

ceived its name. The performance between body and landscape (and technology) leaves behind relational traces, and viewers affectively incorporate them. My multidimensional images are occurrences between a moving body, a dynamic landscape / ground, technology and technique, and a continuously sensing audience.⁴

These examples by Rokeby, Driessens and Verstappen, Bolivar, and myself all intervene in the continuous relations between embodiment and vision. As Mark B. N. Hansen might say, they go beyond the aesthetic perception of the object and have us encounter the image as 'image to the power of image', a 'topology where image infinitely exceeds object' (Hansen, 2004: 205).⁵ Vestigial-vision artworks no longer belong only to the visual order of representation. They rather perform and visualize some of the various forces that act upon how we look and see. In other words, the ongoing constitution of art, viewer, vision, and matter, both are, and point to, more than the sum of their parts.

'Tangible-Temporality'

The tangible-temporality thematic places emphasis on the relational and mutual immanence of embodiment and time. After all, bodies are not only *present*, but *potent*, in and of time. They are coincidental with the potentials of past and future. If time is understood merely as many "presents" in succession, writes Massumi, then 'nothing exists outside of the march of the boxed-in' (Massumi, 2002: 200). The past and future always 'resonate in the present,' are in continuity with one another, smudging one another, where a body dissolves out of 'what it is just ceasing to be, into what it will already have become by the time it registers something has happened' (Massumi, 2002: 200). Bodies and matter *are* change, and a tangible-temporality reading of a given work of art gives primacy to the transitional and potentialized smudgings between past and future matters. This thematic is intended to help unpack art that asks us to investigate, perhaps amongst other things, the continuous and relational feedback loops between time and material performance. It will be utilized to concisely look

at Brandon Labelle's *Death of the Composer, or All Tongues Are Mothers* (2001), David Rokeby's *Machine for Taking Time (Boul. Saint-Laurent)* (2007), Jessica Meuninck-Ganger's *Position / Opposition* (2010) alongside her and my collaborative *Distill Life* series (2009 and ongoing), and John F. Simon Jr's *Every Icon* (1997) alongside Arthur Ganson's *Machine with Concrete* (1992).

Brandon Labelle understands and works with sound because it is 'inherently and unignorably relational' (Labelle, 2007a). He writes that it 'emanates, propagates, communicates, vibrates, and agitates; it leaves a body and enters others; it binds and unhinges, harmonizes and traumatizes; it sends the body moving, the mind dreaming, and the air oscillating' (Labelle, 2007a). Here Labelle is dedicated to action, affect, embodiment, materiality, and, most of all, relationality. He argues that sound is always spatial, temporal, and relational, and describes it as a force that makes and unmakes, passes through and between. As an artist, he shows interest in both the social aspects of relational aesthetics that Nicolas Bourriaud puts forward, and the embodied and material relationality 'in excess' that this book considers foundational for approaches to media art.

Labelle's seven minute and twenty-nine second audio piece *Death of the Composer, or All Tongues are Mothers*, which could just as easily be read with the social-anatomies thematic, was created as part of his *Social Music* radio series in 2001. The program attempted to 'create a conceptual framework' that allowed for, in fact explicitly invited, 'outside influence or social input in determining sound production' (Labelle, 2007b). *Social Music*, as a series and project, aimed to generate 'musical and sonic activities that sought out public space, social interaction, spatial discoveries – found sounds, phenomenological tests, conversations between friends' (Labelle, 2007b). It was itself a social and participatory project that spawned several potentialized works of art.

I choose to analyze *Death of the Composer* because of how it exemplifies transformation over and with time, and to offer an alternative to Labelle's social reading of his own work. For this piece, Labelle first read aloud – and recorded – his curatorial statement for *Social Music*, some of which is in the previous paragraph. Following this, he

had five different volunteers individually listen to his reading and try to simultaneously repeat what they heard as it played back for them. He then remixed the recordings as an accumulation, and repeated the process of listening, speaking, and layering until 'a chorus of misreadings, mishearings and misspeakings appeared' as a per-formed audio track (Labelle, 2007b). In other words, Labelle's embodied speaker-listeners perform his track's continuous potential while quite literally on the cusp of the virtual present. This is then made to virtually appear (to become aurally apparent) to his listeners.

Labelle argues that with *Death of the Composer*, the artwork, its context, and its audience, all emerge in and around 'the random interplay of phenomena' and towards 'the formation of what we could call a "public"' (Labelle, 2007b). I would say, further, that in *Death of the Composer*'s performative creation, the speaker-listener, as body and time, is introduced to and as a continuous but moving loop, between the pre-formed recordings of the audio files' past participants, and the per-formed, new recording by its 'current' (or rather, future) ones. Here we are engaged as physical beings and becomings, simultaneously listening and stuttering over that which we attempt to repeat, preaccelerating to the next moment of materialization. Labelle writes that the piece 'shows how communication is never direct or without faults but always influenced by factors outside' (Labelle, 2005). The same might be said about what it reveals, unravels, and disrupts in both time and bodies. Neither is direct or without faults; they influence one another and the outside, continuous smudgings of past and future affects, potentially present bodily and material moving-thinking-feelings.

David Rokeby's sculpture and installation, *Machine for Taking Time (Boul. St-Laurent)*,⁶ commissioned for the Langlois Foundation in Montréal, algorithmically explores a database of over 750,000 images in real time. The artist initially used two high-resolution cameras on motorized pan-tilt mounts to capture 1024 images off each of the east and west sides of the Foundation building every day for an entire year. These sequential images encapsulate both the movements of the sky in relation to the earth, and the landscape in relation to the camera. For the installation, two computers randomly but fluidly concatenate

pans over the landscape of the city, but from different times. In other words, while we see a smooth movement of the camera in relation to its surroundings as if it were a single, continuous shot, each frame actually jumps to a completely different time of day and year, making an uncanny traversal of human space, with non-human time. Rokeby explains that sometimes the software and compiled moving image follow a standard trajectory, allowing viewers to follow the scanning eye of the camera easily, but at other moments they slip across several days in very quick succession, while only moving from one position to the next.

Rokeby's mechatronic cameras capture successive and mobile moments in the emergence of time, to illuminate the impossibility of a static material-temporality. The piece plays on how our re-memberings always traverse and jump around in time as our bodies relate to the past and our actions in it. But here, we see and feel those jumps. We follow the movement of the camera's pan as if it were in the present, a live and uncut image. We mistake the changes in time as a play of the light. And finally, we are open to, experience, and practice, an / other form of time unfolding. What any description or still image fails to convey is how the artist's stitched together video sequences have a wondrous and pulsating glow about them, a visceral throbbing of light and shadow that reflects the flux and movements of time in and as and with space and an embodied landscape.

We move between seasons, see leaves and snow and bodies and objects appear and disappear, watch sunrise and sunset at different times of day, all in the span of seconds. We experience the temporal city through its transitioning clouds and sun overhead, the changing of the seasons, the ongoing but disrupted and intermingled gestures of the earth and sky and their inhabitants. One critic argues that the 'present does not tick away with the seconds on the clock; it is instead a moment where images of the past are fused into a reconstructed memory. From the deconstruction of time is built a present where expectation is enriched with illusion' (Gagnon, 2007). I do not believe this work is about the 'construction' or deconstruction of time as enriched with 'illusion.' It is, rather, time and its corporeal and incorporeal matters and mattering made visible in all their potential,



Figure 34 | Jessica Meuninck-Ganger | *Position / Opposition*, 2011 | artist book installation, 2.2 m high x 1.2m x 10m

intervened in as a continuously constituting and relational sensible concept. The video we see flows linearly in *our* time-body-space, all the while accenting its undirected traversals through *its* time-body-space. Here the smudgings of time and the landscape are composed as neither object nor concept, neither material nor category; both / and: a relation that is of both object and concept, both material and category. Watching a slow pan over an hour can feel like minutes or months or years in any given 'moment,' an en- and unfolding of the potential of time found in the seemingly subtle movements of the camera and its surroundings. The work shows continuity between body and time, and like a topological figure, coincides with its own transformation.

Jessica Meuninck-Ganger produces works on paper and participatory installations, all with narrative components, and with an understanding of narrative, storytelling, and memoir as inherently time-based. Her large-scale book art installation at GALLERY AOP in Johannesburg, South Africa, plays with the book as a material and temporal medium that asks us to move through time and space and

matter as always embodied in relation. Although trained as a traditional printmaker – the first of mass media technologies co-opted by artists for interventionist means – Meuninck-Ganger, writes Max Yela, 'is not drawn to that medium in order to edition images. Rather, she prefers printmaking as an organizing process for the investigation of experiences' (Yela, 2011). More than that, I would argue that she invites us to experience and practice time and narrative as non-linear and bodily.

Over two meters high and ten meters long when open, Meuninck-Ganger's *Position / Opposition* (Figure 34) is an accordion book that we walk in and around, and are invited to fold and open and look through – since each of the prints is both translucent and cut apart, so as to reveal the space and people around it, the rest of the book, and the spacetimes each re-presents. Most fascinating about Meuninck-Ganger's process is that each fragmented 'print' in her installation is actually made of many, stitched-together editions from the same copper plate. The images break apart with each inking up and pressing down through the printing press, making time apparent: every smaller print in the installation's huge and porous sheets of paper is lighter and more degraded than the last. Time materializes by leaving its traces in the print, while printing manifests as something time-based. The result is that we can see and feel in each large 'page,' and the book as a whole, how time comes to matter, and how materials age, in relation to each other. And we encounter those temporal substances through and with and as each other's bodies and times in the gallery space.

My collaborations with Meuninck-Ganger combine her interests in embodied and participatory narratives, along with my approach to multidimensional and time-based images. In our *Distill Life* series, Meuninck-Ganger and I work with both old and new media as continuously mediated, conceptual-material formations. In short, we permanently mount translucent prints and drawings directly on top of video screens, creating 'moving images on paper.' We incorporate technologies and aesthetics from traditional printmaking – including woodblock, silk screen, etching, lithography, photogravure, and so on – with the technologies and aesthetics of contemporary digital, video, and networked art, to amplify images as *always* potentialized. Poten-



Figure 35. Jessica Meuninck-Ganger and Nathaniel Stern | *Keep to the Path*, 2009 | 11 x 14 inches, photo etching + LCD with video

tialized images re-member along with us; they embody more than we see in their frame; they potentially activate cross-modal sensation, past memories, and future possibilities. While the paper prints in our work are made with stones, silk screens, inks, and copper plates, the LCD (Liquid Crystal Display) screens are store-bought and hacked digital photo frames used as assisted ready-mades to display animation, machinima, and live-captured video footage.⁷ Here potentialization is doubly performed: forever looping images are overlaid with the suspension of time and space in that very same image.

Meuninck-Ganger and I use strategies from print and video to speak back to their own histories, narratives, timelines, and matters. Print artists have always been technological and referential, as well as somewhat anachronistic in their continual re-appropriation of 'dead' (what some call 'zombie') editioning tools. Many video artists, too, have a fascination with 'extendedness and repetition,' but 'change it; the phenomenology shifts from the artist to the viewer who becomes the locus of extension' (Ridgway, 2010: 2). Our juxtaposition of these disparate methods, materials, and content enables novel approaches to understanding each. Nicole Ridgway writes, the work expands 'our conception of printmaking and digital image making, while nimbly reminding us that art is always made in the margins of other art' (Ridgway, 2010: 14). In the context of the tangible-temporality thematic, I refer to a discussion I had with Erin Manning about the work.

She said these pieces emphasize the uneasiness of images with respect to this or that time and place, this or that event. The focus on the 'multidimensionality of the image gives the viewer a sense of an uncanny doubling that is always more than two – a multiplicity in the viewing' (Manning, 2010a). Manning gives *Keep to the Path* (Figure 35) – where Red Hat Society ladies continuously loop and overlap one another beneath a static black and white etching – as a case in point. 'There is a background / foregrounding of ephemerality (the trees as muted as the characters), overlaid by the drawing of a character who trembles between different layerings. This trembling gives a sense that the image cannot hold still' (Manning, 2010a), and neither can *our* sense of time and place *with* it. *Keep to the Path* is an intervention into the space-time of a straight and narrow 'path.' It literally blurs matter and time and space, and our experience and practice thereof.

Finally, inspired by conceptual and minimalist artists such as Sol LeWitt and Lawrence Wiener, new media practitioner John F. Simon, Jr. gained prominence in the late 1990s for his unlimited edition Java applet, *Every Icon* (Figure 36). In a 1999 interview, the artist calls his piece an 'activated idea' (Baumgaertel and Simon, 1999). *Every Icon* begins as a simple grid of 32 x 32 small white squares. In animated sequence, from left to right, top to bottom, each square slowly fills with every digital gradation of white-through-grey-through-black until it shows every single black and white combination of 'images' possible within its frame. It begins as an empty grid, and then at a speed of 100 variations per second, fills in the first square, then the second square, then displays all possible combinations with these two squares, and so on. Here we see white, then 253 different grays, then black, in the first square with white in the second; then white, then 253 different grays, then black, in the first square with the first level of grey in the second square; and so on, until we have every combination in the first two squares, then three squares, up until every combination of 1024 squares has been shown, each with 255 colors. In other words, Simon's artwork is a computer icon that 'basically counts forward, from 0 to 10 to the 308th power,' which, he says, is significantly larger than 'the number of atoms in the universe' (Baumgaertel and Simon, 1999). It takes about one year simply to show all possible variations on *Every*