Rethinking material relations has enabled writing on art to focus on the work of the work of art, what it does, and its material operations that acknowledge matter’s potential force and dynamics. An influential contributor to these discussions has been the feminist philosopher Elizabeth Grosz, whose 2008 book, Chaos, territory, art: Deleuze and the framing of the earth, offers new approaches for thinking about the way art enables matter to become expressive. More recently Grosz has argued for an understanding of incorporeality that encompasses both ideality and materiality. Her recent writings suggest a relation between sense, signification and materiality in which sense is not in opposition to matter, but a shared surface of the incorporeal and the material. Through a discussion of Scott Mitchell’s New Millennium Fountain, this paper will examine the seemingly paradoxical understanding of sense Grosz advocates as a challenge to thinking about the sense making properties of artworks.
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**ABSTRACT**
Rethinking material relations has enabled writing on art to focus on the work of the work of art, what it does, and its material operations that acknowledge matter’s potential force and dynamics. An influential contributor to these discussions has been the feminist philosopher Elizabeth Grosz, whose 2008 book, Chaos, territory, art: Deleuze and the framing of the earth, offers new approaches for thinking about the way art enables matter to become expressive. More recently Grosz has argued for an understanding of incorporeality that encompasses both ideality and materiality. Her recent writings suggest a relation between sense, signification and materiality in which sense is not in opposition to matter, but a shared surface of the incorporeal and the material. Through a discussion of Scott Mitchell’s New Millennium Fountain, this paper will examine the seemingly paradoxical understanding of sense Grosz advocates as a challenge to thinking about the sense making properties of artworks.
INTRODUCTION

The provocation for this essay was the movement of sunlight in Scott Mitchell’s artwork *New Millennium Fountain*, which featured in *NEW13* at the Australian Centre for Contemporary Art (ACCA) in Melbourne 2013. This movement was facilitated by a sequence of carefully placed mirrors that constituted a series of spaces making their various qualities, volumes and surfaces apparent: not only the interior spaces of the gallery and the interior volumes of air in two plastic forms, but also the magnitude of space between the sun and the earth, and the atmospheric space of the weather. This artwork brought disparate forces into play to effectively carve out these spaces in a manner that opens up to a transversal movement across the relations of matter, life and art. Following the trajectory of the thin line of light this essay navigates divergent connections between materiality and ideality to investigate the incorporeality of sense that makes matter more than material.

Incorporeal forces that animate life have been the focus of recent essays by feminist philosopher Elizabeth Grosz as she explores the limits of materialism. She is interested in taking into account the continuity between the inorganic and the organic that foreshadows the eruption of life: ‘a becoming-immaterial or -incorporeal, a becoming-idea of matter itself’ (Grosz 2012, p. 2). She argues life is an elaboration of the excesses of matter, a mode of becoming other through the convergence with and transformation of material relations and energies. Grosz’s writing is of particular interest to artists because she provides a framework for thinking about the practice of art that privileges the material forces that makes sense and signification possible. She suggests, ‘artworks could be understood as experimentations with the real, with the material forces found in the world, rather than representations of the real’ (Grosz in Kontturi & Tiainen, 2007, p. 247). She understands art not as the subordination of matter to conscious purpose but as intensification, proposing ‘[l]ife brings art to matter and art brings matter to life’ (Grosz, 2011, p. 22).

In her book *Chaos, territory, art: Deleuze and the framing of the earth*, published in 2008, Grosz continues to explore questions of sexual difference by extending her interest in the territorializing forces of sexual selection as they operate in the context of visual culture. She argues art emerges from a profusion of impersonal and imperceptible forces, which are indistinguishable vibratory oscillations of chaos that constitute the universe (Grosz, 2008, p. 5). Art captures these forces, slowing them down and provisionally ordering them, bringing them into contact with biological and geologic forces of the earth, as well as forces of the body. Art harnesses these forces; extracts...
and frames them, elaborating them as sensation. Art, Grosz writes,

_enables matter to become expressive, to not just satisfy but also to intensify—to resonate and become more than itself. This is not to say that art is without concepts; simply that concepts are by-products or effects rather than the very material of art._ (Grosz, 2008, p. 4)

The influence of Grosz’s writing in the arts is in part derived from the feminist philosopher Luce Irigaray. Grosz credits Irigaray’s concept of ‘the irreducibility of sexual difference’, with opening up ontological questions pertaining to ‘matter, force, nature, and the real’ that have led feminists in particular to explore a politics of difference (Grosz, 2008, p. ix). Grosz claims Irigaray’s work raises the crucial question, ‘how and for whom concepts function’ (Grosz, 2010a, p. 103). Irigaray’s challenge is to re-think conceptual frameworks underpinning the relations between the subject and discourse as well as the world and the cosmos (Irigaray, 1993, p. 6). From her earliest essays Grosz has responded to Irigaray’s challenge to transform the spatio-temporal economy in order to alter the dynamics between men and women that continues to fortify discriminatory economic and social practices. For example, in her 1988 essay “Space, time and bodies” Grosz argues:

_The subject’s relation to space and time is not passive: space is not simply an empty receptacle, independent of its contents; rather, the ways in which space is perceived and represented depend on the kinds of objects positioned ‘within’ it, and more particularly, the kinds of relation the subject has to those objects._ (Grosz, 1988, p. 92)

At the time of its publication this essay was a breath of fresh air opening up ways of reconsidering the spatial aspects of art practice, such as the constitutive relations activated by an installation, that required a different enquiry into the connections between the materiality of making and the spatiality of context. While a context makes possible different kinds of relations, it is the task of an artwork to organise these, constitute them and make them apparent. Through the marking of a territory, the fabrication of a frame, artworks form thresholds between an inside and an outside that are never definitively determined. The manner in which an artwork negotiates its boundaries does more than separate—it acts as a hinge constituting relations. Borrowing from Andrew Benjamin, it is this activity that I understand as the work of the work of art: what it does and its material operations that acknowledge matter’s potential force and dynamics as the inherent productivity of matter (Benjamin, 2015, p. xvii). The artwork is an interface—a meeting point of matter and things, and thoughts and sense as sensations: a surface organisation where the potential of artworks to produce sensations and form relations enables sense to be apprehended.

In recent years Grosz’s reconsideration of the connections of space and time as political, social, cultural and above all feminist questions has engaged with the work of Charles Darwin and his insistence that life must have emerged from something non-living. Focusing on ontological questions of becoming has led her to investigate others’ writing in the wake of Darwin-biologist Jakob von Uexküll, and philosophers.
Gilbert Simondon and Raymond Ruyer. They emphasise the ways in which the worlds of animals, including the human, are generated from the openness of matter, which Grosz argues, maximises the form-taking qualities of the material universe (Grosz, 2012, p. 1). These thinkers offer a new understanding of biology, which Grosz claims recognises,

a process of bodily form taking that relies on the form-taking qualities of inorganic existence. Life protracts, extends and transforms some of the qualities of inorganic matter, into its own organic conditions; and in turn, life adds to materiality, the conditions of virtuality or becoming otherwise that the material universe already contains, but cannot directly express. (Grosz, 2012, p. 2)

The energy and forces that are condensed and contracted into seemingly solidified matter should not be mistaken as inert. Life is not the vital spark added to the inorganic, rather it unfolds these accumulations utilising the propensity of matter to compress, enfold, prolong, and delay. Matter, Grosz notes, drawing on the writing of Henri Bergson, is 'an undivided flux, [that] is as alive, as dynamic, as invested in becoming as life itself' (Grosz, 2011, p. 20). Life and matter are not opposites but counterparts, divergent tendencies implicated in each other. In becoming other, life extends and transforms matter as a continuous actualization of its potential to be otherwise.

The elaboration of matter in life responds to the excesses of matter that art also frames, transforms and intensifies. Art, Grosz suggests, 'is engendered through the excess of matter that life utilizes for its own sake' (2011, p. 22). Matter and life, matter and art, are not two orders of organisations, but rather two modes of connectivity or types of relation. There are no oppositions in the real; only productive difference. 'Life makes matter artistic' (Grosz, 2014, p. 5), she maintains,

and matter in turn enables life its intense, incorporeal capacities, its own excesses of becoming, two orders of chaos, two modes of becoming other, two directions in the movements of energy, two kinds of forces. A world of and as difference itself. (Grosz, 2011, p. 24)

Grosz seeks a concept of ideality that establishes the non-material reality of ideas and concepts as a mode of connectivity that encompasses both ideality and materiality. The Stoics, she suggests, provide a way of understanding a fully material universe that is ordered and framed by something that lives beyond the expanse of materiality, an order they identified as incorporeal (Grosz, 2014, p. 4). The following section of this essay explores Grosz’s proposition that ‘matter before it is animated by life, is always already involved in, and invested by incorporeal forces, in forces of potential sense, forces of virtual significance’ (Grosz, 2012, p. 2 original italics). This exploration frames the artwork as an experimental response to the problematic structure of the virtual. The final section explores the manner by which Scott Mitchell’s New Millennium Fountain responds to the problematic by framing various forces in a number of interfaces. Traversing the surfaces of these interfaces and their connective properties I emphasise that matter ‘can be understood as more than material’ (Grosz, 2012, p. 2, original italics).
THE INCORPOREAL

Grosz identifies a tendency in the history of Western thought to frame materialism regardless of its orientation in opposition to what it is not: life, mind, idea, form or spirit. She rejects this direction maintaining, on the one hand, that matter contains something in addition to what science can account for or experimentally explore and on the other, that ‘thought is not a mirror of the real, but its own processes of living’ (Grosz, 2014, p. 4–5). Notwithstanding, she acknowledges the difficulty of conceiving of materiality as not already ‘separated from conceptuality, sense, signification, form’ (Grosz, 2011, p. 18). The challenge she contends is to think the universe before and independent of how it is organized, before it is capable of being lived through conceptual categories and bodily habits.

This challenge requires a pre-philosophical or pre-scientific field—a kind of pure outside that she finds in Gilles Deleuze’s The Logic of Sense, and his writing with Félix Guattari in What Is Philosophy? They refer to this outside as chaos, an absence or excess of order, not disorder but a simultaneous plethora of incompatible orders. Grosz insists, ‘how we understand chaos is crucial to how we comprehend matter and what its characteristics and limits must be’ (Grosz, 2011, p. 18). She contends chaos is ‘the fullness of events, that cannot be distinguished from other events, of energetic forces functioning in conflict, and alignment with all others, without clear identity, a universe without divisions or boundaries, differentiating and differentiated forces of various speeds’ (Grosz, 2011, p. 18). This is a plurality of events undivided by the interests of life, a mixture of processes and forces that enable but cannot be reduced to individual entities or things. What is important, is to understand ‘the existence of a real beyond human consciousness and control’ (Grosz, 2011, p. 17). And to comprehend this real, not by reducing what is to brute matter, instead ‘conceptualizing the nuances and layers of ideality that matter carries within itself’ (Grosz, 2013, p. 1). This comprehension necessarily recognizes the energetic and informational flows that result from the activity of ideas not reduced to simple bodily or neurological movements.

In a similar manner Claire Colebrook maintains, ‘Western thought has always resisted the incorporeal’ (Colebrook, 2000, p. 39). She suggests it is only with a critique of the subject as some worldly substance, a critique she follows through the phenomenological tradition from Edmund Husserl and Maurice Merleau-Ponty, that attention is turned to the way in which the actual world extends beyond itself to a virtual domain of sense—as explored in the writings of Deleuze. Consideration needs to be given, she argues, to ‘the radical difference between thought and the body: both the body’s irreducibility to meaning and the event of thought, or meaning as radically separated from any corporeal foundation’ (Colebrook, 2000, p. 27). Colebrook (2000, p. 42) maintains the challenge is to explore ‘the radical becoming of sense or the incorporeal’ that accounts for the real and positive effects of virtual events. What this demands is the need to address the gap between the real and the virtual in order to understand the force of any particular event to extend beyond itself. This is also the gap that Irigaray attends to when she demands a reconfiguration of conceptual frameworks and spatio-temporal economies to provide for the possibility of exchanges.
between and across difference. Like Deleuze, she is wary of any entity, materiality or ideality that might function as some point within the world that explains the world in general (Colebrook, 2000, p. 40).

Both Colebrook and Grosz are responding to the structure Deleuze develops in The Logic of Sense between states of affairs or bodies, language and events and what makes language possible. This provocative elaboration of the incorporeality of events and radical account of sense draws on the Stoics’ rejection of the transcendent nature of Platonic Ideals. Deleuze credits the Stoics with what it means to think by breaking the causal relation between bodies and ideas, and rendering the Idea an incorporeal effect at the surface of things, ‘not Essence but event’ (Deleuze, 1990, p. 130). The Stoics make a fundamental distinction between two kinds of things—one being the material or physical realm of bodies and causes (including psychological causes) together with their corresponding states of affairs. The other is the non-physical realm of effects or incorporeal entities, understood as a realm of the attributes or of happenings on the surface of things. The time of bodies and states of affairs is the present, whereas incorporeal entities elude the present, they do not so much exist Deleuze (1990, p. 5) suggests, rather ‘they subsist or inhere’. Even though the two planes of being coincide, the operations of each are of a different order. What is significant, as Sean Bowden points out, is that:

Events don’t belong to the same ontological register as any of the causal antecedents. Activity and passivity are the characteristics of bodies situated in a corporeal, causal order relative to one another. Events, on the other hand, are impasive, impersonal and incorporeal. (Bowden, 2014, p. 234)

This formulation requires a different understanding of the relationship between materiality and ideality that takes into account the incorporeality of sense on the one hand, and, as Colebrook notes above, the relationship between incorporeal events and the physical configurations of bodies or states of affairs on the other. In the first instance, sense needs to be distinguished from a simple linguistic act or utterance. Needless to say, thought for Deleuze is not tied to a representational paradigm; rather, thought and meaning are positive forms of force and difference in themselves. This gives rise to a complex understanding of sense. Deleuze writes:

On one hand, it does not exist outside the proposition which expresses it; what is expressed does not exist outside its expression. This is why we cannot say that sense exists, but rather that it inheres or subsists. On the other, it does not merge at all with the proposition, for it has an objective (objectité) which is quite distinct. (Deleuze, 1990, p. 21)

The fascination for Deleuze, as Grosz notes, is the capacity of language to generate meaning insofar as its materiality supports a dimension of sense that is more and other than its materiality alone (Grosz, 2011, p. 21). Sense cannot be simply understood as a representation or doubling of what is, rather the incorporeal force of language, as Colebrook points out, is ‘not a difference from, nor a difference of, but an event of difference’ (Colebrook, 2005, p. 175 original italics).
With regards the second instant, the relationship between incorporeal events and physical configurations, Deleuze (1990, p. 6) describes the Stoics as splitting causal relations, not in a manner that distinguishes types of causality, but dismembering this relation forming a new frontier of thought. This frontier is not between bodies and states of affairs, essences and appearances, rather events are both consequences of bodily interactions and exist or rather subsist independently of these bodies. They are caused by states of affairs that are their actualization without belonging to the same realm as they are gathered together in a mode of disjunctive synthesis and always open to a future becoming (Deleuze, 1990, p. 170). Even though Deleuze maintains the event happens to things, states of affairs being the site of their actualizations, as James Williams (2008, p. 107) rightly notes, incorporeal events do not determine or cause any particular singularity to be one way or another. This is why Deleuze maintains there is an irreducibility between events and bodies or states of affairs. As he stresses, sense is the boundary between propositions and things, not to be confused with a spatio-temporal realization (Deleuze, 1990, p. 22). Deleuze refers to this as the ‘empiricist confusion between event and accident’, and asserts, ‘[t]he mode of the event is the problematic’ (Deleuze, 1990, p. 54).

This enigmatic phrase is important as it articulates how Deleuze structures the form of relations between sense, bodies and ideas (Williams, 2008, p. 111). Deleuze explains, ‘[o]ne must not say that there are problematic events, but that events bear exclusively upon problems and define their conditions. ...The event by itself is problematic and problematizing’ (Deleuze, 1990, p. 54). As such the virtual dimension of events cannot be reducible to any kind of emanative causality. They are the incorporeal effect of the forces of chaos that inhere in matter, which Grosz refers to as an imperceptible excess. The event cannot be entirely captured in any particular actualization as there is a dimension that Deleuze and Guattari (1994, p. 156) maintain, ‘is immaterial, incorporeal, unliveable: pure reserve’ (original italics). This is why Grosz argues the incorporeal is the ‘charge of becoming, that every being and every event carries with it, its potential for realignment and reorganization’ (Grosz, 2011, p. 20). Events, Grosz writes, ‘provoke invention, generating problems for which certain kinds of order and organization, are working solutions’ (Grosz, 2012, p. 3). This is a line of thinking that insists on the open temporality of becoming between the virtual and the actual as the movement of difference. As Williams states, ‘problems are not resolvable questions but problematic knots to be retied differently’ (2008, p. 111–2), and replayed in each successive individuation.

ART AS A RESPONSE TO THE PROBLEMATIC

Artworks are just such individuations, continually retying the knots of materiality and ideality in response to the problematic. ‘Existence is a test’, Deleuze (1988, p. 40) contends. And life responds to this test with experimental inventions generated in response to the encounter with this problematic; how to select, order and organize working solutions. Transformation is the ongoing necessity of life that Grosz (2014, p. 5) describes as a continual confrontation with problems, ‘how to live with others, which food to eat, which...’
Art is one of the ways of responding to these intractable problems, and although it does not solve problems in a manner that science might, it ‘develop[s] ways of living creatively with problems, providing new modes of addressing or dealing with them’ (Grosz, 2014, p. 5).

This is the approach Scott Mitchell (2013) takes to art making—each artwork is a response to problems. The specific problem *New Millennium Fountain* responded to is how to bring sunlight into the furthest reaches of an almost hermetically sealed gallery. The ACCA building was designed by architects who placed little value on opening the building to its immediate environment; they felt there was nothing worth framing, nothing to see. As a result, the crusty surface of its rusted steel façade presents a seemingly impermeable countenance to its potential visitors. The building’s design regulates an interior that is further quarantined by a dimly lit foyer that the visitor must pass through in order to enter the gallery. It extricates itself from its surroundings through a cloak of steel. On the one hand this refers back to the industrial character that once had been a familiar sight in the neighbourhood. On the other, it discourages an interface with the outside, limiting any permeation between the contained program and its surroundings.

The apparent limitations imposed by ACCA’s forbidding boundary become enabling constraints for Mitchell who exploits the potential of the building envelope: its roof, slivers of window and walls. He penetrated the crypt-like structure using a series of 33 mirrors to transmit inside something of the outside, maximising the limited permeability of the built structure to disrupt its homeostasis. These mirrors operated as controlling elements directing the sunlight that also controlled their movements.

Key components of the artwork were situated on the rooftop of ACCA. These mirrors were motorised and controlled by micro-processors that enabled them...
to pan and tilt, as they tracked the sun through the course of a day. They received constant updates on the position of the sun from a target mirror situated at the building’s entrance. Via one of the few slivers of window in the building’s façade sunlight was relayed from the mirrors on the rooftop to a mirror in the foyer. From there, by way of other mirrors strategically placed, the sunlight was transmitted in a sequence of reflections. This zigzag trajectory passed by a number of other artworks in the group exhibition, negotiating a circuit to the back space and piercing a partitioning wall along the way. The destination for this light was a collection of mirrors on the wall and ceiling of a faintly lit room. This final cluster of mirrors cast the sunlight downward onto two globular forms.

The ostensible purpose of this trajectory was to raise the temperature of the air inside the forms, using the energy in the sunlight, sufficiently so that
they hovered above the gallery floor. This goal was
ambitious, at the limit of the sunlight’s power as it lost
strength with each consecutive reflection. The fragile
beam that finally entered the back gallery tentatively
floated on the thin skin of the plastic forms activating
the air molecules within. It had a spectral quality—
its oscillating, flickering presence highlighting the
precarious relationship to the sun that sustains
life on earth. Travelling approximately 150 million
kilometres to reach this destination the sunlight proved
to be a particularly hesitant participant, revealing
itself intermittently depending on the weather. As
a result, the sensations engendered by the artwork
were faltering, a wavering appearance frequently
withdrawing, that required patience and persistence
to be encountered. The unstable and fluctuating light
actualised the movement and temporality of material
forces operating at timescales exceeding the human,
incorporating past and future durations that confront
anthropocentric conceptual schemas.

As the site of a working solution this artwork
extracted from its environment, its milieu, something
more than itself. Its territorialising force fabricated
a detour redirecting the sunlight and releasing its potential to activate an encapsulated volume of air within the body of the forms. The spatio-temporal thresholds of the artwork came into play as it negotiated boundaries between various exteriors and interiors. It produced multiple relations within and without, then and now, between various pockets of air: the earth’s atmosphere, the gallery, the artwork. This artwork emphasises what Irigaray claims Heidegger conceals when he clears an opening for his dwelling according to a metaphysical architectonics. She suggests Heidegger ‘forgets the difference of air[s]’ (Irigaray, 1999, p. 28). The variously differentiated volumes of air that this artwork constitutes are not voids or cavities, rather they manifest a number of interfaces for the exchange of energy, force, sense. If the artwork makes or fabricates sense it is because sense is not itself either in the body of the work or its actions. Rather it is the incorporeal effect that enters into relation with other incorporeal events of sense. This is the virtual condition of the event of sense that Deleuze argues makes any language possible. Each volume is a permeable interconnected store of matter that renders its elastic properties in fleeting glimpses, expanding and contracting as it provides a passage through which the light passes. In transforming the sunlight into a vibrational energy capable of elevating the globular forms, this artwork attests not only to the transfer of energy that resonates at a molecular level, but also the capacity of art that enables matter to become expressive.

The sensations produced by this artwork explored the less tangible aspects of physical forces, which Mitchell is drawn to work with. These are the forces of gravity, magnetism, and the electro-magnetic spectrum, of which light is the visible component. These forces carry within themselves modes of self-organisation that New Millennium Fountain re-orientated and intensified. This is the potential of art—to intensify the inhuman forces of the incorporeal, generated from what Grosz (2012, p. 1) advocates is ‘the openness of matter, its form-taking qualities in whose operations sense inheres’. New Millennium Fountain elaborated these qualities, creating a conduit that crossed multiple fields and surfaces to connect a flow of energy that resonated with something larger than itself. This was not a transcendent realm beyond the immediate, nor a realm of Ideas, rather it is the flow of becoming that this artwork enables us to sense without attempting to limit, fix or contain it in a representation. The transformations it undergoes resonate with the incorporeality of the event in its becoming. No matter how many times the sunlight appears, its actualisation is never exhausted. The little manoeuvres of the heliostats on ACCA’s rooftop that responded to the immense manoeuvres of the sun, harnessed forces in matter to become otherwise—to become more than material.

8 – See for example the Listener, shortlisted for the Melbourne Prize for Urban Sculpture 2014, Federation Square, Melbourne, which featured a device, a type of horn antenna, to capture radio waves emitted from the sun. Details of this and other works can be found at http://www.openobject.org.
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