Colors 2001: http, 2003: http)
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Meditation Kit (Mandarava 2006: http)
Menu (Restaurant Der Venus 2004a)
Necklaces (catrepreneur@hotmail 2004: http, Henes 2006: http)
Patterns (Curtis 2003: http, Wabi Sabi 2005: http)
Pendants (Amazon.com 2006: http [image 1]; Blessed Bee 1999: http;
catrepreneur@hotmail 2004: http, Jai Bhagavan 1999b: http, Lytha
Medieval Mayhem 2003: http; Sacred Source 2003: http; Zell, O.
1999a: http, 2003: http)
Poetry (Corser & Adler 1993: 97; Dove 2007: http; Komunyakaa 1998:
Rubber Stamps (Angelfire 2004: http, Cartwright 2004a: http, Stamp Act
2004: http)
Signs (Verschönerungs- und Museumsverein Willendorf 2004b, 2004c, 2004d,
2004e, 2004i, 2004j)
2003: http)
Stationery (Naturhistorisches Museum 1995)
Statues (Bradway 1997: plates 16, 23, 24; Broom Closet 1999: http, 2003:
klik-klok 2001: http; Niederösterreich – Das Weite Land 1996: 1; One
Free Spirit 2003: http)
Tattoo (Pomaska 2002: 4)
Television (Craig 2000)
The Human Body (Gadon 1989: pl. 32, Graham 1997: 267, McDermott,
Three-Dimensional Design (Hawkdancing 1999: http; Hua Liu 2006:
Timelines (de la Croix & Tansey 1975: 25; de la Croix et al 1991: 26;
Gadon 1989: inside front cover, inside back cover; Hume 2003: 18)
T-Shirts (MMII-BAS 2004, Naturhistorisches Museum 2003, Snake &
Snake 1999: http)
Two-Dimensional Design (Fugitive Colors 2001: http, 2003: http;
McGinness 1999: 60; Moon 2005: http)
Wand (Mandarava 2006: http)
Wall Posters (Amazon 2006: http [images 3-5], Naturhistorisches Museum
2003)
Website Logo (Curtis 2003: http)
Website Mastheads (Land Niederösterreich 2003: http, Niederösterreichische
http)
Window Decal (Rising Moon 2003: http)
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Appendix D
Willendorf Data-Text Tables
Table 1: Number of Texts by Assigned Discourse & Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse</th>
<th>Feminist</th>
<th>Liberal Humanist</th>
<th>New Age</th>
<th>Poststructuralist</th>
<th>Scientific</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emancipatory</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popularising</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotional</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are many ways in which these texts both do and do not fit the categories that they have been assigned here.
There are many ways in which these texts both do and do not fit the categories that they have been assigned here.

**Willendorf Discourses**
by Number of Texts

- Feminist: 96
- Liberal Humanist: 9
- New Age: 53
- Poststructuralist: 57
- Scientific: 275

**Willendorf Agendas**
by Number of Texts

- Academic: 161
- Commercial: 117
- Creative: 50
- Emancipatory: 61
- Popularising: 58
- Promotional: 43
Table 2: Number of Willendorf Images by Assigned Discourse & Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Creative</th>
<th>Emancipatory</th>
<th>Popularising</th>
<th>Promotional</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feminist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Humanist</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Age</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-structuralist</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>431</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Amount of Willendorf-Text Material Listed as Number of Characters, Including Spaces

The poststructuralist discourse, academic agenda category comprises only chapter eight of this very text, although reflexively it re-includes the other texts of the study represented there. In other words, taking reflexivity into account in this way means that these particular texts are counted twice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Creative</th>
<th>Emancipatory</th>
<th>Popularising</th>
<th>Promotional</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feminist</td>
<td>34,883</td>
<td>3,452</td>
<td>10,232</td>
<td>39,154</td>
<td>23,324</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>178,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Humanist</td>
<td>239,718</td>
<td>29,806</td>
<td>53,955</td>
<td>203,103</td>
<td>360,293</td>
<td>1,170,725</td>
<td>1,170,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Age</td>
<td>9,884</td>
<td>69,730</td>
<td>27,755</td>
<td>37,494</td>
<td>4,367</td>
<td>216,128</td>
<td>216,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-structuralist</td>
<td>63,248</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,177</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>11,254</td>
<td>86,384</td>
<td>86,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific</td>
<td>279,336</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5587</td>
<td>357,552</td>
<td>357,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>627,069</td>
<td>102,988</td>
<td>95119</td>
<td>280,188</td>
<td>404,825</td>
<td>2,008,931</td>
<td>2,008,931</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Year of Willendorf-Text Publication Listed by Earliest Publication Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discourse</th>
<th>Academic</th>
<th>Commercial</th>
<th>Creative</th>
<th>Emancipatory</th>
<th>Popularising</th>
<th>Promotional</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Appendix E

Willendorf Data Texts in NVivo 7

The data-text name includes the author, year of publication, page numbers, assigned discourse, assigned agenda, number of Willendorf images, and language if other than English. A Key to Discourse and Agenda Abbreviations Appears in Appendix G.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Created</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Abaxion 2003 http New Com 1</td>
<td>26 August 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Achterberg 1991 9+ New Pop 1</td>
<td>23 January 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Achterberg+ 1994 248-249 New Pop 0</td>
<td>23 January 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  Adovasio+ 2003 80 Lib Pop 0</td>
<td>23 January 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  AEIOU+ 2000 http Sci Pop 1 German</td>
<td>12 September 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  AEIOU+ 2003 http Sci Pop 2</td>
<td>20 August 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  AEIOU+ 2006 http Sci Pop 1</td>
<td>21 February 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  Airborne+ 2004 http Fem Pro 0</td>
<td>14 February 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  Alexander+ 1996 152 Lib Cre 0</td>
<td>23 January 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Altman 2000 57 Lib Pro 0</td>
<td>23 January 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Amazon+ 2001a http Lib Pro 0</td>
<td>12 September 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Amazon+ 2001b http Lib Pro 0</td>
<td>12 September 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Amazon+ 2001c http Lib Com 0</td>
<td>22 January 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Amazon+ 2003 http Lib Pro 0</td>
<td>16 October 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Amazon+ 2006 http New Com 6</td>
<td>16 February 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Amido 1995 postcard Lib Pop 1 German</td>
<td>1 April 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Andrews 2002 20 Lib Em 0</td>
<td>23 January 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Andrews 2003 135 Lib Cre 0</td>
<td>23 January 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Angelfire 2004 http New Em 1</td>
<td>18 February 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Aoum1el 2000 64 New Pop 0</td>
<td>23 January 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Ardinger 2000 14+ New Em 0</td>
<td>23 January 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Arizona Daily 1999 http Lib Pop 1</td>
<td>12 September 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Arizona Triad 2006 http Lib Pop 1</td>
<td>4 May 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Aroandade 2000 16 Lib Pop 0</td>
<td>7 February 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Art Begins 2003 http Lib Pro 0</td>
<td>14 February 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Ashton 1991 http Lib Pro 0</td>
<td>6 November 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Auel 1983 36+ Lib Cre 1</td>
<td>11 October 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Austen 1990 4+ Fem Pop 1</td>
<td>12 September 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Austrian Press 1999 http Sci Pop 0</td>
<td>12 September 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Bahn 1996 75 Sci Pop 0</td>
<td>23 January 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Bahn 1997 63 Sci Pop 1</td>
<td>12 October 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Bahn 1999 128 Sci Pop 0</td>
<td>23 January 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Bahn 2006 http Lib Pop 1</td>
<td>29 July 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Baker Kline 1998 5 Lib Pop 0</td>
<td>23 January 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Bandi 1994 187 Lib Pop 1</td>
<td>23 January 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Barasch 2000 232+ Lib Ac 0</td>
<td>23 January 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Baring+ 1991 10 Lib Pop 2</td>
<td>12 September 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Bayley 2001 http Lib Em 0</td>
<td>6 November 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Benard 2001 3 Lib Em 0</td>
<td>23 January 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Berg 1995 http Lib Em 0</td>
<td>11 November 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Big Fat Blog 2005 http Lib Em 0</td>
<td>1 April 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Blair 1993 http Fem Pop 0</td>
<td>6 November 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Blakemore+ 2002 385 Lib Pop 0</td>
<td>23 January 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 Blessed Bee 1999 http New Com 1</td>
<td>12 September 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 Booth 1994 143 Sci Pop 0</td>
<td>23 January 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 Bord+ 1982 17+ Lib Pop 1</td>
<td>12 September 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Bradway+ 1997 207+ Sci Ac 3</td>
<td>23 January 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 Breidlid+ 1996 121 Lib Pop 0</td>
<td>23 January 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Brennan 1998 75+ Lib Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Brezsy 2000 79+ New Em 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Brock 1999 http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Brookhiser 2001 http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Broom Closet 1999 http New Com 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Broom Closet 2003 http New Com 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Buckland 1991 221 New Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Buckland 2002 2+ New Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Budick 2002 http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Bumbaugh 1994 http New Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Burkitt 1933 162+ Sci Ac 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Burkitt 1963 167+ Sci Ac 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Burne 1998 http Sci Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Calbert 1999 http Fem Em 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Calder 1998 276 Lib Cre 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Campbell, J 1996 50+ Lib Ac 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Campbell, J 2002 116+ Lib Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Campbell, R 1998 http Sci Ac 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Carpenter 1994 320 Lib Cre 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Cartwright 2004 http New Com 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>catrepreneur+ 2004 http Lib Com 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Cauthorn 1991 E1 Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Chandler 2000 145 Lib Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Chang 2000 http Sci Pop 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Charters 1997 http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Che Designs 1999 http New Com 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>Cheyne 2000 http Sci Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77</td>
<td>Christ 1998 10+ Fem Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Christ 2000 229 Fem Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Cino 2000 http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Clair 1999 1 Lib Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Clark 2000 257 Lib Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Cochran 2002 http Lib Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Coggins 2003 http New Em 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Comini 1990 178 Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Conkey 1997 176+ Fem Em 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>Cook 1995 http Sci Ac 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Cooper 2001 http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Corinne 1994 http Lib Em 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Conne 1995 http Lib Em 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Cornog 1998 http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Corngan 1997 http Lib Em 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Corse+ 1993 97 Fem Em 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Coutts Shema 1991 http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Craig 2000 broadcast Sci Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Crick 2001 http Fem Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Cunningham 1993 152 New Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>Curot 1998 39 New Cre 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>Curtis 2002 DVD Post Pro 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>Curtis 2003 http Lib Em 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>Dale 1998 92 Fem Cre 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>de la Croix+ 1975 24+ Lib Ac 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>de la Croix+ 1991 26+ Lib Ac 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Deans Earle 1997 http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>Dedman 1997 235 New Cre 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>Dedman 2001 237 New Cre 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>DeGeer 2001 http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>Delson+ 2000 252+ Sci Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>Denton+ 2003 http Lib Cre 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>Diva's Designs 2003 http New Com 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>Dobson 1998 http Sci Ac 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>Dooling, R 1996 197 New Cre 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>Dooling, R 1998 258 New Cre 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>Dove 2007 http Lib Cre 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>Downing 1999 11 Fem Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>Dowson+ 2001 167 New Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>Duhard 1995 http Sci Ac 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>e-archetypes 2005 http New Com 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119</td>
<td>Edghill 1998 35 Lib Cre 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>Eisenbud 1996 3+ Sci Pop 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>Eisler 1988 1+ Fem Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122</td>
<td>Eisler 2000 96 Lib Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>123</td>
<td>Elsner 1997 http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>Elder 1996 350 Lib Ac 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>Elkins 1995 http Sci Ac 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126</td>
<td>Elkins 2002 64+ Post Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>127</td>
<td>Emory University 1999 http Lib Ac 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128</td>
<td>Encolom+ 2001 http Lib Pop 1 Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>Errington 1998 52 Lib Em 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130</td>
<td>Etcoff 2000 198 Lib Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>131</td>
<td>Ewing 1994 357 Lib Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132</td>
<td>Farrar+ 1987 7 New Ac 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133</td>
<td>Federal+ 1991a http Lib Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>Federal+ 1991b http Lib Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>Festa 2002 1057 Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>136</td>
<td>Fisher 1996 http New Cre 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>137</td>
<td>Fowle 2004 http Lib Pro 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>138</td>
<td>Fraser, ML 2002 http Fem Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>139</td>
<td>Fromm 1990 44 Lib Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140</td>
<td>Frueh 2000 87 Fem Em 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141</td>
<td>Frye 1994 105+ Lib Em 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>142</td>
<td>Fugitive Colors 2001 http Lib Pro 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Fugitive Colors 2003 http Lib Pro 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144</td>
<td>Galdon 1989 3+ Fem Pop 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>Gamble 1996 271 Lib Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>Gass 1993 1+ New Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>Gates 1995 http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>Gathercole 1994 85 Sci Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>Gay UK 2003 http Lib Em 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>Gehman 2001 http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>Geographica 2000 143 Sci Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>Gilchrist 1999 78 Fem Em 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>Gilman, D 1992 171 Lib Cre 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>Gilman, SL 2001 232+ Lib Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>Gimbutas 1991 37 Lib Ac 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>God was a BBW 1999 http Fem Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>157</td>
<td>Goddess House 1999 http New Com 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>158</td>
<td>Golebiowski+ 2002 21+ Lib Pro 2 Ger+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Goodman+ 2001 38 Lib Em 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Gotera 2003 http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Graham 1997 14+ Fem Pop 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>Granju 1999 17 Lib Em 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>Grant+ 2002 249 Sci Ac 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Gray 1999 http Lib Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>Great Mother 1999 http New Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>Greer Allen 1992 242+ Fem Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Grey 2000 http Lib Cre 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Title</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Hackett 1997 http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>Hackett 1999 http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Hager 1997 176+ Fem Em 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>171</td>
<td>Hamilton 2003 4 Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Hankwitz 1997 164 Fem Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Hawk dancing 1999 http New Com 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Hawkes 1993 23 Sci Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Henes 2006 http New Com 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>Henke 2000 109+ Fem Em 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Heudin 1999 243 Post Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>178</td>
<td>Higgins 2002 67 Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>179</td>
<td>Highfield 2003 http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180</td>
<td>Hildebrand 1999 92 Lib Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>181</td>
<td>Hitchcock 2003 http Lib Pop 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>182</td>
<td>Honan+ 2001 12 Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>183</td>
<td>Honour+ 1982 13+ Lib Ac 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>184</td>
<td>Honour+ 1995 5+ Lib Ac 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>185</td>
<td>Horn Book 2000 http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>186</td>
<td>Horn, L 2000 122 Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>187</td>
<td>Hourihan 1997 167 Fem Em 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>188</td>
<td>Hoving 1999 248+ Lib Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189</td>
<td>Hower 1993 http Lib Em 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>190</td>
<td>Hughes 1999 109 Lib Cre 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>191</td>
<td>Humc 2003 18 Lib Ac 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>192</td>
<td>Hunt 1996 http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>193</td>
<td>Husain 2001 11+ Lib Pop 1 German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>194</td>
<td>Husain 2003 11+ Lib Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195</td>
<td>Independent+ 2003 http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>Isaacs 2002 75 Fem Em 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>Isaak 1996 205 Fem Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>Jacobi 1978 347+ Sci Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Jai Bhagavant 1999a http New Com 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200</td>
<td>Jai Bhagavan 1999b http New Com 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201</td>
<td>Janson+ 1968 3+ Lib Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202</td>
<td>Jelinek 1995 http Sci Ac 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203</td>
<td>Johnson 2002 http Lib Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204</td>
<td>Jones, D 2002 548+ Lib Cre 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>Jones, EJ 2001 http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206</td>
<td>Joyceoando 2006 http Fem Com 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>Kalaidjian 1963 257 Post Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208</td>
<td>Kaplan 1996 http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Kellermeyer 2003 http New Ac 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210</td>
<td>Kerridge 2002 http Lib Cre 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211</td>
<td>Kinchloe+ 1998 178 Fem Em 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212</td>
<td>Kitzinger 1997 86 Lib Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>213</td>
<td>Klein 2001 21+ Lib Em 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214</td>
<td>klik-klok 2001 http Lib Com 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215</td>
<td>Knie 1999 http Lib Com 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>217</td>
<td>Kohen 1946 49+ Sci Ac 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>218</td>
<td>Kolinsky+ 1999 275 Lib Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>219</td>
<td>Kollman+ 1998a 16+ Sci Ac 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220</td>
<td>Kollman+ 1998b 16+ Sci Ac 1 German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221</td>
<td>Komunyaka 2001 17 Lib Ac 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>Konner 2003 391 Lib Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>223</td>
<td>Korean+ 2003 http Lib Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>Kramarae+ 2000 1357+ Fem Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225</td>
<td>Krethiel 2001 http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>226</td>
<td>Krysl 1996 http Lib Cre 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Authors/Producers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>227</td>
<td>Kube-McDowell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>Kubert 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>La Barre 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230</td>
<td>Ladie 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231</td>
<td>Lambert-Lagacé 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>232</td>
<td>Land+ 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>Lane 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>Lemonick 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>Lewis 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>Liebmann 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>Lipp 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>Loxos 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>López 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>Lord 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>Lord 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>Lowman 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>Lynx UK 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>Lytha Studios 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>Madsen 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246</td>
<td>Mandarava 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>247</td>
<td>MarBeth 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>248</td>
<td>Marewindrider 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>Maringer 1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250</td>
<td>Marshack 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251</td>
<td>Martin 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>252</td>
<td>McCarthy Brown 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253</td>
<td>McClintock 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>McDermott 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255</td>
<td>McDonald 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>McElvaene 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>McFarland 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258</td>
<td>McFarland 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>260</td>
<td>McLaughlin 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>McNar 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262</td>
<td>McPherson 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>263</td>
<td>Medieval Mayhem 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>264</td>
<td>Megaw+ 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>Meixner 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>266</td>
<td>Melanie 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>268</td>
<td>Mellars 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>269</td>
<td>Merchant 1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>270</td>
<td>Metzner 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271</td>
<td>Metzner 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>272</td>
<td>Michael 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>273</td>
<td>Michaels, A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>274</td>
<td>Michaels, A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275</td>
<td>Miller, L+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276</td>
<td>Miller, M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>277</td>
<td>Miller, S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>278</td>
<td>Mitchell, A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>MM-IBS 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>Molyneaux 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>281</td>
<td>Molyneaux 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>282</td>
<td>Monach 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>Monaghan 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>284</td>
<td>Montano 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>285</td>
<td>Moody 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>286</td>
<td>Moon 2005 http New Pro 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>287</td>
<td>Mothering 1998 http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>288</td>
<td>Mother’s House 1999 http New Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>289</td>
<td>Mujica 1991 http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>290</td>
<td>Mukaboo 2003 http Lib Com 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>291</td>
<td>Mumford 1995 289+ Fem Em 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>292</td>
<td>Murray 2000 19+ Lib Cre 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>293</td>
<td>Museum Shop 1999 http Lib Com 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>294</td>
<td>Museum Shop 1999 replica Lib Pro 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>295</td>
<td>Mutén 1994 64+ New Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>296</td>
<td>Natur+ 1995a notebook Lib Com 1 Ger+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>297</td>
<td>Natur+ 1995b postcard Lib Com 1 Ger+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>298</td>
<td>Natur+ 1998 bookmark Lib Com 1 Ger+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>299</td>
<td>Natur+ 2001 3+ Sci Pro 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300</td>
<td>Natur+ 2003a http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>Natur+ 2003b http Lib Pro 2 German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>Natur+ 2003c http Lib Pro 1 German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>Natur+ 2003d display+ Sci Pro 1 G&amp;E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>Natur+ 2003e poster Lib Pro 1 German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>Natur+ 2003e T-shirt Lib Pro 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>Nead 1992 19+ Lib Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>Nelson, P 1995 375 Lib Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>Nelson, RS 1997 http Lib Ac 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>Nelson, SM 2005 http Fem Ac 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>Neugebauer+ 1995 2+ Sci Ac 5 German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>Newsweek 2001 http Lib Em 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>Nieder+D+ 1996 1+ Lib Pro 1 German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>Nieder+D+ 2002a 2+ Lib Pro 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>Nieder+D+ 2002b 9 Lib Pro 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>Nieder+D+ 2004 10+ Lib Pro 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>Nieder+M+ 1999 http Lib Pro 1 German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>Nieder+M+ 2006 http Lib Pro 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>O’Connell 2000 14+ Lib Pro 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>Oefk 2001 188+ Lib Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>O’Hartigan 1994 http Fem Em 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>Olson 2002 110 Lib Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>One Free Sprint 2003 http Fem Com 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>O’Neal Garcia 2000 103 Fem Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>O’NIONS 1988 540 Lib Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>Oppenheimer 2003 131+ Lib Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>O’Sullivan 2002 http Fem Em 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>Paglia 2002 133+ Lib Cre 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td>Paleolithic Art 1994 http Lib Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>Paleolithic Art 1997 CD Lib Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>Paleolithic Art 2003 http Lib Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>Palmer 2005 191 Lib Cre 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>Pandora's Books 1999 http New Com 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>Paper Poppy 2005 http New Com 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>Pearson+ 2001 63 Post Em 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>Peterson, J 1999 484 Post Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>Peterson, L 1999 http New Ac 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>Piel 2001 401+ Lib Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>Pinkola Estés 1998 208 Fem Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339</td>
<td>Plagens 1995 http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>Polcari 1993 285+ Lib Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341</td>
<td>Pollack 1997 63+ New Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342</td>
<td>Pollack 2001 57+ New Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343</td>
<td>Pornaska 2002 1+ Lib Com 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344</td>
<td>Pornaska 2005 http Lib Com 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendixes</td>
<td>Willendorf Data-Text Lists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345</td>
<td>Pond 1998 254+ Lib Em 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346</td>
<td>Porter 2003 129+ Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347</td>
<td>Porter 2005 128+ Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>348</td>
<td>Prater 1999 http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349</td>
<td>Prehistoric Art 1998 http Lib Ac 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>Prehistoric Man 1988 66+ Lib Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>351</td>
<td>Prideaux 1973 98+ Sci Ac 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>352</td>
<td>Profile+ 2001 http Lib Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>354</td>
<td>Quantum Alchemy 1999 http New Com 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>355</td>
<td>Quantum Alchemy 2003 http New Com 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>356</td>
<td>Quantum Alchemy 2006 http New Com 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>357</td>
<td>Rabinvitch 2003 191 Lib Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>358</td>
<td>Rainbow Crystal 1999 http New Com 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>360</td>
<td>Rakoff 2001 69 Lib Cre 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>361</td>
<td>Rawson 2002 113+ Lib Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>362</td>
<td>Redmond 1997 30+ Fem Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>363</td>
<td>Reed+ 2000a http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>364</td>
<td>Reed+ 2000b http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365</td>
<td>Reichstein 1998 89 New Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>366</td>
<td>Reimer 2003 http Lib Pro 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367</td>
<td>Restaurant+ 2004a menu Lib Com 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>368</td>
<td>Restaurant+ 2004b building Lib Com 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>369</td>
<td>Rice 2001 18 Lib Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>Richard, F 2002 http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371</td>
<td>Richard, P 2002 http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>372</td>
<td>Riley 2000 http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>374</td>
<td>Roberts 1999 45 Lib Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375</td>
<td>Rochon 2003 http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>Rosendahl 2007 171+ Post Ac 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td>Ross 1961 35 Lib Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378</td>
<td>Roth, G 1993 108 New Em 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>379</td>
<td>Roth, LM 1993 145 Lib Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380</td>
<td>Roth, M 1998 16+ Fem Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>381</td>
<td>Rudgley 2000 198+ Lib Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>Ruppei Shell 2002 23+ Lib Em 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383</td>
<td>Russell 1998 261+ Fem Em 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384</td>
<td>Sacred Source 2003 http New Com 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>385</td>
<td>Sacred Source 2006 http New Com 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>386</td>
<td>Sanders 2002 548+ Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387</td>
<td>Satzi 2005 http Lib Pro 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>388</td>
<td>Satzi 2006 http Lib Com 8 German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389</td>
<td>Schechner 2002 188+ Lib Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>Schneider Adams 1994 358 Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391</td>
<td>Schwarz 2001 http Lib Pop 0 German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>392</td>
<td>Schwendener 2002 http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>393</td>
<td>Scurlock 1991 http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>394</td>
<td>Seiferle 2001 129+ Fem Cre 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>395</td>
<td>Sgarbi 1997 195+ Fem Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>396</td>
<td>Shadowmarch 2003 http New Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>397</td>
<td>Shaile+ 2001 90 Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398</td>
<td>Shands 1998 108+ Fem Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>399</td>
<td>Sharp 2002 240 New Em 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400</td>
<td>Shew, SJ 2006 http Lib Ac 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401</td>
<td>ShawA 2001 http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>402</td>
<td>Sherman 2003 http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>403</td>
<td>Simon, C 2003 50+ Fem Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>404</td>
<td>Simon, S 2000 http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>405</td>
<td>Sinclair 1996 http Lib Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>406</td>
<td>Smart 1998 39 Lib Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>408</td>
<td>Snake and Snake 1999 http New Com 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409</td>
<td>Soffner 2000 http Sci Ac 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>410</td>
<td>Sones 2003 http Lib Em 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>411</td>
<td>Sones 2004 http Lib Em 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>412</td>
<td>Spero 1996 248 Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>413</td>
<td>Spice 2003 http Lib Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415</td>
<td>Stamp Act 2004 http Lib Com 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>416</td>
<td>Starhawk 1999 27+ New Em 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>417</td>
<td>Statuary 1999 http New Com 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>418</td>
<td>Statuary 2003 http New Com 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>419</td>
<td>Sterling 1996 128 New Cre 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>420</td>
<td>Steves 2003 393+ Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>421</td>
<td>Steves+ 2000 3+ Lib Pro 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>422</td>
<td>Stimpson 1993 642+ Fem Ac 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td>Stone, K+ 2003 50+ Lib Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424</td>
<td>Stone, M 1978 vir Fem Em 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>425</td>
<td>Straubhaar 1999 http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>426</td>
<td>Strensk1 2000 312+ Lib Ac 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>427</td>
<td>Strenski 2001 90 Lib Ac 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>428</td>
<td>Stockland+ 1992 3+ Lib Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>429</td>
<td>Summer 1996 http Lib Em 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>430</td>
<td>Summesberger+ 2002 2 Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>431</td>
<td>Sutcliffe 2002 http Lib Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>432</td>
<td>Szombathy 2003 1 Sci Ac 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>433</td>
<td>Talaria 1996 http Lib Com 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>434</td>
<td>Talaria 2003 http Lib Com 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>435</td>
<td>Taylor 1997 115+ Lib Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>436</td>
<td>Tiger 2000 6 Fem Em 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>437</td>
<td>Tigertail 2003a http Sci Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>438</td>
<td>Tigertail 2003b http Sci Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>439</td>
<td>Ting Hua Liu 2006 http New Com 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440</td>
<td>Tomaskova 1995 http Lib Ac 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441</td>
<td>Toms+ 1999 133 New Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>442</td>
<td>Tringham+ 1998 24+ Sci Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443</td>
<td>Trobe 2001 113 New Cre 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444</td>
<td>University of N+ 1999 http Lib Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445</td>
<td>Upper+ 2005 http Lib Pop 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446</td>
<td>Uzgalis 1999a http Sci Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447</td>
<td>Uzgalis 1999b http Sci Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>448</td>
<td>Venus+ 2000 http Lib Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449</td>
<td>Verschöner+ 2004a key ring Lib Pro 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450</td>
<td>Verschöner+ 2004b statue Lib Pro 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>451</td>
<td>Verschöner+ 2004c sign Lib Pro 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>452</td>
<td>Verschöner+ 2004d sign Lib Pro 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>453</td>
<td>Verschöner+ 2004e sign Lib Pro 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>454</td>
<td>Verschöner+ 2004f 1 Lib Pro 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>455</td>
<td>Verschöner+ 2004g sign Lib Pro 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>456</td>
<td>Verschöner+ 2004h sign Lib Pro 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>457</td>
<td>Verschöner+ 2004i sign Lib Pro 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>458</td>
<td>Verschöner+ 2004j sign Lib Pro 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>459</td>
<td>Virtual Concrete 1999 http New Cre 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460</td>
<td>Voss+ 2000 15 Post Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461</td>
<td>Wabi Sabi 2005 http New Cre 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>462</td>
<td>Wabi Sabi 2006a http New Cre 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willendorf Data-Text Lists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>463</td>
<td>Wachauschiff 2003 http Lib Pro 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>464</td>
<td>Walter 2003 http New Cre 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>465</td>
<td>Wann 1998 129+ New Em 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>466</td>
<td>Wann 1999 http New Em 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>467</td>
<td>Weiermair 2004 http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>468</td>
<td>Welle 2000 4 New Com 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>469</td>
<td>White 1996 172 New Cre 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>470</td>
<td>Whitehorn 2001 http Fem Pro 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>472</td>
<td>Willem de Koon+ 2002 http Lib Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473</td>
<td>Willendorf+ 2000 http New Em 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>474</td>
<td>Willendorf 2001 http Lib Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>475</td>
<td>Willie 1999 http Fem Em 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>476</td>
<td>Willie 2000 http Fem Em 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>477</td>
<td>Wishart 2003 6+ New Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>478</td>
<td>witchshop 2004 http New Com 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>479</td>
<td>Witcombe 1999 http Lib Ac 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480</td>
<td>Witcombe 2005 http Lib Ac 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>482</td>
<td>Wosk 2001 232+ Fem Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>483</td>
<td>Yazdani 1999 51 Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>484</td>
<td>Zacharek 1999 http Lib Pro 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>485</td>
<td>Zell, MG 1999a http New Com 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>486</td>
<td>Zell, MG 1999b 1+ New Pop 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>487</td>
<td>Zell, MG 2003 http New Com 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>488</td>
<td>Zell, O 2003 http New Com 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>489</td>
<td>Zell, O 2006 27 New Pop 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490</td>
<td>Zyninya 2006 http Lib Em 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F
Chapter-Four Signifier Illustrations
Dialogue-Bubble References

Following is a fully referenced list of the verbal signifiers that appear in the four dialogue-bubble illustrations of chapter four. The illustrations juxtapose the signifiers by age, height, material, and name of the artefact. These signifiers include instances where the age, height, material, and even the name of the artefact is implicated by generalisations made by the particular text cited (ie they include instances where Venus artefacts as a group are generalised, and Willendorf is specifically cited as a member of that group). English entries appear in both Australian-preferred and U.S.-preferred spelling, according to the text cited. Entries in German are italicised. The entries are not case sensitive, but match the occurrence of the initial entry. Likewise the entries are not sensitive to spacing, but match the occurrence of the initial entry.

**Figure 4.1 Age(s)**
Except for the last generalised grouping, Willendorf-age signifiers are here grouped under headings utilising the traditional Western hegemonic standard of years before Christ. The groupings run as far as practicable from the most recent to the longest ago. The entries within each grouping are listed alphabetically.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12,000-BC</td>
<td>till about 14,000 years ago. Up to that point, it was just... the Venus of Willendorf (Denton &amp; Herring 2003: http)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,500-BC</td>
<td>10,000-15,000 B.C. (Aroguardade 2000: 16) 10,000-15,000 B.C. (de la Croix 1975: 34) 15,000 to 10,000 B.C. (Nelson, R.S. 1997: http) 15,000-10,000 B.C. (e-archetypes 2005: http) 15,000-10,000 B.C. (Janson &amp; Kerman 1968: 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,000-BC</td>
<td>more than fifteen thousand years ago (Olson 2002: 110) more than fifteen thousand years old (Klein 2001: 21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,000 BC</td>
<td>15,000 year old (Blessed Bee 1999: http)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000-BC</td>
<td>around 15,000 B.C.E (Smyth 1999: http) some 15,000 or more years B.C. (Coults Shema 1991: http)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16,000-BC</td>
<td>26,000-10,000 years ago (Tringham &amp; Conkey 1996: 24)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18,000 BC</td>
<td>20,000-year-old (Geographica 2000: 143) twenty-thousand years ago (Michaels, C. A. 2004: http)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18,000-BC</td>
<td>20,000-18,000 BC (Baring &amp; Cashford 1991: 10) about 20,000 years ago (Pond 1998: 255, Upper Paleolithic 2005: http) ca. 20,000 Jahre alt [italics added] (Naturhistorisches Museum Wien 1995b: postcard, 1998: bookmark, 2003e: poster) going back roughly 20,000 years (Flower 1993: http) the Bronze Age (c. 3500), 15,000 years later (Baring &amp; Cashford 1991: 10) twenty thousand years ago, more or less (Klein 2001: 21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19,000-BC</td>
<td>c. 25,000-13,000 BC (Rawson 2002: 113)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 BC</td>
<td>22,000 year-old (Niederosterreich – Des Weite Land 2004: 11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000-BC</td>
<td>10,000 to 30,000 years old (McDonald 1996: http) 30,000 to 10,000 years ago (University of Newcastle upon Tyne 1999: http)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20,000 BC (Michael 2003: 72)
c. 20,000 BC (Budick 2002: http)
ca. 20,000 B.C. (Niederösterreich – Das Welte
Land 2002a: 2)

21,000-BC range
about 21,000 BC (Prehistoric Art 1998: http)
c. 21000 BC (Neat 1992: ix, 33)
c.25,000-10,000 BCE (Christ 2000: 229)

21,500-BC range
20,000 to 27,000 years ago (Prideaux 1973: 98)
between 27,000 and 20,000 years ago (Gray
1999: http)

22,000-BC range
about 24,000 years before the present (Schechner
2002: 190)

22,500-BC range
20,000-25,000 BC (Weiernmair 2004: http)
25,000 - 20,000 B.C. (Strickland & Boswell 1992: 3)
25,000 to 20,000 BCE (Kellermeier 2003: http)
at least 25,000 years old (Molyneaux1965: 17)
c. 25,000-20,000 B.C. (Strickland & Boswell 1992: 5)
c. 25,000-20,000 BC (Hume 2003: 18, 221)
c.23000BC (Husain 2003: 120)
c. 23000 v. Chr. [italics added] (Husain 2001: 120)
ca. 25,000 Jahre alt [italics added] (Molyneaux
2002: 17)
ca. 25,000 to 20,000 B.C. (Polcarl 1993: 285)
ca. 25,000-20,000 B.C. (Week 2001: 233)
ca. 25,000 years old (Stadler 1998: http) [1 counted
occurrence is the reference title stated not by
the initial text], but by the thesis in reference to
the initial text]
era 25,000-20,000 B.C.E. (Miller & Gur 2002: http)

23,000 BC
23,000 B.C. (Porter & Prince 2005: 211)
25,000 year old (cattrepreneur@hotmail.com 2004: http)
25,000 year-old (Curtis 2003: http)
25,000 years ago (Richard, P. 2002: http)
25,000 year-old (Honan & Bedford 2001: 12)
25,000-year-old (Altman 2000: 57, Curtis 2003:
Lehmann 2002: 2)
25,000 B.P. (Curtis 2003: http)
25,000 year-old (Naturhistorisches Museum Wien
2003a: http)

23,000-BC range
30,000-20,000 years old (Kollman & Schulz
1998a: 17)
30,000-20,000 Jahre [italics added] (Kollman &
Schulz 1998b: 17)
about 25,000 years ago (Chang 2000: http)

25,000 years old (Naturhistorisches
Museum Wien 2003d: http)
about 25,000 years ago (Vorschornerungs- und
Museumsverein Willendorf 2004: 1, Satzl
2005: http)
Approximately 25,000 years ago (Great Mother
1999: http)
around 24,000-22,000 BC (Bahn 2006: http)
around 24,000-22,000 BCE (Wilcombe 2005: http)
around 24,000-22,000 BCE (26-24,000 B.P.
Wilcombe 1999: http)
around 28,000-18,000 B.C. (Hoving 1999: 26)
Between 27,000 B.C. and 19,000 B.C. (Redmond
1997: 30)
c. 24,000-22,000 BCE (Wilcombe 1999: http)
c. 23000 v. Chr [italics added] (Husain 2001: 120)
c. 25 000 Jahre alt [italics added] (Molyneaux
2002: 17)
dato von origin 24,000-22,000 B.C.E. (Broom Closet
1999: http)
etwa 25.000 Jahre alt [italics added]
(Vorschornerungs- und Museumsverein
Willendorf 2004: http)
over twenty-five thousand years old (O'Connell
2000: 14)
somewhere between 24,000 and 22,000 B.C.E.
(Lane 2001: 1)
variably estimated at 22-24,000 years B.C.E.
(Sones 2004: http)
When first discovered...approximately 15,000 to
10,000 B.C.E...revised back to 25,000-20,000
B.C.E., and then...revised again to c. 30,000-
25,000 B.C.E...now...around 24,000-22,000

24,000 BC
24,000 BC (López 2002: http)
26,000 years ago (Richard, P. 2002: http)

24,000-BC range
about 24,000 B.C.E. (Lipp 2003: 153)
ca. 25,000-23,000 B.C.E. (McElvaıne 2001: 138)
estimated age...varies from 22,000 to over 30,000
years old (Stamp Act 2004: http)

25,000 BC
25,000 AC (MMIII 2004: T-shirt)
25,000 B.C. (McLaughlin 2001: http, Stoves &
Openshaw 2000: 3)
25,000 BC (Burne 1998: http)
25000 BC (Museum Shop 1999: http)
is said to be 27,000 years old (Snake and Snake
1999: http)

25,000-BC range
30 - 20 thousand BCE (Shadowmarch 2003: http)
40,000-10,000 BCE (Peterson, L. 1995: http)
about 25,000 B.C. (Stone, M. 1978: 183)
an approximate age of 27,000 years (Gass 1993: 2)
approximately 25,000 B.C.E. (willendorf@geocities 2000: http)  
around 25,000 B.C. (Redmond 1997: 31)  
around 25,000 BCE (Müllén 1994: 122)  
around 250 centuries BC (Tigertail 2003b: http, Uzgalis 1999b: http)  

at least 27,000 years ago (Craig 2000: videotape)  
between 21,000 and 29,000 years old (Roberts 1999: 45)  
c. 25,000 BCE (Kincheloe & Steinberg 1998: 178)  
c. 25,000 BC (Blakemore & Jennett 2002: 385, Hume 2003: 15)  
ca. 25,000 B.C.E. (Corser & Adler 1993: 97, Gadon 1989: pl. 31)  
ca. 25,000 B.C. (Redmond 1997: 31)  
ca. 25,000 BC (Hamilton 2003: 4)  
Gravettian (ca. 25,000 v. Chr) [italics added]  
ca. 25,000 v. Chr. [italics added] (AEIOU Project 2000: http)  

**25,500-BC range**  
between 25,000 and 30,000 years old (Honour & Fleming 1982: 13, 1998: 5)  
c. 28,000-23,000 BC (Emory University 1999: http)  

**26,000-BC range**  
40,000-12,000 years ago (Taylor 1997: 116)  
c. 28,000 Jahre alt (Meixner 2004: postcard)  

**26,500-BC range**  
between 26,000 and 25,000 BC (Loizos 1999: http)  
c. 26,000 - 25,000 B.C. (Venus 2000: http)  
c. 28,000-25,000 B.C. (de la Croix et al 1991: 26, 36, Venus 2005: http)  
c. 28,000-25,000 B.C.E. (McElvaine 2001: 450)  

**27,000-BC range**  
approximately 27,000 BC (Prater 1999: http)  
around 27,000 years BCE (Arizona Triad 2006. http)  
back to 27,000 B.C. (Gray 1999: http)  
ca. 27,000 B.P. (Soffer, Adovasio & Hyland 2000: http)  
ca. 27,000 PB [sic] (Soffer, Adovasio & Hyland in Wilcombe 2005: http)  

**27,500-BC range**  
30,000 - 25,000 BC (Fortune City 1999: http)  
30,000 – 25,000 BCE (Fortune City 1999: http)  
30,000 and 25,000 BC (Koeller 2000: http)  
30,000 to 25,000 B.C. (Miller, S. 2001: 273)  
30,000 to 25,000 BC (Koeller 2002: http)  
30,000 to 25,000 BCE (Keimerleer 2003: http)  
30,000-25,000 BC (Paleolithic Art 1997: CD)  
30,000-25,000 BC (Ali Meyer 1997: CD)  
about 25,000-30,000 years ago (Kohem 1946: 49)  
Alter: 25,000 bis 30,000 Jahre (Amido 1995: postcard)  

**c. 30,000-25,000 B.C.**  
(Achterberg 1991: following p. 98)  
c. 30,000-25,000 B.C.E. (Smart 1998: 39)  
ca. 25,000 - 30,000 B.C.E. (Gadon 1989: Inside front cover, Inside back cover)  
ca. 25,000-30,000 B.C. (Pomaska 2002: 2)  
ca. 30,000-25,000 B.C.E. (Gadon 1989: 6)  
the most common dates...run from 25,000 to 30,000 BCE (Zell, O 2003: http)  

**28,000 BC**  
30,000 year old (Goddess House 1999: http)  
30,000 years ago (Sacred Source 2006: http)  
30,000 years old (Kramarae & Spender 2000: 1367)  
30,000-year-old (Jai Bhagavan 1999b: http, Steve 2003: 393)  

**28,000-BC range**  
about 30,000 years ago (Pollack 1997: 63, pl. 8)  
Stone, K. 2003: 51)  
about 30,000 years old (Sones 2003: http)  
approximately 30,000 years old (Hume 2003: 45)  
approximately 30,000 years old (Eisler 2000: 97)  
(at least thirty thousand years old) (Pollack 2001: 57)  
around 28,000 B.C.E. (Metzner 1995: http)  
back approximately 30,000 years (Eisler 2000: 96)  
back...let us say, thirty thousand years (Greer Alien 1992: 244)  
onover 30,000 years old (Wishart 2003: 7)  
approximately 30,000 BC (Venus 2000: http)  
some 30,000 years ago (Monaghan 2002: 190)  

**28,500-BC range**  
Aurignacian 30,000-27,000 (Metzner 2001: 99)  

**29,000-BC range**  
c. 30,000-28,000 B.C. (Shaw, S. J. 2006: http)  

**30,000 BC**  
30,000 [sic] (Lemonick 1995: http)  
30,000 B.C.E. (Chandler 2000: 145)  
30,000 BC (Talania 1999: http [2 occurrences], 2003: http)  
30,000BC (Paper Poppy 2005: http)  
in 30,000 B.C. (Mukaboo 2003. http)  

**30,000-BC range**  
about 30,000 BC (Prehistoric Art 1998: http)  
about 300 BC (Tigertail 2003a: http, Uxgalis 1999a: http)  
c. 30,000 BC (Brennan 1998: 120)
c. 30,000 BC (Pomaska 2005: http)
c. 30,000 B.C.E. (Pollack 1997: pl. 8)

33,000 BC
35,000 year-old (Mandarava 2006: http)
over 35,000 years ago (Wishart 2003: 6)
some 35,000 years old (Blakemore & Jennett 2002: 599)

36,000-BC range
At one inch per century, the Willendorf Goddess is more than thirty feet from the beginning of the timeline. (Ardinger 2000: 14)

100,000-BC
may date as far back as 100,000 years before Christ (Gilman, D 1992: 171)

≤1,995,000-BC
Most modern archaeology dates the Venus figurines to around 25,000 BCE, but recent British research points to a date for the earliest Great Goddess figures of up to three million years ago. (Muten 1994: 122)
two million years ago...a hoax (Grey 2000: http)

generalised ancient (DeGeer 2001: http)
millennia-old (Kubert 1999: 9)
thousands of years ago (O’Connell 2000: 115)

Figure 4.2 Height(s)

These Willendorf height signifiers are listed in centimetre-rated groupings from smallest to largest, followed by size-description-rated groupings in alphabetical order. The entries within each grouping are also listed alphabetically.

10-cm range
4-inch-tall (10 cm) [italics added] (Molyneaux 2002: 17)
just over 4 inches (10cm) (Molyneaux 1985: 17)
only about 10 cm (4 inches) high (Ladle 2001: 190)

10.16 cm
4-inch-high (Steves & Openshaw 2000: 3)
4-inch-tall (Spice 2003: http)
four-inch-tall (Brennan 1998. 75)

10.18-cm range
a little more than four inches high (Kohen 1946: 49)
about 4 inches high (Maringer 1960: 109)
only 4 inches high (Cartwright 2004a: http)

10.475 cm
4 1/8 in. (Gadon 1989: 6, pl. 31)
Height 4 1/8 ins. (Maringer 1960: vii)
stands 4 1/8 inches tall (Venus Direct 2000: http)

11 cm
11 cm (Putman 1988: 459)
11 cm groß (Meixner 2004: postcard)
11 cm high (Russell 1998: 261)
11 cm hoch [italics added] (Golebiowski et al 2002: 21)
11 cm in height (Loizos 1999: http)
110 mm in height (Koeller 2000: http)
HEIGHT 11 CM (Rudgley 2000: 281, pl. xxi)
height: 11cm (Reimer 2003: http)
Höhe 11 cm. [italics added] (Neugebauer-Maresch 1996: 67)
Höhe beträgt 11 cm. [italics added] (Land Niederösterreich 2003: http)
only 110mm. in size (Conkey 1997. 188)

11-cm range
11 cm (4 ½") high (Curtis 2003: http)
4 ½ in. (11 cm) (Willendorf 2001: http)
4 1/3 inches (11cm) tall (Baring & Cashford 1991: 10)
4.3 Inches (11cm) tall (Upper Paleolithic 2005: http)
4" (11cm) high (Diane 2003: http)
a mere 11 centimetres high (Rudgley 2000: 198)
about 11 cm in height (Loizos 1999: http)
about 11 cm. or 4 inches high (Sonse 2004: http)
Height 11 cm/4 in. (Auel 1983: xii)
height 4 1/3 in. (11 cm) (Baring & Cashford 1991: 10)
only 4 1/3 inches (11 cm) tall but seems massive (Baring & Cashford 1991: 10)
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11.1-cm range
about 11.1 centimeters in length (Wilcombe 2005: http)
4 3/8 inches (11.1 cm) high (Wilcombe 1999: http, 2005: http)

11.125 cm
4 3/8” high (de la Croix & Tansey 1975: 34; Shaw, S. J. 2006: http)
Height 4 3/8 inches (Polcari 1993: 285)
11.176 cm
4.4 in. (Fortune City 1999: http)
11.25-cm range
11.4-cm range
4 1/2”, 11.4 cm (Prater 1999: http)
Height 11.4/4 Y. in (Auel 1983: xii)
11.43 cm
4 1/2 inches (11.5cm) high (Honour & Fleming 1982: 13, 1995: 5)
11.5-cm range
no more than 4 1/2 inches (11.5cm) high (Honour & Fleming 1982: 13, 1995: 5)
12 cm
12 cm (Zombathy 2003)
height: 12 cm. (Tigertail 2003a: http)
12.065-cm range
height 4 3/4” (Janson & Kerman 1968: 5)
12.7 cm
five inches long (Nelson, P. 1995: 375)
five-inch-high (Taylor 1997: 116)

diminutive-related description
diminutive size (Lane 2001: 1, Koeller 2000: http)
fairly small (Sones 2004: http)
little (Sones 2004: http)
small scale (University of Newcastle upon Tyne 1999: http)
tiny size (Stone, K. 2003: 51)

hand-related description
could be held in the hand (Zell, O 2003: http)
could fit easily into the palm of a hand (Christ 1998: 10)
fist-sized (Steves 2003: 393)
fit easily into one’s hand (Austen 1990: 4)
fits in the palm of a hand (Broom Closet 2003:
http, Rainbow Crystal 2003: http)
fits perfectly in the clasped hand (Gadon 1989: 6)
hand-size (Janson & Kerman 1968: 4)
hand-sized (Ruppel Shell 2002: 23)
in sizes that easily fitted the hand (Eisenbud 1998: 8)
palm-sized (Stone, K. 2003: 51)
pocket-sized (Cochran 2002: http)
small enough to be held in the hand (Russell 1998: 261)
small hand-size (Janson & Kerman 1968: 4)

inches-related description
only a few inches tall (Simon, S. 2000: http)

more-than-physical-size-related description
a most powerful small object (Independent 2003: http)
big smallness (Komunyakaa 2001: 17)
tiny but massive appearing (Monaghan 2002: 190)

Figure 4.3 Material(s)

These Willendorf material signifiers are arranged in groupings listed alphabetically. The entries within each grouping are also in alphabetical order.

bone
bone (Sacred Source 2006: http)

clay
clay (Kubert 1999: 9)

limestone
kalkstein [italics added] (Kollman & Schulz 1998b: 17)
Kalksteinstatuette [italics added] (Kollman & Schulz 1998b: 16)
Kalksteinvenus [italics added] (Molyneaux 2002: 17)
limestone—stone (Blakemore & Jennett 2002: 385)

**limestone, detail**
a fine porous oolitic limestone not found in the region (Wilcombe 2005: http)
a particular type of oolitic limestone not found in the region (Wilcombe 1999: http)
finely grained oolitic limestone (Burkitt 1933: 164, 1963: 174)
finely limestone (Naturhistorisches Museum Wien 2001: 3, Summesberger & Lehmann 2002: 2)
oolitic limestone (Ruppel Shell 2002: 23)
oolitic limestone (Hitchcock 2003: http; Lane 2001: 1; Pond 1968: 256; Sones 2004: http; Wilcombe 1999: http; 2005: http)
relatively soft, breakable limestone (Marshack 1995: http)
soft limestone (Gadon 1989: 6)

**limestone, red**
fine limestone—originally painted thickly with red colour (Stadler 1998: http)
Limestone with traces of red ochre (Auel 1983: xii, Diane 2003: http; Fortune City 1999: http)
limestone, with traces of red coloring (Conkey 1997: 168)
Limestone, with traces of red ochre pigment (Taylor 1997: 116)
limestone, Traces of red coloring, probably red ochre, are discernible, surviving in the deeper folds of the body. It is thought to have been red all over at one time. (Taylor 1997: 115)
limestone—covered with red ochre (Delson et al 2000 521)
limestone—originally covered with a thick layer of red colour (AEIOU Project 2003: http)

limestone—originally thickly coated with red ochre (Naturhistorisches Museum Wien 2003d: display)
limestone—seems originally to have been covered with pigments, of which traces remain (Honour & Fleming 1982: 13, 1996: 5)
limestone—still showing traces of paint (Maringer 1950: 109)
oolitic limestone—colored with red ochre (Koeller 2000: http)

red
originally painted red (Bahn 1996: 75)
sandstone
sandstone (Counts Shema 1991: http)
soapstone
soapstone (Klein 2001: 21)

**stone**

**stone, detail**
soft stone (Prater 1999: http)

**stone, red**
soft, reddish brown stone (Christ 1998: 10)
stone colored a reddish ochre (Hoving 1999: 302)
stone—painted with red ochre (Kellermeyer 2003: http)

**Figure 4.4 Name(s)**

These Willendorf name signifiers are arranged in groupings listed alphabetically. The entries within each grouping are also in alphabetical order.

**aphrodite**
the Aphrodite of Willendorf (Loizos 1999: http)

**artefact**
the artefact (Rosenzah 2007: 176 [6 occurrences], 178 [2 occurrences], 183, 184)
the artefact itself (Rosenzah 2007: 188)
the Willendorf artefact (Rosenzah 2007: 186, 188)
this Willendorf artefact (Rosenzah 2007: 182)

**creator**
Creatrix of the Universe (Arizona Triad 2006: http)
The Creatrix (Austen 1990: 5)
Mother Creatrix (Mandarava 2006: http)

donii
the donii (Auel 1983: 36, 37)

figure
figure...from Willendorf (Delson et al 2000: 521)
the Willendorf figure (Lipp 2003: 155)

figure, diminutive
prehistoric figurines...Willendorf (Ofek 2001: 189)
the figurines of Willendorf (Dowson & Porr 2001: 157)
the...Willendorf figure (Marshack 1996: http)
Venus figurines...of Willendorf... (Hager 1997: 214)
Venus of Willendorf figurine (Breziný 2000: 428, catreprenuer@hotmail 2004: http)
Willendorf figurine (Rudgley 2000: 299)
Willendorf Goddess figurine (Metzner 2001: 99)
Willendorf...Figurchen [italics added] (Szombathy 2003)

goddess
Goddesses of Willendorf... (Redmond 1997: 26)
the famous Goddess of Willendorf (Graham 1997: 14)
the fertile goddess Venus of Willendorf (Sherman 2003: http)
the Willendorf Mother Goddess (Aoumil 2000: 64)
Willendorf Goddess (Lipp 2003: 155)

goddess, great
The Great Goddess of Willendorf (Austen 1990: 4 [2 occurrences] 18, 26 [1 counted occurrence is the reference title stated not by the initial text], but by the thesis in reference to the initial text]; Gass 1993: 2, Mandarava 2006: http)

lady
Lady (Lipp 2003: 155, 156)
the fat, fecund Ladies of Willendorf... (Ardinger 2000: 17)
the Lady (Mother’s House 1999: http)
the Lady of Life (Mother’s House 1999: http [2 occurrences])

the Lady of Willendorf (Pollack 1997: 64)
their famous fat Lady (Nelson, R. S. 1997: http)
This lady (Fugitive Colors 2001: http, 2003: http, Austen 1990: 4)
Willendorf Lady (Lipp 2003: 155, 234)

morning star
Morning Star (Fisher 1999: http)

mother
a Willendorf Mother (Ardinger 2000: 74)
Big-belly Mother (Lipp 2003: 155, 234)
Earth Mother of Willendorf (Gadon 1989: pl. 31)
Mighty Mojo Mama (Wabi Sabi 2005: http)
the ancient earth mother venus of willendorf (Melanie 2001: http, 2003: http)
THE EARTH MOTHER (Gadon 1989: pl. 32, Merchant 1992: 116)
The Earth Mother of Willendorf (Gadon 1989: 6, 402, 405, inside front cover, inside back cover)
the Stone-Age large-breasted Earth Mother of Willendorf (Merchant 1992: 116)
the Willendorf Mother (Aringer 2001: 18)

number
...der Venus (Neugebauer-Maresch 1995: 2, 6)
the Willendorf 1 figure (Cook 1995: http, Cook in Rosendahl 2007: 175, Rosendahl 2007: 184)
Willendorf no. 1 (McDermott, L. 1995: http [6 occurrences], Rosendahl 2007: 184, 185)
Willendorf, Venus I (Neugebauer-Maresch 1996: 67, 68)

problematised
a "Venus of Willendorf" feel (Yazdani 1999: 51)
called Venus of Willendorf (Porter & Prince 2003: 213)
...der "Venus von Willendorf" [italics added] (Niederösterreichische Museen 1999: http)
die sog. "Venus von Willendorf" [italics added] (Kolman & Schulz 1998b: 16)
die..."Venus von Willendorf" (Naturhistorisches Museum Wien 2003d: http)
goddess of Willendorf,* (Kramarae & Spender 2000: 1367)
known as the Venus of Willendorf (Eisenbud 1996: 3)
known as Venus of Willendorf (Pomaska 2005: http)
so-called Venus of Willendorf (Eisenbud 1996: 3)
the Aurignacian sculptured "fat Veruses"...Willendorf (Starhawk 1999: 39)
the famous Austrian "Venus of Willendorf" (Maringer 1990: viii)
the famous little "Venus" (Elkins 2002: 64)
the famous misnamed "Venus" of Willendorf (Metzner 1995: http)
the famous 'Venus of Willendorf' (Voss & Schmidt 2000: 15)
the prehistoric fertility symbol called the Venus of Willendorf (Liebmann 1994: 131-132)
the rounded so-called Venus found in Willendorf (Roth, L. M. 1993: 145)
the so-called "Venus of Willendorf" (Niederösterreich – Das Weite Land 1996: 1)
the so-called "Venus of Willendorf" (Kollman & Schütz 1998a: 16)
the so-called Willendorf Venus (Sanders 2002: 548)
"the Venus of Willendorf" (Kohen 1946: 49)
the "Venus of Willendorf" (AEIOU Project 2006: http; Bahn 1997: 63)
the 'Venus' of Willendorf (Koeller 2000: http; Witcombe in Lane 2001: 35; Witcombe 1999: http; Rosenfeld 2007: 186)
the "Venus of Willendorf," (Gillman, S. L. 2001: 232; Conkey 1997: 176; Lane 2001: 1)
The "Venus" from Willendorf (Elkins 2002: 139)
the "Venus" of Willendorf figurine (Witcombe 2005: http)
the "Veneses" of Willendorf... (Delson et al 2000: 252)
"The Willendorf Goddess" (Lipp 2003: 153)
"the Willendorf Venus' (Nead 1992: 33)
"The Willendorf Venus" (Kernage 2002: http)
the Willendorf "Venus" (Tigertail 2003b: http [2 occurrences], Uzgalis 1998b: http)
the... "Venus von Willendorf" (Naturhistorisches Museum Wien 2003a: http)
this "Venus" of Willendorf (Schechner 2002: 190)
"Venus" (Siefieirer 2001: 129)
"venus," figurines...Willendorf (Delson et al 2000: 296)
"Venus of Willendorf" (Maringer 1960: viii)
"Venus of Willendorf," (Achterberg 1991: following p 99)
"Venus of Willendorf," (Gotera 2003: http)
"Venus of Willendorf" (McElvain 2001: 450)
Venus of Willendorf "Earth Mother," (Pomaska 2002: 2)
("Venus von Willendorf") (Niederösterreichische Museen 1999: http)
"Willendorf" (Rupell Shell 2002: 240)
"Willendorf Venus," (Great Mother 1999: http)
"Woman of Willendorf" (Lipp 2003: 153)

sculpture
the Willendorf sculpture (Blair 1993: http)

statue
a statue of a very corpulent female (Goodman & Villaplano 2001: 38)
the statue of Myrtle of Willendorf (DeGeer 2001: http)

statue, diminutive
Our Venus statuette (Verschönersungs- und Museumsverein Willendorf 2004f: 1)
the early Stone Age statuette of a conspicuously obese fertility goddess (Horn 2000: 122)
the statuette of Willendorf (Kohen 1946: 69)
the famous Willendorf statuette (McDermott, L. 1995: http)

stone
the Willendorf stone (Jones, D. 2002: 548)

title
Frau Willendorf (Russell 1998: 263)
Miss Willendorf (Spice 2003: http)
Ms. Willendorf (Witcombe 1999: http; 2005: http)

venus
a Venus of Willendorf (Bradway & McCord 1997: 210; Dooling 1998: 266)
a Venus von Willendorf (Rosenfeld 2007: 179, Simpson 1993: 64a)
a...Venus of Willendorf (Andrews 2003: 135)
...der Venus von Willendorf (Neugebauer-Maresch 1995: 2)
instances where the photo is read as standing for the artefact standing as a likeness of the artefact. and standing as an image inspired by the artefact.

Willendorf artefact that is the object of this study. These signifiers include

Venuses of Willendorf (Wabi Sabi 2006a: http)

Venus of Willendorf’s (Henke 2000: 174)
Venus of Willendorf (sic) (Takahia 1999: http)


Venus von Willendorf, Figure (Reimer 2003: http)
Willendorf Venus (Great Mother 1996: http [3 occurrences], Nead 1992: 133)

W
Little Venus of W (McCloskey 2004: http)

Willendorf
a Willendorf (Lipp 2003: 155)
Pavlovian-Kostienkian-Gravettian female figurines...Willendorf (Jelinek 1995: http)
the ancient Willendorf (Zell-Ravenheart, O. 2006: 27)
the Willendorf (Gadin 1989: 6, McDermott, L. 1995: http)
Willendorf, the (Gadin 1989: 401)

Willie

woman
the Woman of Willendorf (Kohen 1946: 58, Witcombe 2005: http)
Woman from Willendorf (Kohen 1946: 58; Witcombe 1999: http [2 occurrences], Witcombe 2005: http [3 occurrences])
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Patchwork-Photo References
As with the verbal signifiers, following are graphic signifiers standing for the Willendorf artefact that is the object of this study. These signifiers include instances where the photo is read as standing for the artefact itself, standing as a likeness of the artefact, and standing as an image inspired by the artefact.

Figure 4.5
Photos of the Artefact

Row 1
1. Burkitt 1933: pl. iv
2. Maringer 1960: ill. 33
4. Janson & Kerman 1968: 5
5. Prideaux 1973: 98
6. de la Croix & Tansley 1975: 34
7. Jacobs 1978: 348
8. Stone, M. 1978: ill. 1

Row 2
1. Gadin 1989: pl. 31
2. Austen 1990: 5
5. de la Croix et al 1991: 36
7. Strickland & Boswell 1992: 4
8. Corser & Adler 1993: 97
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9. Gass 1993: 1
11. Lord 1994: 77

Row 3
1. Naturhistorisches Museum Wien 1995a: notebook
7. Elsentud 1996: 11
8. Niederösterreich – Das Weite Land 1996: 1
12. Graham 1997: 15
13. Pollack 1997: pl. 3

Row 4
1. Redmond 1997: 31
2. Taylor 1997: 116
5. Kollman & Schulz 1998a: 17
8. Smart 1998: 39
10. Stadler 1998: http
11. Tringham & Conkey 1998: 26

Row 5
1. God was a BBW 1999: http
2. Great Mother 1999: http
3. Hoving 1999: 27
4. Loizos 1999: http
5. McGinnness 1999: 60
6. Mother's House 1999: http
7. Uzgalis 1999a: http
8. Uzgalis 1999b: http
9. Wilcombe 1999: http
10. Wilcombe 1999: http
11. Wilcombe 1999: http
12. Wilcombe 1999: http
13. Wilcombe 1999: http
14. AEIOU Project 1999: http
15. Chang 2000: http

Row 6
1. Cheyne 2000: http
2. Craig 2000: videotape
5. Rudgley 2000: pl. xxi
6. Stoves & Opspaw 2000: 3
7. Venus Direct 2000: http
8. World's Oldest 2000: http
10. Fugitive Colors 2001: http
11. Fugitive Colors 2001: http
12. Husain 2001: 120
13. Ladle 2001: 190
15. Piel 2001: 401

Row 7
1. Woek 2001: 232
2. Golebiowski et al 2002: 21
4. Molyneaux 2002: 17
7. Schechner 2002: 190
8. AEIOU Project 2003: http
11. Hitchcock 2003: http
15. Husain 2003: 120

Row 8
1. Korean National University of Arts 2003: http
2. Land Niederösterreich 2003: http
8. Oppenheimer 2003: 131
10. Tigertail 2003a: http
11. Tigertail 2003a: http
12. Wachauschiff 2003: http

Row 9
1. Lynx UK 2004: http
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2. Lynx UK 2004: http
4. Restaurant der Venus von Willendorf 2004a: menu
8. Verschönerungs- und Museumsverein Willendorf 2004b: sign
10. Satzl 2005: http
11. Satzl 2005: http
12. Upper Paleolithic 2005: http

Row 10
1. Witcombe 2006: http
2. Witcombe 2006: http
3. Witcombe 2006: http
4. Witcombe 2006: http
5. Witcombe 2006: http
6. Amazon.com 2006: http [image 3]
8. Arizona Triad 2006: http
10. joyoceando 2006: http
11. Satzl 2006: http
12. Shaw, SJ 2006: http
13. Shaw, SJ 2006: http
15. Rosendahl 2007: 177

Figure 4.6
Likenesses of the Artefact

Row 1
1. Prehistoric Man 1968: 666
2. Axel 1983. x
4. Gadon 1989: pl. 32
8. Niederösterreich – Das Welte Land 1996: 1

Row 2
1. Broom Closet 1999: http
2. Clair 1999: 1
4. Hawk dancing 1999: http
5. Jai Bhagavan 1999a: http
7. Jai Bhagavan 1999b: http
8. Jai Bhagavan 1999b: http
12. Museum Shop 1999: replica

Row 3
1. Rainbow Crystal 1999: http
2. Roberts 1999: 45
5. Snake and Snake 1999: http
7. Talaria 1999: http
8. University of Newcastle Upon Tyne 1999: http
10. Zell, M. G. 1999b: 1
12. Chang 2000: http
13. Weie 2000: 4

Row 4
1. willendorf@geocities.com 2000: http
2. klik-klok 2001: http
3. Curtis 2002: DVD
4. Pomaska 2002: 2
5. Pomaska 2002: 2
6. Abaxion 2003: http

Row 5
1. Lipp 2003: 153
5. One Free Spirit 2003: http
6. Quantum Alchemy 2003: http
7. Rainbow Crystal 2003: http
8. Rainbow Crystal 2003: http
10. Sacred Source 2003: http
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#### Figure 4.7 Willendorf-Inspired Images

| Row 1 | 1. de la Croix & Tansey 1975: 24  
|       | 2. de la Croix & Tansey 1975: 25  
|       | 3. de la Croix et al 1991: 26  
|       | 4. de la Croix et al 1991: 26  
|       | 5. Fisher 1995: http  
|       | 8. Wann 1998: 131  
|       | 9. Wann 1998: 133  
|       | 10. Wann 1998: 136  
|       | 12. Wann 1998: 139  
|       | 14. Wann 1998: 143 |

| Row 2 | 1. Wann 1998: 145  
|       | 2. Wann 1998: 147  
|       | 4. Che Designs 1999: http  
|       | 5. HawkDancing 1999: http  
|       | 6. HawkDancing 1999: http  
|       | 7. Jai Bhagavan 1999: 45  
|       | 9. Lytha Studios 1999: http  
|       | 10. McGinness 1999: 60  
|       | 11. McGinness 1999: 60  

| Row 3 | 1. Quantum Alchemy 1999: http  
|       | 2. Wann 1999: http  
|       | 4. O’Connell 2000: front cover  
|       | 5. willendorf@geocities.com 2000: http  
|       | 6. Fugitive Colors 2001: http  
|       | 7. Fugitive Colors 2001: http  
|       | 8. Fugitive Colors 2001: http  
|       | 10. Melanie 2001: http  
|       | 11. Melanie 2001: http |

| Row 4 | 1. Melanie 2001: http  
|       | 4. Whitehorn 2001: http  
|       | 6. Curtis 2003: DVD  
|       | 7. Golebiowski et al 2002: inside front cover  

### Rows

| Row 6 | 1. Sacred Source 2003: http  
|       | 2. Statuary 2003: http  
|       | 3. Talaria 2003: http  
|       | 5. Zell, O 2003: http  
|       | 6. Angelfire 2004: http  
|       | 7. Cartwright 2004a: http  
|       | 8. Cartwright 2004a: http  
|       | 10. Lynx UK 2004: http  
|       | 11. Meixner 2004: postcard  
|       | 12. MMII-BAS 2004: T-shirt  

| Row 7 | 1. Verschönerungs- und Museumsverein Willendorf 2004b: statue  
|       | 2. Verschönerungs- und Museumsverein Willendorf 2004d: sign  
|       | 4. Satz! 2005: http  
|       | 5. AEOIU Project 2005: http  
|       | 7. Henes 2006: http  
|       | 8. Henes 2006: http  
|       | 9. Henes 2006: http  
|       | 10. Mandarava 2006: http  
|       | 11. Mandarava 2006: http  
|       | 13. Quantum Alchemy 2006: http |

| Row 8 | 1. Sacred Source 2006: http  
|       | 2. Sacred Source 2006: http  
|       | 4. Sacred Source 2006: http  
|       | 5. Sacred Source 2006: http  
|       | 7. Satz! 2006: http  
|       | 8. Satz! 2006: http  
|       | 10. Satz! 2006: http  
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<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Curtis 2003: <a href="http://example.com">http</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Curtis 2003: <a href="http://example.com">http</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Curtis 2003: <a href="http://example.com">http</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Row 5

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Curtis 2003: <a href="http://example.com">http</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Curtis 2003: <a href="http://example.com">http</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Divas's Designs 2003: <a href="http://example.com">http</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Divas's Designs 2003: <a href="http://example.com">http</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Fugitive Colours 2003: <a href="http://example.com">http</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Fugitive Colours 2003: <a href="http://example.com">http</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Fugitive Colours 2003: <a href="http://example.com">http</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Fugitive Colours 2003: <a href="http://example.com">http</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Land Niederösterreich 2003: <a href="http://example.com">http</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Medieval Mayhem 2003: <a href="http://example.com">http</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Row 6

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Melanie 2003: <a href="http://example.com">http</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Melanie 2003: <a href="http://example.com">http</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Melanie 2003: <a href="http://example.com">http</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Melanie 2003: <a href="http://example.com">http</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Melanie 2003: <a href="http://example.com">http</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Melanie 2003: <a href="http://example.com">http</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Melanie 2003: <a href="http://example.com">http</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Melanie 2003: <a href="http://example.com">http</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Melanie 2003: <a href="http://example.com">http</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Row 7

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>catrepreneur@hotmail 2004: <a href="http://example.com">http</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>catrepreneur@hotmail 2004: <a href="http://example.com">http</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>catrepreneur@hotmail 2004: <a href="http://example.com">http</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>catrepreneur@hotmail 2004: <a href="http://example.com">http</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Fowle 2004: <a href="http://example.com">http</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>McClintock 2004: <a href="http://example.com">http</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Witchshop 2004: <a href="http://example.com">http</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Witchshop 2004: <a href="http://example.com">http</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Row 8

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>e-archetypes 2005: <a href="http://example.com">http</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Moon 2005: <a href="http://example.com">http</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Wabi Sabi 2005: <a href="http://example.com">http</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Wabi Sabi 2005: <a href="http://example.com">http</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Amazon.com 2006: <a href="http://example.com">http</a> [image 1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Amazon.com 2006: <a href="http://example.com">http</a> [image 2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Amazon.com 2006: <a href="http://example.com">http</a> [image 3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Mandarava 2006: <a href="http://example.com">http</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Ting Hua Liu 2006: <a href="http://example.com">http</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Wabi Sabi 2006: <a href="http://example.com">http</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Zynnya 2008: <a href="http://example.com">http</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix G

Willendorf Discourse & Agenda Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ac</th>
<th>Academic Agenda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Com</td>
<td>Commercial Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cre</td>
<td>Creative Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Em</td>
<td>Emancipatory Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fem</td>
<td>Feminist Discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib</td>
<td>Liberal Humanist Discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>New-Age Discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop</td>
<td>Popularising Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Poststructuralist Discourse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>Promotional Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sci</td>
<td>Scientific Discourse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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