

CHAPTER 10

THE PRIVILEGED SPACE OF PHOTOGRAPHY AND PAINTING

Two things stand out when we look at a painting. The first is: no matter where we move relative to it, its image does not change substantially. It can look bigger or smaller if we move closer or further away, but we can never see it from a different angle because it is two-dimensional. An object now to the left of another one will always remain so, as will an object nearer to us than another. We never can move among the trees of a forest, they are always "over there". The work refuses to yield its space to us, the space remains aloof. The laws of perspective that affect how we see objects in a shared space have been nullified. The work's reality lives as an illusion held behind the frame, just beyond our reach. As in film the artistic space is physically inaccessible. The second thing is that, unlike film, no matter how long we wait, nothing seems to change in the painting. The wind never blows in the forest, the person walking down the forest path never takes another step. Surely there was a past leading up to this moment, and a future that ought to ensue from it. Space has become strong enough that not only can it exclude us from being within it, but also can freeze out our time from whatever time may be occurring within its space. The wind of our time blows across its surface but never stirs it to life. If only we could penetrate into the work, enter into its space, be next to the characters, surely then they would come to life, the leaves of the trees would start stirring in the breeze. On either side of the portal, perhaps time continues to flow, but they do invisibly to each other.

> NARRATION

Literature has the ability to narrate or describe any subject at all. It can relate a story line involving human characters. It can create a beautiful description of a scene from nature or just an everyday object. It can also artistically describe an abstract concept or idea, although most would label this prose. A painting can represent an excerpt from a story involving human characters. It can depict a landscape or a still life of everyday objects. Painting can also be abstract¹. It is however through representative examples of literature and of painting that we can establish the clearest link across the middle of the spectrum to connect the last temporal and the first spatial arts.

It is at least theoretically possible that in literature the subject of a narration can itself be something that is unchanging in time, for instance a narrative description of a painting. We have already seen that in taking time to describe what occurs *during* time, literature creates a side channel to the main flow of time that had been in the action. Once action can be forestalled so that the description of it can be given at leisure, the possibility exists of indefinitely postponing the resumption of the action. The description turns inward and begins to dwell more and more on itself. What was a side channel becomes a still pool. It no longer empties back into the main flow of the action further downstream in time. At best we can conjecture that at some time in the past perhaps, before what is being described now, the flow in which we stand split off from the flow of some action in progress. We ourselves did not witness that separation. We are caught between a past we cannot see and a future we cannot see where perhaps the action resumes.

What benefit is there to prolonging indefinitely the narration of an action? While an action may have been its occasion, the return to the action meant the end of whatever merit the narration of that action had on its own. While the verbal narration in literature had the property of extending itself in time indefinitely as it strives to stay true to the moment it would describe, visual narration can select a single image that locks up within it all the worthwhile aesthetic relations and qualities that could emanate from the moment being described, and then offer us an indefinite amount of time to unlock them as we ponder the image.

Earlier on the spectrum, action served the purpose of occasioning narration. Eventually narration took over from action, and then took a form that need no longer change with time. The image is free to comment on itself, outside its own time, through its spatial form. When caught in the onward thrust of an action, we do not have time to ponder all the ramifications of any particular moment in the process. If we had, we would realized what the present boded and have time to prepare ourselves to react to it. With painting we can contemplate at our leisure the significance of what was but a moment in time.

If the narrator in the painting still wishes to capture more of a story than what exists in a single moment of time, s/he can choose a salient image that epitomizes the story in addition to presenting something significant enough on its own to attract our attention. By applying human-meaning (see chapter one) the viewer can hypothesize a past leading up to the moment depicted and a future that may ensue from it.

> TWO DISJUNCT SPACES

Imagine that at certain magic moments in our lives, a portal appears in the middle of the air in our everyday space through which we get an enticing but limited view into another world. Like children pressing their faces against the window pane of a toy store, for a while we are held thrall to its vision. We loose sight of the rest of everyday space around us. If, however, we move away from the portal, the image vanishes. Such is the painting or photography. They allow us access to different realm that would, anywhere else in the everyday world, remain invisible^{x1}.

A blank film screen or a blank canvas does not suggest a space different from ours, but when occupied by figures and shapes, which relate to each other on a different spatial scale than ours, we become aware that what the screen holds is a space other than our own. The gap between our space and the space of the work cannot be bridged *through* space, just as in literature there was no bridge between external space and the space of the imagination (the space in which the book physically exists in our hands and the space conjured up by the words in the book). The space in our imagination extended in every direction without limit. The same is true of the space of a painting. Though we have a limited view of it through the portal of the picture frame, we trust that it extends indefinitely. The frame, by intervening where it does, rather than limiting the potential painting space, prevents a situation from arising where we would have confirmed that there *was* a limit to its extent. As it is, neither our space, nor the work's, though each infinite in extension, extends into the other. They do not wrap around each other, surround each other, or absorb each other. Each can extend indefinitely without there being any point in common between them. They simply interface at a portal that we call the frame. Only if we try to move to a different position in our space in order to see more of the work's space, are we reminded that our movements are in a different space

because they do not produce the expected results in the artistic space. However, the part we see is usually sufficient for us. We do not have to prove the rest is there.

> THE FRAME

When we first approach a work of art it must be from within the everyday reality; we cannot approach it already from within its own reality. The work must accommodate itself in some way to the everyday reality, be tolerated by it until it has an opportunity to then proceed in its own way. To do this the work sometimes tries at first to resemble the everyday reality. The words of the poem are the same words as we use in everyday speech, but gradually separate from the latter, and weave their own spell through metric insistence and re-proportioned use of sounds. Figuratively or literally, some sort of frame surrounds most works and excludes distracting material from outside the artistic environment. In music, the work is held in the figurative embrace of time between a beginning and ending. In film there is a screen, which acts both as a barrier between the artistic space and the everyday space and the means by which we see from the latter into the former. In literature there is the figurative screen or curtain of the eyelids which reveal the imaginary space within. In painting there is often a literal frame, and it serves to connect yet separate the two spaces.

The frame of the film encloses the action that we see but it does not limit space to what is contained within the frame at any given moment. Different parts of the artistic space were brought at different times within the center of the screen. If two characters were talking while they walked, they would not, as in theatre, have to move back and forth in order to remain within the view of the audience. Artistic space moved fluidly with regard to the portal to it in the everyday space. In theatre we shared the same space with the actors, when the scene changed we were brought with the actors to a new location. With painting the frame not only intervenes between two spaces as it does in film, but the space on the other side of the frame freezes out time on our side, so that we no longer see changes of locale in space³.

As long as the boundary of the frame remains inviolable, the surrounding everyday reality cannot close in by virtue of its predominant weight and flood the small gap in the everyday space containing the artistic space. To this end, as we shall see shortly, it is important that the web of cause not extend across the frame but effect break down. Otherwise the significance of the work would be that of a *detail* of a larger reality rather than being enough to stand for a different reality. If I paint my house, I am painting over a portion of the everyday reality. If I paint inside a frame, I am creating a different reality. Its boundaries, thanks to the frame, are *not* the frame but extend indefinitely. The painter cannot paint over the entire world, but can paint something that, because it is detached from the everyday reality, can "stand in" for the latter. What the painter has to say about this reality within the frame can be a statement about what the world at large *is*, *could* be, or *should* be like. We can then impute what we want of the painterly reality back into our everyday reality.

By holding the everyday reality outside, the frame also acts to amplify what it holds within it. In this the frame acts somewhat like a mirror⁴. Like a room with mirrors on either end, which can therefore seem to go indefinitely in length, relationships between parts of the painting are echoed and reechoed because the eye usually turns back inwards when it arrives at the outer boundary of

the picture. Every path outwards eventually leads inwards. The relationships within the frame become more and more known as we recycle over them. Our awareness is like a perfectly elastic billiard ball which remains forever in motion. A sculpture achieves something similar by being self-contained in three-dimensions. To continue observing a sculpture we must remain visually attached to its surface and not turn outward. When we get to architecture the frame turns into a portal that though it separates the space of the work from the everyday space, is permeable to our own physical self. We can cross back and forth between the two spaces.

There is often a change in scale at the boundary of the painting's frame. The city or the human figures depicted in the painting usually exist in a smaller scale than in the everyday reality (though it is also possible that what is depicted is shown larger "than life"). Noting this change helps the painting maintain its spatial reality vis-à-vis the everyday reality by making it seem that a significant extent of space is contained in a frame though the frame is but a small part of the everyday space⁵.

Even if a frame is put around a portion of the everyday reality, the significance of what is now surrounded is at heightened by virtue of the fact that it is no longer constrained to enter into attenuating relationships with numberless other elements in the larger environment which draw it outwards. A part is now the whole.

Here are two analogies for the function of the frame. If I make a ring out of my thumb and index fingers, I find that if I hold the ring close to my eyes and look through it, I can continue seeing the same fixed object in the external environment even if I move the ring around so that my eye sees at one time through the right portion of the ring and the left portion of the ring at another. If, however, I hold the ring at arms length, a slight repositioning of the ring will cause an object to drift from being seen inside the ring to outside the ring. [diagram] If I think of the frame of the painting as a ring, then it would appear as if the ring is placed far from my body, in fact at the same distance as the objects I see through it. It is as if I am looking through a magnifying glass that remains attached to the surface behind it.

A second analogy would be a peephole. I am walking down a commercial street along a solid wall on the other side of which is a private garden. I come to a tiny hole in the wall. When I look through it I see something that was not only invisible before, but also of a highly unexpected nature. Without the peephole I would have remained ignorant of the presence of the other reality. It is observable only within the small aperture of the hole. Since the aperture is close to our eyes and far from the eyes of any people who may be in the garden, they will tend not be aware of me. As in film, I am a voyeur. The two spaces are connected tenuously, just through the hole, and it is the same with the frame. The wall containing the peephole is thick (the difference between the two realities is profound). As I rest my eye on one end of it, the end in my space, I can only see what lies straight ahead of it in the other reality. I cannot extend my view up or down, left or right. When I try to I see only the sides of the tunnel of the peephole. A peephole affords us our only awareness of another space but at the same time limits our view of it. We must always see the other space through at minimum the thickness of the wall, we can never enter it.

> WE CAN'T CHANGE OUR PERSPECTIVE ON THE WORK

In theatre we were protected from injurious consequences of the action by removing ourselves to a safe distance. We still, however, were in a continuous space with the action. If we wanted, we could approach the action and interact with it, thus changing how the work evolved through time. With film and again in painting we can no longer interfere with the work even if we wanted to. This is made apparent to us if we try to effect a change in the appearance of the scene depicted by changing our position relative to it. Our motions are of little avail. The reason is that we moving in our space, and not in its. In painting we are still in the most general sense in the presence of narration in that we are seeing the vision of someone else's eyes. We dependent on where they are in space. This restriction will lift with sculpture in the round.

If we look through a door or a window, movement on our side of the opening changes and adds to what we see of the other side. The laws of perspective geometry exist over the unified space that includes both sides. This is true also of a mirror even though both sides of the portal represent the same portion of the everyday reality. With the painting we never see any more of its space than we do at present. What seems to lie outside us, in fact lies inside an impassable barrier. This inside, visible but unobtainable in painting, becomes invisible and unobtainable in sculpture, and then becomes both visible and obtainable in architecture.

Camelot appears only rarely and a hundred years apart in time. Painting appears to us all the time but at only one moment of its time. The duality of seeming complete but never seeing that completeness (either in time or space) is a significant part of the aesthetic of painting. As we go from left to right across the spectrum, to gain control time, space at first would seem to need to make itself immune from the effects of our time in the everyday reality. At the boundary of the everyday and painting spaces, cause and effect cannot get across. Only later on the spectrum will space risk, with new found strength, to interact with the everyday reality.

Here is a summary of the ways in which our own motion fails to produce changes in the appearance of the image in the painting. If we move higher or lower, left or right, nothing new appears in the painting. There seems to be but one line of direction in space between us and the painting. If we move to a different place, the scene in the painting still looks as if we are looking at it from the same direction. In the everyday space, if a nearby object lies in the same line of sight as an object further away, and we move to the left, the nearer object moves to the right of the further object. This does not happen in a painting with regard to objects depicted as being at different distances from us. The same objects always line up with the same objects further away, regardless of how we try to move in our space. By shifting our position, and the various components of what we do see never change their apparent position relative to each other

What seems remote in the painting will always remain remote no matter how we try to adjust our position. If we walk away from the canvas, all objects in the painting, regardless of their purported distance from each other, get smaller at the same rate. The mountain in the distance grows smaller as rapidly as the tree in the foreground. If a house is depicted as if we see it from a quarter of a mile away, and we double our distance from the canvas by moving several paces, the house will shrink to the size it would have if we were seeing it from a distance of a half a mile. Are we giants striding a quarter of a mile in just several steps or are we mortals who have moved several feet? The rate of change in the size of objects contradicts their allegation of relative size.

If we move towards the space of the painting, we feel that we should be able to enter its space. The objects that appear in the foreground should seem to move apart to let us through. Instead we bump into a canvas, which though it holds the image of the painting is also the barrier that keeps us out of the image's space. Even before bumping into the canvas, something else happens to keep the painting's reality from us. The objects dissolve in front of our eyes, changing into objects of a very different nature: brush strokes. Motion towards the painting's reality thus breaks the spell that creates that reality. We see pigment as pigment and no longer as being something else. We see the cause and no longer the artistic effect. We know how the magician does the trick. Only if we treat the brushstrokes abstractly, as bearing no relation to the objects we saw previously, do they remain part of an artistic reality.

The spell is also broken if we walk behind the painting. We do not see the same scene from the opposite point of view. The image has vanished. It was an illusion. We can also never get behind an object depicted in a painting, for that would mean we can control the painting's space. Getting behind something is a form of controlling something, as when the hunter sneaks up on its prey. We cannot lift the object out of the painting and into our three dimensions.

We intuitively sense that the painting's space extends behind our back as well as in front of us⁶. This will be contradicted only if we in fact are prompted to turn around and look. If we do, we no longer see the painting itself, so its reality simply disappears altogether. With that reality gone we do not expect it to be any longer present. Only when we are looking at the painting does the possibility arise and remain activated that its space extends behind us. In that way we are free to think that if we see trees in a forest in front of us, then there are probably trees behind us as well, although there do not happen to be any trees between us and the nearest trees seen on the canvas.

What are we looking *through* when we see the painting? Is it the space of the room or the space of the painting? We sense also that the work's space extends between its foreground and our eyes. The painting's space seems to open out to our eyes. The bottom of the frame does not arbitrarily halt our sense of the foreground of the painting. It does not so much bump up against the everyday space as it simply vanishes. Like the blind spot of our eye, we do not know it vanishes unless we very specifically look for it in a certain portion of space and find it is absent. The only things that would contradict our sensing the work's space immediately in front of us is if an object in the everyday reality were to intrude itself between us and the canvas. Otherwise when we see the subject of a portrait looking forwards, by their gaze the intervening space is brought to life and we are drawn into the space in which the subject sits.

If we are not focused on the painting then the space between us and the wall belongs to the everyday reality. There are then two distances to the canvas, the measurement in feet in the room between where we are standing and the canvas, and the distance in the artistic space to the implied vantage point from which the scene is viewed. In the empty space between us and the canvas there is no exact boundary line between the two spaces. One extends effortlessly into the other without conflict, although at any exact instant in time we could not envision a given point as being in both at once, any more than in certain common optical illusions, while we can see one figure or another, we can never see both at once.

The least restricted dimension of a painting's space is its depth because it lies away from us within the canvas. We can see within its space to a horizon. This limit can even be exceeded, the painting's horizon can be made to be more remote than the one in the everyday reality.

Through the magic of the artist's conjuring spell, the view of the other side of the canvas hovers tantalizingly before us, as long as we remain quite and breathless in space. We are allowed only a partial view of its space, and only one moment of its time. If the artist has done h'er job well, we will remain rapt in our contemplation of the image. We will not move. We will not do anything that would lead us to suspect that we are not in the same space as the image, or that this space does not extend ubiquitously. We become detached observers, and forget our body in the everyday space. We can go further an forget our ego that would separate us from the image.

We are granted provisional entree into the painting's space on condition that we keep our "hands off", that we look and do not touch. We must not try to verify that the objects we see are real in the sense they would be in our own environment. If we do try to touch the work, we find it is a flat surface, and the objects it holds are intangible, not in graspable dimensionality. Thus, paradoxically, the implication of touch aroused by the visual content of the painting can remain a vital part of our experience as long as it remains ideated. If we persist in trying to enter its space via the motion of our body, its reality turns out to be a thin, fragile membrane, that is broken when we try to enter. As it breaks the image disappears. It was but an illusion in terms of our own space: its foreground and background a thin patina joined together. In that intangible dimension the illusion lived and thrived.

> WHAT PAINTING CAN ACHIEVE BY BEING IN A SEPARATE SPACE FROM US

> HAVING TO DO WITH PERSPECTIVE

The breakdown of normal perspective at the boundary of the painting means that more than one person in the everyday space, at the same time, can basically share the same spatial perspective on the work's space. This was true, too, of the people distributed in the movie theatre. It is also true of both cases that viewers at different times can see the same thing, although in the case of film there is the proviso that it be at the same moment during a showing although it doesn't matter which showing.

In painting, space has freed itself from the limitation that had been placed on its content due to its intersection with the time of the viewer. A single now does not need to be matched any longer with a single here. The painter can depict each object in a group from different vantage points. The results are all translated to the single viewpoint of our eye. This would be impossible if we were in the same space as the objects. The painter can portray each object from left to right across the canvas as if being seen from directly in front of it. If we were in the same space, to achieve this, we would have to move from left to right. We can also interpret what we see as the result of seeing inside many different spaces at once. The painter can depict the same object from varying different points of view, either superimposing the images on one another or displaying them side by side⁷.

One possible benefit of perspective is that we are never forced to see the other side of something, a side in back that may disprove or belie what the front promises us. A truly "complete" view of an

object in three dimensional space would entail seeing from every possible angle. This is impossible because the combinations of angles and distances are infinite. The third dimension, rather than being automatically an improvement over two dimensions, also stands for the impossibility of seeing an entire three-dimensional object, at least as long as we remain ourselves three-dimensional. A four-dimensional creature could see all sides of a three-dimensional object at the same time just as we see all aspects of a two-dimensional square at one and the same moment. What is opaque in three dimensions becomes, figuratively speaking, transparent in four. Painting, by having a control over perspective independent of time, has another approach to completeness. It can superimpose views of the same object seen from different sides. Taken to an extreme this would result in indecipherable visual "noise". Cubism⁸ is a particular solution that uses only a finite set of perspectives, not superimposed, and usually limiting the view of any one part of an object to just one perspective on it. What in the temporal arts was the restriction on *when* we can see something in space, in cubism becomes a restriction on *where* we can see *what*. What cubism gains in allowing us to see from more than one side it loses in that we have a difficult time conjecturing where one part lies in three-dimensions relative to another. The painter, in combining within the same locale the results of different perspectives from different places, is acting as if space itself can be molded and superimposed upon itself; as if the painter were a sculptor, a sculptor of space rather than of material in space.

> DIFFERENT SPACES CAN IMPLY DIFFERENT TIMES

Once the precedent exists of there being a space that is not our space, but distinct from ours, it is possible that there be more than one such space, distinct from each other as they are from ours. A single painting can record qualities from each space at different times. Separate events from the life of a single individual, each occurring in a different locale, can be depicted on one canvas. Between the portion of the canvas occupied by one event and that of another there is breakdown in space. The same space does not permeate the entire canvas. Where space breaks down the notion of coeval breaks down with it. We are no longer obliged to interpret events depicted in these different spaces as being contemporaneous even though they are seen by us at the same moment in our time.

> DIFFERENT TIMES IN THE SAME SPACE

If an object evolves in time, then in the timeless moment of the painting, a plurality of moments in that evolution can be shown, or certain traits gathered together in space from different moments. A human figure can be drawn that looks at once like an infant, a child and an adult. Birth and death can be joined. Different aspects of an object may reach perfection at different times. Each perfection can be retained in the painting's image. It is like a camera lens whose aperture is time rather than space. When the aperture is at its narrowest, it allows in the most time, near and far, past and future, at once. It recaptures into the present parts of the past that are therefore never necessarily lost. In Magritte's "Kingdom of Light" series, early twilight is showing in the sky while late twilight is showing in the building below. Each represents the moment of perfection in the diurnal history of the aspect of the scene in question. The light of dawn can coexist with the light of noon or that of evening. There is no contradiction in time because there is no flow of time to separate these different lights. An object in painting can be more than it can be at any one moment of time in its everyday history in time. Space gradually absorbs the effects of passing time, and then can reflect them back to us in our present time.

> THE FULL EXPRESSION OF A FORM

In a dense forest a single tree rarely attains its fullest possible form. It is encroached upon by other growing things which compete with it for space, water, nutrients and light. In contrast a tree standing by itself in an arboretum can grow out until it embodies the complete expression of its inherent form: the form most characteristic of its species which lies already in the seed. It is like the shape that a balloon will take when fully inflated, which exists in potential state when uninflated. Like the balloon, if a form in nature is forced by artificial means to occupy more than the space requisite to express its innate form, it will become bloated and misshapen and, at worst, break apart. In the forest, the closer one object is to others, the more the others prevent an observer from seeing it in its entirety, draw our attention away, partially occlude it, or stand in its light. The form that is assumed by the tree in the forest is largely determined by restrictions pressing inwards from the outside while the tree standing alone manifests a form largely determined by forces pressing outwards from inside it.

Objects limit each other in space when they share a common time. Otherwise, one object could change its shape in response to an inherent formal concern without any other object needing to change in response. In everyday space, if two organic objects grow towards each other, when they finally touch, they must either stop their growth, go around each other, or one retreats as the other expands. There is no way for them both to continue expanding so as to maintain unhindered its original essence. The painter, though, can provide a different space for each, spaces which could partially or entirely be superimposed. In general an object whose nature in the everyday reality we may see only partially, can have its fullest nature flower in painting. Instead of random trees in a forest, the painter can surround an object with others whose qualities are designed to bring out the qualities of the former: to help it express its true nature rather than curtailing it.

In the everyday reality, the inner energy of an organic object drives it outwards as far as it can go in space. At this point it is in dynamic equilibrium with the content of space around it. If the object attempts to spread further its life force would fail by overreaching in space. The painter can represent various stages in the ever-changing balance between outward expression of innate forces and inward contraction in response to outward forces. Forms can be seen as burgeoning and swelling, straining to attain their fullest manifestation, or overreaching it, their energy spent, now contracting or retreating inwards.

> OBJECTS PASSING THROUGH EACH OTHER

In everyday space if two objects are approaching each other from opposite directions, they will reach a point where, relative to a viewer, they seem to lie in the same line of sight. At this point they will either collide or one will pass in front of the other - the nearer occluding the farther. In the privileged space of painting another possibility exists, that of one literally passing *through* the other. They offer no impermeable boundary to each other because though they occupy the same space they do not truly occupy the same time. The present of time has been thoroughly denatured (a process begun in literature). Photography achieves the same effect in the double exposure. The painter can make an exact copy of such a photograph. Film, because it uses photography as a technique can do the same, and literature can achieve it through appropriate description and the evocation in our

imagination. A permutation on this theme is for an object which seems to lie nearer the viewer to be occluded by an object that seems to lie further away. Or one object can occlude another that is not even in the same line of sight, as if it were passing in front of it.

> MORE ABOUT TIME IN PAINTING

Though time has a less substantial role to play than space in painting, it still has a definable role, one, which by virtue of its very restrictions, contributes uniquely to the aesthetic of the artistic experience. Time can no longer add additional content to space, but space can add additional content to human awareness through time. Space can absorb the consequences of time in order to yield them back to us gradually through our time⁹. Space can also use time to record but a single moment of time that else might have gone unnoticed. This is most obvious in photography.

> THAT WE CANNOT ENTER THE WORK'S TIME

In film, though space retreated into the screen, our time was able to follow in after it. However once space is in the ascendancy over time it can act to cast our time out from the work. We bring our time with us to the painting but it remains attached mostly to the everyday reality, it does not penetrate into the work. Here is an analogy made with space in place of time. If we place our eye at the edge of a building flush against one the sides, and site along that side, we have no way of determining how far that side extends. It might be a few feet it might be miles. We can only tell if we move our eye away from the side. By analogy, in painting, our time "intersects" with the work's time at such an "acute" angle that we cannot tell how long its time extends. We may be experiencing what is but a moment of its time, or we may experiencing an eternity of its time. With a different temporal "perspective" perhaps we might see the people in the painting moving through time, but that time cannot get across the boundary between the two spaces. If there is a flow of time within the painting's space we cannot experience it. As it is, the two realities intersect at only a single point in time and in a single locale in space. If only we could step off the side of the frame and follow the leaf that is being carried downstream by that river, it might also become *later*. To the primitive artist it might have been an advantage that the work did not evolve. The wild animal on the cave wall has no potential to harm us because we have charmed its time.

> CAUSALITY. OPENING A SEAM IN TIME. AN ENRICHED FUTURE.

>> TIME'S PROPENSITY FOR FUTURE

There is a special relationship between our future which continues to eventuate in time and the painting's future which is continually and indefinitely postponed. Our future continues to empty into the work's present making that present progressively richer in its implication for what might arise next in the future. It is as if a seam opened up in the fabric of time into which is poured our accumulating experience of the work, like a dam behind which more and more water accumulates. The present bears more heavily on the future than it would in the everyday reality where the intent, which our present bears along to the future, is limited by the fact that time is already ongoing into the future.

Once the possibility exists of freezing the action for even a moment, whether in the temporal art of literature or the spatial art of painting, even if the action resumes a mere moment later, causality no longer operates over the gap. It no longer causes the future to eventuate in the relentless push of time, because time and space are no longer inextricably wedded. The side channel of narration in literature has become a deep and perhaps bottomless well in painting. The future, when, or in the case of painting *if*, it arises, is less ineluctably connected with the previous moments in time. The relation between past and future is altered, re-colored by our having the time to step into our stream of time and take a good look at what is going on in the present and how it portends the future. What happened until a moment prior to the now of the painting may well have proceeded according to an ongoing chain of cause and effect. What will continue to happen if and when time resumes may also operate according to another chain of cause and effect, but it will be *another* and not the same chain of causality. During this break of causality, the *impulse* of time into the future can remain even if the impulse never fulfills itself. There is a mounting tension of the present against the future.

In this suspended present, we can begin over and over again to envision the future, perhaps differently each time. As different courses of our time layer over the single present time of the painting, a non-single future is created, a multiplicity of proximate futures, all of which are as equally valid by virtue of their all equally lacking actualization. There becomes many threads of time. A frozen present can give birth to any number of immanent futures even when the future we are referring to is only a moment away. The holding up of the flow of time does not stop the pressure of time, but rather, like water of a stream trying to get around a blockage in a stream, creates a more varied and complex local topology. The water does not disappear; it is somewhere. In painting the present is supercharged with the immanence of the future, and the proximate future of the painting is fuller than the proximate future of the everyday reality because the next moment is not there to remove at one fell swoop, with its mere fiat of existence, the stirrings of all the possibilities¹⁰. In the real world there cannot be, in regard to space, two futures at the same time: space has room only for one reality.

> ANOTHER POSSIBILITY: TIMELESSNESS

Another way to view the absence of a flow of time within a painting is that we keep flowing away in time from the work's time, our time probing the painting but not reaching past its surface. We keep trying to get back in step with the work, but no matter how many times we try to synchronize our self to the work, so that we can then evolve together with it, the reality of the work remains frozen. As we repeat this act, the period of the cycle of trying elongates, the amplitude of the oscillations approaches zero, and a sense of timelessness can eventually arise within us. Though our body continues to age in the everyday reality, our mind or consciousness ceases to evolve. The frozen image mirrors our breathless consciousness. The work simply *is*, as Plato's Ideas are, outside time. What we see does not need an antecedent in time and does not need to be the cause in turn of anything else. Simply by being too, we are in identity with the work.

> MOTION AND STILLNESS

If we see an object in motion, and also see it change the rate of its motion, we can foresee the possibility of the object slowing until it stops. If, however, we see an object not in motion, there is

nothing in the appearance of the stable object to suggest that it once moved or that it might move again. Stasis is complete unto itself. It does contain the thought that there is an alternative state called motion. We encountered a similar situation in music. The notes in a simultaneous chord have no need to be turned into a sequential melody, but a melody, which has a tempo, allows for the possibility that the tempo can change and, at a maximum, would cause the stasis of a simultaneous chord. The film moving through the projector can stop moving, and the current frame will appear as a photograph. Looking at the photograph, though, we would not know how it might be turned back into a flowing image. If while reading a work of literature, the flow of images in our imagination froze, the image on which we would then dwell is like an inner painting. The image alone does not suggest the plot. The posture of a dancer at any moment, if frozen in time, becomes a sculpture, but we cannot know the full nature in time of the movement from which the sculpture is an excerpt.

> MORE ABOUT SPACE IN PAINTING

What the painting space holds is in keeping for our time to unlock. The order in which this unlocking occurs is not predetermined by space. All content is held in abeyance in space without temporal prejudice. The here in the space of painting is held in front of us in spite of our motions through time in the vicinity of the canvas. In the everyday reality, if we move, a new conjunction of here and now is effected. Both the everyday space and the artistic space extend indefinitely in all directions yet neither space truly limits the other. If an object within the canvas is incomplete because of the presence of the frame, we do not doubt that it completes itself beyond the frame. Nor do we believe the space of the room in which we find the painting stops at the frame and does not continue until the other side of the frame. When we are most captivated by a painting, its reality is so convincing that we conceive that its space will exist everywhere, and that the everyday reality will, for the nonce, be found nowhere. Through the portal of the frame one space becomes aware of the other, but one does not deluge and flood out the other. This lack of interaction between the painting space and the everyday space is no more improbable or hard to understand than is the relation of the space in our imagination to the space that is external to us. There is no particular place within the everyday space that we assign as being the location of our imagination¹¹.

> DIMENSIONS

The distinctions between the spatial arts, that have most to do with the role of time and space in the direct aesthetic experience of the work rest elsewhere than on the number of spatial dimensions present in the work. The central experience of painting derives from the fundamental inaccessibility of its space. This restriction is true too of holography though it presents us with three-dimensional images. In a more subtle way a view outside of closed window would also bear resemblance to a painting, particularly if at no point in time do we gain access to its contents outdoors.

> DIFFERENT SPACES AT THE SAME TIME

Science can define an innumerable number of different spaces, each with its own properties. No one of these space requires for the possibility of its existence that any other space exist. Painting already shows us that more than one space be present in time. The space represented within the frame can be *any* type of space. The frame can hold the presentation of a Euclidean space or any of

the non-Euclidean spaces. It can show the projection into two dimensions of a space in three, or even more, dimensions. The painting space, be it of any type, can allow things that are not possible in our space and conversely not allowing perhaps certain other things that are possible in our space. Each space that is present in the painting can have its own unique set of properties. Different parts of a canvas can each represent a different type of space with its own rules of perspective. In the Western Renaissance, painters tried to make the painting space appear *like* the everyday space, as if that were a logical goal. It is but one possibility. In Medieval painting, a single, homogenous space often fails to encompass all the objects on the canvas but clings to individual objects.

> PATHS FOR THE EYE

If when young, we always approached our house from the same direction, then the first time we approached it from the opposite direction there would have been a certain surprise when our house came into view after a sequence of unknown houses. In the case of painting, the content of space is finite, so the paths that the eye follows quickly begin to fall into certain well worn paths. The spatial matrix becomes set and firm in a relatively short amount of time. This leads to repetitions of paths for the eyes that are suggestive of what is done to induce hypnosis. As a result, mere suggestions on the part of the painter can be amplified into resonant effects. On the other hand, truly creative viewing of a painting may try to break out of well worn paths so as to dislodge elements from each other and see them in a new light.

We can liken the composition of a painting to a topographical map, and the motion of our eyes in looking at the composition to the motion of water after a rain. Where the land is completely flat and the soil equally impermeable (when the canvas is totally blank) water (the eye) flows in all directions equally. When there are elevations and depressions, gullies and hills (objects on the canvas), or where different soils have different capabilities of absorbing water, our eyes (like the water) will move according to the suggestions of the shapes and dwell on certain objects in proportion to their absorbency.

> DEPTH OF RESOLUTION OF DETAILS

Nature is capable of sustaining the same richness of detail no matter how closely we scrutinize. Nature maintains her reality at *all* levels. In contrast, if one continued to magnify the painting, eventually it would turn back into materials of the everyday reality, though as such it can sustain further magnification. The artistic reality will have disappeared. The degree of detail varies from painting to painting. Both a large and a small rendering of the same object may contain the same amount of detail. The painter chooses how much of reality to pack into a fixed amount of space. The painter can show more, the same amount, or less detail than we would see if looking at the same subject from the same implied distance in the everyday reality. If less, we may become more aware of larger features that previously had remained obscured amid too much detail. The artist can simplify, portraying only certain salient details that serve to bring out the essential nature of an object. If something is portrayed large, but minus much detail, it may seem bloated and featureless.

> THE PERCEPTION OF "OBJECTS"

I am watching a painter applying brush strokes to the canvas one at a time, larger or brighter here, smaller or dimmer there. At first I see nothing more than patches of color having random shapes. Then suddenly, as one more touch is added, I no longer see the 'sense data' that I just described, but instead I see an 'object'. What happened? A moment before and the nexus of strokes bore no resemblance to the object I now perceive. Now it seems to me as if the object had always been there although I now only just realized it. My conclusion is that the painter has provided me at that moment with the minimum necessary sense data required for my brain to form an awareness of a thing distinct from the data: an object. That this perception of object comes from within me is made obvious by the fact that between the previous moment, when I had no perception of an object, and the moment now, in which I do perceive an object, only a trivial amount if anything had been added by the painter in the form of the raw data. To 'paint' an 'object', I need no more than what my brain habitually takes in through my senses before dismissing anything new or different in the sense data and replacing it instead with a perception, from my memory, of an object. This makes the painter's job easier, if all s/he wants to do is make me perceive an object. S/he does not have to paint everything that the eye would see if it contemplated the object for a long time.

That I rely on no more than a minimum of fresh data to form a perception of an object, shows that there is a certain impoverishment within perception versus what might be available by way of sensation. The painter can return me to the awareness of this richness. The painter does not so much copy or imitate nature as s/he goes out *before* nature to re-create that out of which nature is made in our eyes. The artist might articulate it in this fashion. "What I am doing is less an act of seeing and more a reversal of that usual act...sensation does not reach out to me in order to engender perception...If I have a perception I undo it, I reach back out to place in nature outside of me (on the canvas) the sensation that gives rise to the perception. For me perception is just the cause of my desire to recreate." During this creation, sometimes the artist will "stand back" from the canvas to perceive the sensations created so far, to move from the realm of sensations to perceptions¹².

> UNINTENDED SHAPES

When I was a teenager I saw a display of Chinese vases at the Metropolitan Museum in New York. They stood one next to the other in a single display case. As interesting as the vases were, what intrigued me more were shapes that the vases imparted to the blank spaces between them. Between any two shapes that don't share a common boundary line there is always a third shape that is the (often) unintended byproduct of placing the two intended shapes near each other. All that was required of me to see these "in-between" shapes was a suppression of my normal habit of seeing in terms of objects: and to see all shapes on an equal basis. Once lines and shapes are all equal, the sides of a building, for example, no longer need to belong with each other by virtue of their being part of the same object. Lines belonging to several adjacent buildings can instead belong to one another, and create a marvelous, unintended shape.

> USING THE OTHER SENSES TO ENTER THE WORK'S SPACE

As long as we remain with sight alone we are kept out of the painting space and cannot change perspective on what we see. Sight however activates sensations within us of what it would be like to hold, caress or generally feel an object. To touch something we must be in the same space as

what we touch. If we imagine a sensation of touch we must be imagining that we are in the same space as the touched object. It is not only touch that is activated by sight. A representation of a flower with an odor that is known to us, may stimulate an ideated sensation of smell. For this to occur, we must put ourselves in our imagination in the midst of the scene in which it occurs and be surrounded by it. Even sight itself can be subject to ideated sensations arising out of the primary sensations from the canvas. The latter will coexist with the former, forming a subterranean counterpoint to it. In our imagination we are free to see things from any point of view we choose, and thus in this way overcome the limitation in painting on changing perspective.

In painting we see objects only *because* we do not touch them. Touching the painting leads to a contradiction between what we see and what we feel (pigments). The illusion is spoiled. Sight thus is the only primary sense in painting (the only sense receiving data directly from the work). Touch, with all the other senses, must remain ideated and imagined.

> PHOTOGRAPHY CONSIDERED SEPARATELY FROM PAINTING

If this book were being written two hundred years ago, before the development of film and photography, would we have sensed any "gaps" along the spectrum where *new* arts might fit or that the place for them would turn out to be in the middle of the spectrum adjacent to the everyday reality? For the most part in this chapter I have not mentioned photography separately from painting. This is because the two arts occupy the same position on the spectrum, which in turn is because space and time appear similarly in our experience in both arts. I have used the term painting alone to refer for all art that sits at the present location on the spectrum, and therefore to photography as well as painting. In both cases images are static and reside in a privileged space immune from our active intervention. If a photograph is made of a painting or vice versa, the work's spatial properties, as we experience them, do not change. Here we begin to consider photography and painting separately, bearing in mind that from the point of view of the spectrum these differences are secondary.

> PROCESSING AND PERCEPTION

If measured on an accurate clock, there is a brief duration of time in between when the retina in the eye receives visual information and the moment when we have a conscious recognition of a sight. From the point of view of consciousness, however, there is no time lag. Consciousness always perceives what it takes to be the immediate present. The time it takes for information to reach the brain and be processed is not known to consciousness. It is this processing time that becomes noticeable to the consciousness of the photographer as the process in everyday time between the exposure of the film (the retina) and the making of the print. Once in the artistic time of the viewer, this processing time is again unknown. The viewer perceives the finished image as if it were always there.

> DOUBLE / MULTIPLE EXPOSURE

We have chosen to speak about multiple exposures under the heading of photography, but in essence it is something that is achievable by all the arts on the spectrum beginning with literature. In the everyday reality only one object can occupy one location in space at one time. That which

occupies space *now* deprives *other* things from occupying the space *here*. Seen this way, an object stands for a sort of deprivation, a casting out from the space it occupies other possible content. If two objects, not presently in the same place, try to become located in the same place at the same time, the laws of cause and effect will prevent it from happening. One or the other will prevail. However, we can bring them to the same place at different times in the everyday reality, record the effect, and reproduce the combined effect at a third time. When we see the results, we assume that two objects were already in the same place, without worrying about how they became so. In photography this effect is achieved literally, through multiple exposures of the same piece of film. The effect is so striking in photography because of photography's resemblance, when desired, to the everyday reality. In painting it is simulated by a single part of space having within it the fused essences of different objects (a *spatial* multiplicity shown in *space*). This is similar to when a painting reveals the essence of one object as it would appear at different times in its history: a *temporal* multiplicity shown in *space*). A sculpture or work of architecture¹³, too, can represent fused forms.

Instead of two objects existing in the same space in the same place, another interpretation of a multiple exposure is that two spaces exist superimposed on each other in this one locale; and that while empty there would have been no way to know that there were two spaces rather than one. Yet another interpretation involves the notion of an afterimage. The image now in consciousness supplants in vividness the image of the immediate past, which is nonetheless there. If we suddenly close our eyes we may still see it. A double exposure can make us aware of the previous image by allowing it to remain as vivid as the more current image.

If each image in a double exposure is that of an object, does each fully express itself as a form in spite of the presence of the other? It may be like those optical illusions which can be seen in two different ways, but never both at once? The answer would then be yes, but to do so for one means ignoring the other. What would a forest look like if every tree were fully visible including those positioned behind others? To which tree would I attribute this or that particular piece of visible data? Opacity disappears with double exposures¹⁴. Objects lose their materiality. It no longer matters if the photograph looks "life like", we know we are not in the everyday reality. In one way we have gained the upper hand on reality, for rather than functioning primarily as a barrier to what lies beyond it, matter can be seen as a mask that can be taken off. It can partially reveal what lies beyond it by showing the latter as lying within it.

> SPACE AND PHOTOGRAPHY

> THE IMPLIED WHERE AND WHEN OF THE SUBJECT OF A PHOTOGRAPH

With a photograph we assume that the content depicted once existed in fact, someplace else probably than where we are now, but possibly the same place we are in now. If in the same place it will be obvious to us that the time is not our own present¹⁵. If the space is elsewhere than where we are now, what we see might be or might not be existing currently in the everyday time. We would have to voyage there to find out, but unless we recognize the place, we do not know how to get there through our space¹⁶.

> WHAT STANDS OUT IN THE EVERYDAY VERSUS PHOTOGRAPHIC SPACE

In the everyday reality, if there is a collection of objects on a table, and I am interested in just one of them, it is as if I were only seeing that one object and the others were not there. It is as if a frame had narrowed down until it excluded everything but the one object, or a spotlight was put upon it. It is treated as if it were alone and not interacting, or entering into spatial relationships, with what surrounds it. That is why if a photo is taken of the same objects we are surprised that the object we had singled out no longer stands out. It is now just one thing among many equal things. The photographer must take extra steps to achieve what consciousness does readily. If something is to stand out in the photo it must do so either on purely formal grounds, by taking into account its structural relations with the other objects around it, or by *literally* cropping away the distracting data. In a way, then, the photo is "realer" than the everyday reality, because in the photo everything is equally present in space at the same time. Though everything is present in the everyday reality, our perception of the everyday reality is designed to emphasize certain things and de-emphasizes others, this according to personal needs or interests. This emphasis occurs even though there is nothing in the spatial structure of the emphasized objects to recommend our attention more than the other objects. It is a bit surprising to think of the everyday reality as already being an "artistically" manipulated reality, but in this respect it is.

> CROPPING

Cropping frees objects within the frame from having to enter into relationships with objects around it. In the process a new set of relationships is formed since the frame is seen as a distinct boundary, i.e. as an object that relates with the objects within it. While the photographer may not be able to handle all the relationships that would have existed with the objects beyond where the frame is, s/he has a much easier time negotiating the set of relationships generated by the frame. Depending on the frame's alignment with the objects within it, certain qualities about these objects will be emphasized or de-emphasized. It is analogous how changing the phase of two sounds causes the sounds to reinforced or suppress each other. The same is true of the mutual alignment of lines.

The frame also explains why a photograph can never be the same as that which is photographed. Even if it were possible that in every other respect the photo and the subject were identical, the photo includes four cropping lines that define the photographic space. These lines are within our field of vision. In contrast, when we look at an everyday scene, we are unaware of the boundary line of our field of vision as being itself an object or shape within our field of vision. The lines defining the limits of the photograph take part in the relational composition of what we see and thus change the aesthetic quality of what we are seeing.

> SPACE AND TIME

If the camera is close to the subject, form and composition will be changed by the slightest movement on the part of the photographer. If the subject is in action, form and the composition will be changed by the slightest difference in the time of the exposure.

> MOTION AND PATH

With time under the control of space, the photographer can create static form out of motion. By leaving the shutter open while an object is in motion, the photographer creates a new object whose length is the path of the original object and whose width is the width of the original object. What once was a historical event that unfolded in time is now available all at once for consideration. Motion when deprived of time becomes the creator of a new type of shape, a shape that was always in the state of becoming when in time but now statically is. The photograph, unlike the eye, will never see motion, only its results. In a world of objects, some of which are in various states of motion, if we extend exposure time indefinitely, spatial order will disappear and everything will overlap in space into a single amorphous mass (in consciousness, though memory preserves the past image of an object, that image, when projected into the present, is in the same location in space where that object is at present). Ultimately, in making visible the path of an object in motion, one form (that of the original object in motion) is sacrificed in the creation of another. Motion can eventually outwit photography. If the velocity of the moving object is high enough, a limit is reached with regard to the sensitivity of the film. Ultimately the object in motion will leave no image at all. Short of this, space imprisons time.

In the creation-phase of painting, there was always one object in motion, the paint brush. One could argue that what we see in the finished painting is the path of that object. The density of the eventual painting is usually so dense that we lose sight of that motion or what may have been in motion. Sumi ink drawings are admirable in that one still retains the sense that there was motion and some of the qualities of what it was that was in motion.

> TIME AND PHOTOGRAPHY

Photography is closer to the everyday reality in the creation phase than is painting in that every photograph starts with what something *was* at a certain moment in time and then can transform it into what one wants it to be. Painting can start with no image, an image in the imagination or an image in the everyday reality. In terms of the everyday reality and everyday time, a photograph is an external, versus internally, remembered proof that the past once existed as the present. There is in this a reminiscence of the narrator's omniscience in literature. It is enough that the narrator witnessed (or imagined) the event for h'er to describe it. It no longer when it happened, for it is remembered into the present. In the artistic time, the past of the everyday becomes the present.

The camera's act of surrogate visual consciousness preserves the memory of the present tense in time without running the risk of that the memory will become clouded by what succeeds it in the future. The price for this is that time will never start flowing again within the image. Richard Avedon said that "The photograph is the death of the present moment which cannot eventuate the future". [footnote] The present lives again when the print is developed, but then dies into *our* ever-new present. The image no longer participates in the causal network from which it was first excised.

The longer the duration of the exposure the more the content of the photograph becomes independent of the time at which the photo was taken. If an object is no longer present in front of the camera when the exposure time ends, its presence is retained in the artistic time as if it were there all along.

A photograph that "freezes" an action still requires more than an theoretical instant to expose the film. If a series of photos is taken of the same subject with diminishing exposure times, regardless of how sensitive the film is, a point is reached when there is not enough light reaching the film to leave an impact. The image grows fainter as the exposure time becomes less and heads towards an inevitable black. Consciousness too is figuratively a film that must absorb a sufficient amount of sensory input before it can be aware of what is there. This amount can be very small. A flash of light may last less than a hundredth of a second, but it is capable of being 'seen' and as such fills a moment of consciousness whose duration in our awareness is longer than the hundredth of a second measured on the clock. For consciousness, the "present moment" in which awareness effloresces, cannot be a mathematical instant, it must be a finite duration, though perhaps a small one.

If an object or source of light is there in theory but is too faint to be detected by consciousness, the long exposure has the effect of changing the state of that object from non-existence to existence.

If the photograph attempts to extend the present moment indefinitely by leaving the shutter open, at some point the film becomes over-saturated with light. Instead of being black and formless, it is white and formless.

The Subject of a photograph is often evolving or changing with time. Even if an object is static in position, the lighting may change. In some situations the photographer benefits from sensing in the present the adumbration of what the next moment will be.

The process by which the image is captured in photography is also the act of rendering that image no longer visible. The image ceases to be a sensible image and becomes the altered chemical state of the silver nitrate on the film. At the moment the image is captured it ceases to be a phenomenon in time and becomes only a pattern in space on the strip of film. It is held, we might say, in a form of 'memory', unseen until 'remembered' by the process of printing the image. If we take the film out of the camera and look at it, try prematurely to restore it to time and consciousness, that act destroys the image and replaces it with a more current image, which saturates and overexposes the film¹⁷.

When a sculptor molds a figure, h'er physical motions act directly on the material forming the shape of the object, often directly altering that shape in the everyday world. The nature of the steps that the photographer takes in processing and printing the picture are physically dissimilar to the shapes and forms of the image it holds. The photographer is this sense "blind" to h'er efforts until the film is developed.

> PAINTING VERSUS PHOTOGRAPHY

If we compare literature and film on the one hand with photography and painting, we have within each pair a difference of techniques in spite of which there is a unity artistically on the spectrum. If we compare film with photography we have the opposite case: a similarity in technique though a dissimilarity on the spectrum.

In terms of its artistic effect there is little achievable in painting or photography that is not achievable by the other, although one may provide an initial incentive chronologically for the other to attempt something. For instance a painter might not have conceived of creating a certain type of

picture if s/he had not first seen 'stop action' photographs. The photographer may not have thought to try to achieve certain color or lighting effects if s/he had not first seen it in a painting. Sharpness and clarity are also not a good criteria for distinguishing the two because a photograph can blur when it wishes and a painter can mimic any degree of clarity that the eye can detect. No matter how "real" a photograph may look, there is always an artist who can paint the same subject to look just as real. Similarly, a photographer can make a photo look like a painting. Though originally photography was considered more objective than painting, a true copy of nature, it has proven as subjective as the latter. Two good photographers shooting the same subject, from the same vantage, at the same time, are likely to create two very different looking photographs.

There are no forms that can be created in one and not the other. Both artists are free to emphasize any quality about an object. While the painter can create a shape from scratch, using only h'er imagination, the photographer can search external reality and usually find that same form, or a form that can be manipulated photographically into the desired form. "Finding" can be as creative process as constructing from scratch. There is little limit to what shapes can be found in nature since shape varies with perspective and the photographer can adopt any of an infinite number of points of view relative to an object. Ultimately the photographer can use a beam of light as a painter uses a brush. Both paint light onto a surface.

> DIFFERENCES THAT APPEAR DURING THE CREATION PHASE

The most interesting differences between painting and photography occur during the creation phase of the work, which though it lies outside the scope of this book, are worthy of mention. In photography, the scene is captured all at once. It is then "developed", a process that remains *dark* until light is once again restored at the end. A painting "develops" gradually. At the beginning the painting is white and formless, as if a photograph were overexposed. For the painting, however, it is still "underexposed" in that it still awaits the impression of content. As the painter's brush moves over the canvas there is a feeling of molten creation, liquidity of form. More and more space becomes occupied. With photography, the image, though as yet unseen in print, has always been complete spatially. The painter's eye is like a camera that provides successive snap shots of the developing picture.

The sketch that is preliminary to painting has no meaning in photography. The closest thing to it in use is the contact sheet from which one chooses the best shot from among a series of shots. The steps that the photographer takes to process the image are physically *dissimilar* to the entity that is represented on the film. The steps that the painter takes to create an image move in space in a way analogous to the image being created.

On a clock, an interval of time elapses between when light strikes the retina and the brain perceives an image. It is a duration that is however outside our consciousness. What we see is *now*, not a *moment ago*. The duration between light striking the film in the camera and our seeing the final image is a much longer duration, and again is unknown to us. At the end of this duration what we see is not so much *now* as *then*. What took place invisibly for the photo in the dark room happens visibly for the painter, and moreover is known as an image in painter's consciousness. The painter's consciousness is used to delay our consciousness.

Until recently in the history of photography, once an image was captured its form could not be changed. Now with computer software and digital photography, the photographer can essentially act like a painter. S/he can use as a starting point a blank computer screen, a photograph, or any other image including a painting scanned in to the computer, and then have the same freedom to create as the painter, except that emendations are much easier.

Photography and painting can merge in collage.

> PAINTING (AND PHOTOGRAPHY) AND THE OTHER ARTS

For many of us, our acquaintance with spatial works of art often comes from photographic reproductions. If it is a photo of a photo, the term reproduction loses its meaning since all photographic prints are printed from the same negative. Film and literature also can record and describe works of other arts, regardless of whether the work is temporal or spatial. A temporal work is caught in progress and a spatial work is commented upon as we continue to consider it in our time. Photography (and painting) are most successful depicting other spatial works of art. If used with a temporal work of art, they must first transform that work into a spatial work in that they record the spatial appearance of only a moment from the work.

> PHOTOGRAPHY VERSUS FILM

A photograph of an object is not the same as seeing the same object in a scene from a film during which the camera remains stationary over a sustained period of time even though the appearance of the object remains unvarying in both cases. The difference lies in who is controlling when and for how long we view of the table. These two factors are an inherent property of the structure of the film, but not of the photograph. All observers will experience the object for the same duration. Film contains its own time as part of its artistic dimension, which, if we watch it, becomes our time. With photography time retreats into our own consciousness alone. We determine when the image of the photograph will no longer be seen. We leave it, it doesn't leave us¹⁸. In the film, during the scene the feeling persists that the image will be taken away from us at an unknown moment in the near future.

What if we take the individual frames of a film, each itself a photograph, and view them, each one for as long as we will, one after the other, in their original order? Though we have preserved their order of their temporal flow, something important is lost. The meaning of these frames, one to another, is exquisitely tuned to the speed in which we viewed them. In the film, this meaning is lost if either the speed or the ratio of their durations is altered in any way. Moreover when shown within the film we are not aware of the frames as separate images, it is a single flowing image. Once the images are made separate, they fall apart in space, after which their order can no longer be guaranteed.

If we look at a group of photographs set side by side in space, the experience remains essentially that of photography. If, however, someone else shows us the same photographs, first one then another, placing the each new photograph on top of the previous one, then it is more like looking at a film.

If we started with the separate frames of a film, with no order specified, it would take a great effort of understanding and organization to try to put them back into a meaningful order. Continuous motion through space by a single character would be a help. From lip positions we could deduce phonemes, but then we would have to put them into words, and the words into meaningful sentences: no mean task. Technically, we do not even know that the various images are each meant to be seen for the same duration, for that is a byproduct of how the film advances through the projector.

> PAINTING VERSUS FILM

When a film is made of a painting, at any given moment the viewer may see just a portion of the entire painting, though at others perhaps the entire painting is seen at once¹⁹. The movie camera can focus on just a detail and then pan across the canvas gradually revealing a continuous swath. The camera can just as easily jump from one place to another on the canvas. If I am seeing just one detail at a time, and I am not the "director" of the film, although my experience of the painting may seem quite complete and satisfying, I do not know if I have yet or ever will see the "entire" painting.

If the camera explores the painting in a connected fashion through its space, new parts of the canvas are revealed just coming over the horizon in the direction the camera is moving. What we see there seems newly created in time. Concurrently I notice older parts drifting out of existence at the opposite end of the film screen. When I see a given part of the painting I have no way of knowing whether I will be shown it again. If I do see it again, I have no immediate way of telling whether I am seeing the same locale on the canvas or if the painter has repeated the same content in two different locales. To know this I would have had to keep very close track of the path being followed by camera in the interim of time.

Through the film I get to know the space of the work gradually through time. The entirety of its space is not always present to me all at once, but this is one of the distinguishing conditions of a spatial work of art. The relation between what I have just seen and what I see next is as much a relation through time as it is through space. This is not true when we look directly at a painting. There is however ultimately a finite body of material in the original painting, and if the film continues to recycle over this material, the work loses its sense of temporal development in favor of being a more spatial experience, something that is accelerated if the film camera more frequently expands its scope to embrace the entire painting frame.

> PAINTING AND POETRY

An appealing link between poetry and painting exists in paintings that have been given poetic titles. The works of Rene Magritte and Paul Klee come to mind. Usually titles for paintings are descriptive, or atmospheric. Poetic titles are different. It is as if the usual direction of poetic motion from words into images was momentarily turned around and the images suggested the words except that the words just as quickly turn around and volunteer to be the title of the image. Once the words of the title are there, they suggest images to our imagination, just as they would in poetry. *But* as we already have a specific image in front of us in the painting, that image *must* be the one evoked by the words; thus an ontological identity develops between the words in the poetic title and the image contained in the painting.

> PAINTING AND MUSIC

Certain parallels between the arts that stand at the beginning of each half of the spectrum. If we say that painting exists in a protected space that is immune from (our) time, then we might say that music exists in a protected time that is immune space in that changes wrought in space have little effect on the relations of pitch and duration in time that form the structure of the work. Painting creates, out of something insubstantial a semblance of substance and reality. Music too creates a fundamental reality out of something insubstantial (sound).

A certain area within a work of Monet's when viewed from a distance may seem to be of a single color. Approaching more closely, we see that there are actually differently colored pigments on the canvas. If there were such a thing as distance in time, then a simultaneous chord might, at a distance, seem a single effect, but then upon closer scrutiny resolve into separate sounds, but as there is no distance in time, the chord will always, when present in time, seem at once both a single effect and a multiplicity of pitches.

Notes

¹ Abstract painting is as capable as representative painting of evoking a separate artistic space and having its forms retire into that space, though it also may try to break down the barrier between the artistic and everyday space. The word arts may also be termed abstract whenever the sound of a word is liberated or considered separately from its meaning (just as a form from an object).

² In a museum, as we walk from one painting to the next, it is as if we were in a fabulous building in which each window looks out on a different, unrelated view, there being no common space surrounding the outside of the building that would thereby unite together the different images.

³ If we could get to the "other side" of the surface of the canvas, would we know that we were on the other side or would it be like Alice through the looking glass: everything seeming normal - almost? We might even see things on the "other" (previous) side of the frame which we might even call paintings, but which were actually glimpses of the everyday reality. Alice, of course, had the advantage of remembering being in the previous reality, and notices that things are reversed.

⁴ Like a mirror, the frame occupies just a portion of the everyday space, but its content is different than what we expect at that place in space. It holds a different part of the everyday space, a content that we cannot ordinarily see when looking in the direction in which the mirror lies. Within the frame of the painting we see something that is not ordinarily in that place in the everyday reality, but something that might be found somewhere else in the everyday reality. Both a painting and a mirror have the ability to change or distort the appearance of what is seen through them.

⁵ Architecture, in contrast, cannot afford this change of scale when we pass through the portal into its space.

⁶ The attempt to literally extend the painting space around the observer is found in circular dioramas such as the one at the United States Historical Monument at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania. Except for the diorama itself, which is lit, the viewer stands in relative darkness. This suppresses awareness of the everyday space that lies between the viewer and the diorama proper. Ultimately one could place the viewer in the center of a large, hollow sphere, whose inside surface is covered with a painting that represents exactly what the observer would ordinarily see in all directions about her. The experience however would remain that of an artistic space and not the everyday reality. The observer cannot move in order to journey in the space. All that would happen is that objects would for a while change size, but out of step with the laws of perspective, after which the surface of the canvas would block further movement.

⁷ An alternate interpretation would be that we had multiplied instances of ourselves in space without violating our temporal unity, each self seeing something somewhat different.

⁸ Cubism is a more recent attempt to view a single object from different positions. Ancient Egyptian statues of the pharaoh show different parts of the body viewed from different points of view.

⁹ The artist is the vehicle for the storing of temporal information, but is only conscious of a certain portion of that content. There is no guarantee that what the artist consciously put into the work will correspond with what the viewer consciously takes out of the work.

¹⁰ The present tense in painting stands to the present tense in human consciousness as the latter stands to the current moment in an animal of a lower phylum which responds to stimuli without awareness and reflection. In his book "Matter and Memory", Henri Bergson says that consciousness appears when a delay occurs between a cause and a response. However, since consciousness exists within time, and time itself does not halt, how do we know a delay ever occurred? Perhaps because the future as it occurs, and the present pregnant with the future, is richer and more unexpected than it is in a fully deterministic, closed physical system. Painting can take consciousness further, and consider an amazing reality in which all the potentialities and possibilities conceived of in the present came to life.

¹¹ If we say that the space of imagination is in our head we avoid the question as to why this is as infinite in extent as the everyday space of which we are alleging it to be a part.

¹² The viewer too has the ability to examine the threshold of sensation versus perception by drawing nearer and further away from the canvas and finding the boundary line where object turns back into brush stroke.

¹³ Perhaps from the building's frozen point of view in time, we, the observers, are like multiple exposures of the same entity, appearing within its one moment of time in different places within its space. The work, being timeless, is unable to conceive of a modality that would otherwise explain how we got from one place within it to another: it sees us as multiple exposures.

¹⁴ More like Bach's musical space than Beethoven's (see Chapter 2 page [...])

¹⁵ Would it be as obvious if a photograph in front of us depicts precisely (including size-wise) what we would see in front of us if the photograph did not block our view?

¹⁶ Unless there is additional information provided.

¹⁷ In one direction as shutter time is reduced we approach no light or blackness. In the other direction we approach overexposure and saturation with light. In both cases though a uniform color results on the film, no structure or form in space is discernable. There is either darkness without content or brightness without content.

¹⁸ Although in a sense it has already left us into its privileged space before we even began looking at it.

¹⁹ As in a photographic enlargement, it is as if the content of one frame is projected into another frame. While the first frame (the painting's) can be made smaller or larger, the second frame (the film's) remains constant in size.