PLAYFULNESS SEEMS TO BE PLAYILLNESS

Lenka KLIMEŠOVÁ

ABSTRACT

Paper introduces the main concepts of playillness theory. Playillness theory is about playfulness elements which complicate an interpretation of artwork in comparison with contemporary new media fields in digital and visual arts culture. Where is the border between playing and art creativity? What is the difference between children game and artistic game? Can be a toy an artwork? Is device art trashy? I describe the importance of discussion about these questions by using ludic interfaces and visual culture studies. I focus on common playfulness similarities between game and art elements leading to wrong interpretation of both terms. Outline the artistic rules in comparison with game rules. How can we combine them for getting our own goal? We can use artistic rules for improving commercial game, but it will be still commercial game. We can use game rules in artwork and it will be still artwork. Playfulness is an integral part of *homo ludens* and *Ludic Society*. We can apply it where and how we want. This seems to be dangerously playillness. My paper explains the theory of playillness and its meaning in digital visual arts and *ludic culture.*

1. GAME CONCEPTS AS A PART OF HUMAN CHARACTER

Play processes describing by Roger Caillois show basically various personal characters. *Agôn* as a workaholic (have to still work on own success), *alea* as an introvert (hope and wait for something is happen), *mimicry* as an extrovert (express yourself) and *ilinx* as a melancholic (need to feel the adrenaline and not have any fear of possible consequences). Then we have two counterparts here – *ludus* and *paidia* that can transform all four principles mentioned above. *Ludus* reminds an intelligence and *paidia* feeling. Nowadays a special type of *ludus* is represented by a hobby. Hobby allows to use natural creativity of each of us. We want and need to do our hobby without any coercive means and that's why it has an undisputed impact on cultural creativity and innovation. *Ludus* shows the limits of body and at the same time its almost infinite possibilities. When you find out your body limits then you start to use *paidia.*

The term game has various meanings. I perceive it more from ludic interfaces and visual culture studies. What is important for me is that I found next conceptual interpretation of my own artistic work. I make mostly performance where use a self-portrait as a mask and body as a disguise. *"Mask (...) liberates the true personality."* [1] This creative process straight related to *mimicry* term from the text. Just because of the term performance is taken from the theatre. *Mimicry* *"...exhibits all the characteristics of play: liberty, convention,*

suspension of reality, and delimination of space and time." [2]
Mimicry is something for "*to-be-looked-at-ness*". During the following of mimicry it is easy to get lost yourself and stay alone with own obsession or dependence. *Ilinx* "*...is a question of surrendering to a kind of spasm, seizure, or shock which destroys reality with sovereign brusqueness.*" [3] It describes here the same conditions like for *gaze* in the context of gender studies.

2. IS DEVICE ART TRASHY?
Machiko Kusahara tries to transform artworks into commercial products. She applies device art theory on the Euro-American art history background. It is not possible. The main difference is in the cultural concept and perception. What is art in Japan is not art in Europe or America context at all.
She compares Duchamp in the context of Japanese culture. Duchamp provoked people with the question what all is art. His objects are not useful nor for personal use. Device art makes from art a product. Duchamp criticized the products and commerce.
Kusahara introduces device art from Japan and analyzes how these artists transformed their artworks into successful commercial products, and what are key issues in it. Who needs to know this? I don't know but what is the worst thing for artist from my cultural background is to make from artwork such a product. This means a death of artwork as well as artist.
When I see the trashy videos from Maywa Denki I have to compare it with children shows in my country (e.g. Jů a Hele show). Are these shows also art? Should be the art? Definitely not. Device art is a theory without consistent research. It needs to be compare and investigate from more cultural backgrounds.
From my point of view, device art is more toy than art at all. Device art is pretty trashy. Of course it is possible that some kind of device art has more artistic concept than someone else. In this case we are standing before the same problem how to recognize common game from art game. You can call art by many names and use various artistic forms. Border of art is made by using any form in artistic way. That means use the form to show its own borders, not just use it in common way. Device art doesn't do that.

3. MORE PLAYFULNESS LESS PLAYILLNESS
Playillness theory is about playfulness elements which complicate an interpretation of artwork in comparison with contemporary new media fields in digital and visual arts culture. Playillness raised from the extension of the playful thinking in Euro-American culture during 20th and 21st century. Nature of playillness lies in its ubiquity. I am interested especially in playilness elements in visual art field. It is very difficult to use "new" media and at the same time be critical and able to resist the effects of the media. But this attention should be the condition for artists working for the first time with any technology or paradigm. For example if we want to define playfulness as first we choose the clearest element of playing – game. Then when we see

any playful element automatically think about game. We can find playful element also in art. Now there is no problem to see the art element as well as in game. I would like to describe interpretation rules to distinguish common game from artwork with playillness elements.

Game supports a stereotypical thinking. Art fights against it. The game is not narrative nor interactive, it is pure simulation. [4] Structure of game gaze is nearer to film gaze instead of art gaze. Artist does not tolerate a simulation. Artist seeks the truth. The best examples of artistic playfulness we can see in various workshops, labs and collaborative residences.

"*Playfulness is made up of five component and distinguishable dimensions of cognitive spontaneity, social spontaneity, physical spontaneity, manifest joy, and sense of humor.*" [5] These five components finally show some common qualities in both art and game. They also make the most frequently topics for discussion during interpretation.

The concept of everywhere creativity represents a new way of life. Use your creativity, find the game principle in your everyday life and enjoy the playillness ideology! Ideology until that time you realize it. Who is playing is who not naughty.

Playfulness is the main part of *homo ludens* and *ludic culture*. The term of new human kind *homo ludens* contains the consequence of playillness. Playillness is no longer viewed as a problem but as a playful ecosystem. [6] The only evidence of game is when we realize we are playing.

REFERENCES
[1] CAILLOIS Roger. *Man, play and games.* p. 21
[2] CAILLOIS, ibid., p. 22
[3] CAILLOIS, ibid., p. 23
[4] AARSETH, Espen. *Genre Trouble : Narrativism and the Art of Simulation.* In: HARRIGAN, Pat, WARDRIP-FRUIN, Noah (ed.), *First Person : New Media as Story, Performance and Game,* p. 52
[5] BARNETT, A. Lynn. *The Adaptive Powers of Being Playful.* In: AYCOCK, Alan, et al. (ed.), *Diversions and Divergences in Fields of Play.* Greenwood Publishing Group : 1998, p. 100-1
[6] Nicolas Bourriaud

LITERATURES
AARSETH, Espen. *Genre Trouble : Narrativism and the Art of Simulation.* In: HARRIGAN, Pat, WARDRIP-FRUIN, Noah (ed.), First Person : New Media as Story, Performance and Game, MIT Press, 2004, p. 331.
BARNETT, A. Lynn. *The Adaptive Powers of Being Playful.* In: AYCOCK, Alan, et al. (ed.), *Diversions and Divergences in Fields of Play.* Greenwood Publishing Group, 1998, p. 299.
BOURRIAUD, Nicolas. *Postprodukce.* Praha : Tranzit, 2004, p. 106.
CAILLOIS Roger. *Man, play and games.* First Illinois, 2001, p. 224.
SALEN Katie, ZIMMERMAN Eric. *Rules of Play : Game Design Fundamentals.* MIT Press, 2004, p. 672.