

Interactive comment on “Boundary|Time|Surface: Art and geology meet in Gros Morne National Park, Newfoundland, Canada” by Sydney A. Lancaster and John W. F. Waldron

Simone Rödder (Referee)

simone.roedder@uni-hamburg.de

Received and published: 10 June 2020

The paper presents an outdoor ephemeral art installation situated at the intersection of land art and the discipline of geology. While not a research paper in a narrow sense, the paper outlines the rationale for the artwork, presents its science as well as arts context, describes its methodology and set-up, the installation process and results in the form of lasting documentations as well as audience reception. In my view, the title in its current form captures this overall scope well and should not be changed to include one of the sub-points mentioned above.

With its idea to add a scientific publication to the range of lasting documentations of the

Printer-friendly version

Discussion paper



artwork (this could be made more explicit in the paper as another goal), the manuscript in my view is pertinent to the journal and deserves the attention of the geoscience community.

From my point of view as a social scientist, however, the paper in its current form strongly reflects the background of its author team, an artist and a geoscientist. The chapter on the history of the C-O boundary (2.3.) serves to motivate the selection of the installation site, yet it is too long and detailed for requirements. In addition, some of the jargon should be explained (e.g., stratotype) or removed (e.g., stratigraphic codes) to make the paper accessible to a broad audience.

In a background chapter, the artwork presented in the paper is situated in an arts context. What the paper lacks, however, is a more systematic conceptualization of the social context of the project (2.1), and namely the art-science collaboration. In the social sciences, the term "boundary" is regularly used to refer to communication between professional worlds such as arts and science. Art-science collaborations then can be understood themselves as communication across boundaries including boundary work and boundary objects (e.g., Rödder 2017, "The climate of science-art and the art-science of the climate: Meeting points, boundary objects and boundary work". *Minerva*, 55). I think the paper would greatly benefit (& could address some of the other referees' concerns) by a more theoretical grounding of its concept of art-science, including a clearer and more explicit reflection on the many notions of boundaries that 'surface' in the paper: manifest, metaphorical-symbolic, permanent, positive (fixed points, security), negative (separation, exclusion).

I. 293 I think the economic interest should not be mentioned explicitly in a scientific paper.

Interactive comment on Geosci. Commun. Discuss., <https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-2020-2>, 2020.

[Printer-friendly version](#)[Discussion paper](#)