

How should we approach writing a review of such a seemingly inconsequential event? It was so fleeting in comparison to the time we've spent considering writing about it, I'm not sure if it even merits a place within this dialogue. What is it that we're expected to review and what is our role as reviewer/s?

The main element of reviewing is surely to judge something. You may read into it critically, theoretically, but all of the words that you write are basically decorative. They are decorating your judgement of something as good, bad, boring, interesting, etc. This is essentially the point of the review.

But the review supersedes the initial event, therefore the reviewer has a great deal of responsibility in terms of the enduring status of the reviewed. Does that mean by merely alluding to the initial event, the starting point for this discussion, we're neglecting our duties to record and sustain it?

If the role of us, as reviewers, or of this review, is to sustain the initial event –

–that isn't the role of the reviewer but it is a definite function of reviewing, particularly in the absence of other documentation–

- then perhaps we are neglecting our duty by choosing not to refer to it specifically. But if this review is *part* of the work, then perhaps the work is also about the nature of reviewing. Rather than simply being expected to write a review, we are being asked to appropriate the form of a review and the role of reviewer/s in order to explore something about the nature of documentation, mediation and representation.

As mediators we have absolute power in the sense that what we write will be an enduring record of the work of Rosie Farrell. The fact that we are also part of the work is key to the whole thing. This somehow diminishes our power. I'm not exactly sure how.

Because what we write won't be an enduring record of the work of Rosie Farrell, what we write is the work or is at least a component of the work. As the initial event was so underwhelming surely the significant part of the work is its documentation i.e. the reviews.

This leads me to wonder about the audience. If the reviews are the work, is the audience of the work the readers of the Liverpool Echo in which the reviews are printed? Surely this review would not be appropriate or relevant to such an audience, leading the reviewer to conclude that the work is disengaging! But I feel confident that the audience is elsewhere.

In this series of encounters various audiences seem to be used almost as red herrings. The primary audience, who were present at the initial event whilst labelled clearly as such, were only witness to the initial event, which we have concluded is *not the work*. Or at least only *part* of the work. The Liverpool Echo readers have a similar role. Whilst being primary *readers* of the reviews, they are not really an *audience* for the work. Until Rosie brings all of the various stages of the project together and presents the work as a whole to a new set of viewers, there will be no real audience.

Ironically, it is an act by Rosie that is needed to bring all the various elements of the work together, so in the end it is the artist who will act as a final mediator between the work and the audience.