Moonie S. [Painting and time: Fifteen points of view](#). *Journal of Contemporary Painting* 2018, 4(1), 171-175.

Copyright:

© Intellect 2018

DOI link to article:

https://doi.org/10.1386/jcp.4.1.171_1

Date deposited:

01/04/2018

Embargo release date:

01 April 2019

This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 3.0 Unported License](#)

Painting and time: Fifteen points of view

Stephen Moonie, Newcastle University

Abstract

This article offers a series of reflections upon the complex relationship of painting with time. The introduction sets out a trajectory from modernism to postmodernism. Painting's physical immediacy was prized by modernists, but that immediacy was also subject to a logic of historical development: a disjuncture that was challenged by postmodern critics. As we move towards the contemporary period, understanding of our relationship with time has altered, according to various theorizations by David Harvey, Fredric Jameson and Paul Virilio. The introduction draws upon Nagel and Wood's notion of 'anachronism' as means to consider painting's relationship with time as non-linear; but it also proposes, as do the following contributions, that painting's engagement with time is not merely theoretical, but is a matter of continual day-to-day practice.

Keywords

painting

time

modernism

postmodernism

criticism

anachronism

Our inaugural issue of the *Journal of Contemporary Painting* on Painting and Cinema included an article in which invited painters reflected on how cinema may be said to have influenced their practice. We have repeated this format here, asking artists, writers and a painting conservator to address the subject of Painting and Time from the perspective of their own practices or through more general observations. Fifteen short statements have been collated from Andrew Grassie, Shirley Kaneda, Brendan Prendeville, Laura Lisbon, Monique Prieto, Alaena Turner, Niamh O'Malley, Damian Taylor, Anna Salamon, Lawrence Chin, Naomie Kremer, Gordon Cheung, David Cyrus Smith, Charlie Gere and Damien Meade, with an introduction by Stephen Moonie.

Introduction

Artists and friends recall that when Clement Greenberg made studio visits, the critic would turn his back to the wall while paintings were brought out. He would spin round, taking in the painting in one go. This little performance was an attempt to preserve, or even to enact, the very instantaneousness that he prized as an attribute of the best modernist painting. It was also a litmus test of his critical 'eye', where he attempted to bracket out those extraneous factors of memory, prior knowledge or subject matter that might cloud his intuitive critical judgement. Greenberg wrote in 1959 of the 'at-onceness' of modernist painting: 'For the cultivated eye, the picture repeats its instantaneous unity like a mouth repeating a single word' (Greenberg [1959] 1993: 81). There is undoubtedly an odd disjuncture between the elegance of this critical formulation and the silliness of its enactment in the studio. Nonetheless, this story provides a neat encapsulation of the modernist assumption – stemming back to Gotthold Ephraim Lessing's 'Laocoön: An essay

upon the limits of painting and poetry' (1766) – that painting is a static medium: and that its best examples are apprehended in a singular flash of illumination (Lessing [1898] 2005).

On the other hand, Leo Steinberg admitted in 1962 that he had no idea what to make of Jasper Johns' first solo show at Leo Castelli Gallery in 1958: it was only later, as the memory of those strange Targets and Flags impressed themselves upon him, that he became cognisant of their significance; further, it would take time for Steinberg to reflect upon and to articulate their effect on him (Steinberg [1962] 2007: 12–13). Here painting is experienced as a succession of recollected images imprinting themselves upon the viewer's memory: painting – or more accurately, the judgement or interpretation of painting – is the subject of self-conscious reflection: the viewer's experience gestates slowly while the painting's meaning or significance makes itself felt.

These two instances, each taken from classic modernist critics, encapsulate two aspects of temporality that subtend the medium of painting. Greenberg's response was based on the idea of painting as a singular object distinct from other media such as music, literature or even sculpture, where the viewer's apprehension unfolds over time. Greenberg's understanding of painting placed primacy on 'experience', where the aesthetic quality of painting takes precedence over its meaning. Steinberg, however, was less interested in 'quality', and instead emphasized the interpretative aspect of our encounter with painting. In this respect, the unfolding of time plays a crucial part in sustaining the interpretative impulse: to make sense of painting as an object of scholarly enquiry. These two approaches, the aesthetic-critical and the art-historical, form distinct ways in which painting is apprehended, and yet, they undoubtedly overlap.

When Rosalind Krauss made her break with modernism in the early 1970s, she opened her essay 'A view of modernism' ([1972] 2010) with a story about Michael Fried at

the Fogg Museum during the display of 'Three American Painters' in 1965. A young student approached Fried, pointing to a painting by Frank Stella. The student asked 'What's so good about that?' Fried replied that Stella wanted nothing more than to paint like Diego Velázquez, but that the option was no longer available to him. Raising his voice for emphasis (and, as I like to imagine the scene, grasping the young man by his lapels), Fried explained, 'He wants to be Velázquez, so he paints stripes' (Krauss [1972] 2010: 115). One can appreciate the comedy of this incident, but for Krauss, it encapsulated the disavowal of temporality at the heart of modernism: the 'instantaneous' apprehension of painting presupposes a familiarity with its history. Krauss reflects upon the peculiar logic of placing Stella and Velázquez within the same historical continuum, one that could not be dissociated from the rhetoric of immediacy. Using the analogy of perspective, with its sequential, spatializing logic, Krauss argues that

[I]f someone asks us what's so good about a painting by Stella and our answer is that he has to paint stripes because of Manet [...] we have made the Stella painting into a particular kind of screen onto which we project a special form of narrative. (Krauss [1972] 2010: 124)

Looking at Stella therefore entails not simply the immediacy of the concentric bands of paint stamping themselves out as shape, but it opens up 'a perspective view that opens backward into that receding vista of past doors and rooms, which, because they are not reenterable, can only manifest themselves in the present by means of diagrammatic flatness' (Krauss [1972] 2010: 124).

Krauss indicts the ‘innocence’ of modernism, the ‘loosening’ of its critical intelligence in failing to acknowledge its own historicity. She deconstructs the singular plenitude of the modernist painting: both moves are a means to stake out an incipient postmodernism. However, the interest of Krauss’ passage for us is that she is describing a peculiar kind of narrative: a telescoped history whereby the present and the past are brought into close proximity. Stella and Velásquez are brought together in a continuum where one figure is not explicable without the other and yet, their conjunction appears absurd, given the radical difference between their paintings. Further, and quite crucially, Stella’s access to the past is barred: it recedes from him inexorably.

Krauss is not only describing the modern – that which cannot be done again – but her essay intimates the changing nature of space and time as we enter the postmodern period. Robert Smithson had remarked in 1966, in his characteristically gnomic way, that the decline of the modernist tradition could be seen as an unravelling of an organic sense of time as a biological metaphor of seeding, sprouting and growth ([1966] 1996: 35). Indeed, Fried claimed that ‘the ultimate criterion of the legitimacy of a putative advance in modernist painting is its fecundity’ ([1965] 1998: 219). Fried argued that the best modernist painting must turn out to have been historically necessary: drawing on Hegel via Merleau-Ponty, it must embody ‘the maturation of a future in the present’ (1960: 90). However, Minimalism emerged as a rival to this logic of historical development. In opposition to this notion of time, which is bound up with the metaphor of biological growth and development, Smithson proposed a sense of time that he called the ‘crystalline’: here time is static rather than dynamic, an accretion rather than a maturation (Roberts 2004: 44). Smithson discerned this in the paintings of Ad Reinhardt, where ‘time vanishes into a perpetual sameness’ ([1966] 1996: 34).

Smithson's idea of time prefigures Fredric Jameson's claim that time becomes spatialized under the condition of postmodernism: the past is rendered a pastiche of stylistic appropriations: Jameson highlights films such as Roman Polanski's *Chinatown* (1974), but it might apply to the montaged paintings of David Salle, or to the abstract appropriations of Peter Halley or Sherrie Levine (1991). Similarly, David Harvey's notion of 'space-crossed time' and Paul Virilio's 'accelerationism' propose fundamentally different conditions under which we experience space and time under globalized financial capitalism (Harvey 1990; Virilio 2010).

While those theories are seductive in their grand scope, offering powerful concepts with which to grasp the dislocations effected by our networked, technological post-industrial society, we must consider what this means for painting. As Krauss argues, modernist painting, even at its most sensuously immediate, is nothing if not historical. Of course, the pre-modern understanding of history was distinct from ours: Alexander Nagel and Christopher Wood have proposed an entirely different understanding of time during the Renaissance. They propose the notion of 'anachronism' to explain the relationship of the Renaissance artist with antiquity: that Renaissance artists had neither a secure chronological understanding of antiquity nor did they self-consciously regard themselves as historically distinct from that epoch as Panofsky had proposed in his classic study of perspective (Nagel and Wood 2005). Instead, Nagel and Wood propose a 'clash of temporalities', where iconographic motifs and objects were used in ways which disrupt our modern conception of originals followed by later copies. For Renaissance viewers, they argue, there was no contradiction in seeing the figures from Sandro Botticelli's *Primavera* (c. 1482) wearing fashionable contemporary dress or in seeing a free-standing bronze statue of Christ set in a fifth-century Early Christian altar, as in Vittore Carpaccio's *The Vision of St Augustine* (1502–

03). Instead, they claim that ‘modern copies of icons were understood as effective surrogates for lost originals’ (Nagel and Wood 2005: 405). Nagel and Wood’s is a specifically art-historical argument, but its exceeding sophistication, and its proposal of discontinuous temporalities, is itself a consequence of the changed relationship with time theorized by postmodernism. This relationship is distinct from the modernist notion of time, where Stella and Velázquez are placed within a linear historical continuum: painting’s essence persists, even if its outward form changes over time.

Although Nagel and Wood propose a ‘clash of temporalities;’ this does not militate against the unmediated, phenomenological *appearance* of the artwork to the viewer (Nagel and Wood 2005: 408). This immediacy might recall Greenberg’s modernist wholeness or it might resonate with the technological ‘presentism’ theorized by Virilio, whereby our society of instantaneous communication has dissolved our sense of history (Virilio 2010: 99–102). However, Nagel and Wood’s is instead a more complex, non-linear relationship of the past with the present brought about by the artwork’s specific temporality.

This introduction has mainly reflected upon the critical and historical apprehension of painting, rather than upon its daily practice (as described in the contributions below). Following Nagel and Wood, paintings exist in time as material objects, but they also cut through time: they point back, consciously or unselfconsciously, to history, but paintings also point forwards to subsequent appropriations, discoveries or belated recognitions. Painting today no longer forms part of a linear historical trajectory (i.e., if it ever did), but it nonetheless continues as a specific material practice embedded within those complex temporalities.

Andrew Grassie

There are two instances of 'time' that I will describe in my work.

There is the daily ritual of cracking eggs, mixing pigments and translating photographic images into painted surfaces, a process of repetition that appears to demote innovation and creativity in favour of the subtler transformations that occur during translation. Like many a Sisyphean task, it is the sort of progression that loops back to the start, to yet another copy, where the end is in sight before one even begins.

However, within the paintings I have noticed another 'time' emerge. The spaces in the works feel like vacuums. The 'time' in them appears to slow down or be trapped. Yves Bonnefoy (1995) brilliantly describes the sense of time in Piero della Francesca's frescoes as 'the gift of a moment', where figures and objects are 'caught in mid flight'. Our gaze lingers over these silent suspended moments. Here, there is no passage in time, only a cross section. The life that is carried over from one instant to another is lost and this loss produces a sense of melancholy.

Perhaps there is also a link here between the time taken in the process of making a painting and the affect of frozen time within some images. David Joselit (2016) discusses how the 'markings' of an artist are stored up in painting like a battery, eternally present and able to be unlocked by a viewer. In this sense he believes 'paintings are paradoxically live', so that the process is made visible in the object, one eternally present in the stillness of the other.

Shirley Kaneda

Time is fluid, but its markers are established by notable events. Of the many approaches made to abstract painting, the majority were prematurely abandoned or worked through

too hastily in pursuit of signal achievements in order to establish a hierarchical condition. What is built into painting and abstraction in particular is the ability to record itself while reflecting on the world outside. This intrinsic self-referential dialogue through and of itself, once crucial and exemplary as a way to reflect and mark the world's development, has now been derided and perceived as an inadequate reflector of the evolution of our time. The threat of entropy is constant for any form, but such a misconception allows other mediums to validate themselves against painting and disregard its cross-referential capability that encompasses time, materiality and relationships with what can and cannot be seen.

For any art to remain relevant and timely, it requires a constant dialogue between innovation, repetition and transformation. Abstract painting has regularly altered the terms of its existence so it can refine, renew and revisit what may have been prematurely discarded in order to continue to extend its vocabulary and to re-order our perception of what may have been previously established. This ability to operate between time allows the new to be contextualized in ways that connect us to the past while remaining fluid and unstable in the present as a mode of representation.

Brendan Prendeville

In an early Hopper painting, a young woman, having slipped to the floor from the bed she leans against, inclines her head drowsily towards an impasto rectangle of morning sunlight that just touches her bare foot. The woman's posture suggests a moment of awakening in which inner state and outer reality are just beginning their encounter. Two temporalities meet, but do not coincide: that of the body and that of the cosmos. Painting engages with these two aspects of time, duration and entropy. In Monet's *Nymphéas*, life grows from

itself, the inverted reflection of chaos, an inward expansion. In Agnes Martin's grids, fine distension affords an opening of the eyes that is self-aware, an inward opening to the continuous present. Late Hopper paintings often portray the opposite. In a bare room, a woman, lean and in her middle years, stands in the rectangle of sunlight cast through the window that she faces and that falls fully on her; between her fingers, there is a cigarette. She is the gnomon in a mortal sundial, marking the advance of cosmic time. This sun means death. Yet painting may also, as with Bonnard's blooms within blooms, conjure the illusion of a self-renewing present: the work of Scheherazade.

Laura Lisbon

By spraying paint as a way of making paintings, the 'expression' of the paint counts on pace and distance, direction and viewpoint, and speed and lack thereof across the surface. Concepts of *spacing* for producing a painting become deeply intertwined with methods of *temporal* structuring.

The *spacing* of painting has also come to count on the number of obstacles placed in front of the canvases delaying the sprayed paint from reaching the surface directly. I call the orchestration of these obstacles a 'set-up', which implies a 'before' of the work. I am trying to find a way to also show the set-ups as the 'now' of the work in order to unsettle the before and after of a painting. Most recently, the large-scale and small-scale set-ups operate as architectures – not as sets of planes that make volumes, but instead as sets of points that make for a procession of sight, paint and body through the form. The cut, the frame, the trace and the view are all ways to still the work – to think in terms of a painting or a tableau that depends on a pause or remove from the set-up for its appearance.

Monique Prieto

Painting takes time to make, time to see, time to consider, time to ripen and time to decay.

But I like to think that painting can also create or give time. For me there is a sensation, standing with a generous painting, of a stretching or a loosening of the experience of time.

What comes to you is not just you in the moment, looking. There comes to you also every other time you encountered that painting, in person or in print and there comes the artist in her time making the painting. And just so, she is responding to other artists and their paintings in their respective times. Then there is the bit of time just ahead that the surprising choices in front of you seem to open up. Taking in a painting that really gives is like experiencing a little or even a grand billowing of time. The painter grabs the corners of time and shakes. What was flat and measurable ripples open [...]

Alaena Turner

My painting practice perhaps hosts time through the quality of 'the live' and as a visual form of narrative. By 'the live' I mean to convey more than merely the present tense, and indicate a concern for the daily-ness of painting, the repeated performance of placing and erasing colour, the physical contact with materials, the time of both doing and waiting. Whilst my work is ordinarily presented in a static form, the 'live' persists in the marks created through the technique that I have adopted of using oil-paint as both the mark-making medium and the adhesive, which makes the physical layers of my painting cohere. The aesthetic created through this ill-advised process of using paint as glue suggests that the painterly

composition is provisional, implying the possible collapse of the painting, mess to be cleaned up or a continued negotiation between a painting and painting materials. As a narrative of what it may mean to make a painting, it is intended that this may extend beyond the process of my own practice and find points of correspondence with earlier historical moments concerned with the nature of abstract painting or the question of what constitutes work for the painter.

Niamh O'Malley

I structured a painting workshop recently, a collaborative project where participants took turns to make marks (without sign or symbol) within a specific time frame, on both sides of a pane of glass held centrally in a gallery. As a group we observed that the time of thought, of potential and of decision became compounded and pressured. A favourite quote, 'the texture of distance at point blank'¹ reflects that resolve to conclude the rush of stuff into a point perhaps? A solid and material point even, made visible as accreted brushstrokes and manipulated matter. There is also a disappointment in such a concluding act. How can one mark the completion of an image, a word, a thought?

I sometimes think of 'subjects' as dispassionate 'reaction shots' to their frenzied observer: a self-defeating responsiveness and artifice, one thing leading to another in a chase of sense and senses. Two kinds of distances travelled: between a form observed and recorded to the production of a form out of utter subjectivity. Marks become animators, living points, [...] dots more concrete than words.

Damian Taylor

For Gotthold Lessing it was self-evident that the time of a painting was the single 'pregnant moment'. Two decades later Gainsborough offered a powerful reminder of painting's temporal complexity, withdrawing his major submission for the 1784 Royal Academy exhibition ('Three Eldest Daughters of George III') because it was to be hung too high for viewers to appreciate, as he put it, the 'work of the picture'. The importance of the dialogue between the time of the image and that of its making is an old one, that, since Gainsborough's age, has been greatly complicated. On the one hand, Cubism, abstraction, etc., have undermined the idea of an image, let alone the image of a single moment. On the other, the pervasiveness of photography has promoted an assumed (however problematic) simultaneity between the time the image depicts and that in which the image was made. In a dialogue between painting and photography I have recently been interested in removing the image from photography and focusing more on the environment of a photograph's exposure. For instance, a cyanotype with the somewhat didactic title *Hampstead Heath 11.02–13.34 2 July 2015 Early light Shower, Sun, later light shower* (2015) records several hours' broken sun and the impression of raindrops, whereas *Midsummer's Day Venice 20/6 23.45–22/6 01.20 Snails* (2015) records the trace not only of 24 hours' light but also of an inquisitive snail.

Anna Salamon

For quite some time now, I have been intrigued by Luce Irigaray's theoretical proposition that 'painting makes time simultaneous'. In 'Flesh Colours', referring to Klee, she offers us

painting as a material intervention into human psychological timeline, an intervention effecting future change.

Here, interestingly for Klee perhaps, it is not novelty that alters futurity, but continuity: the continuous tense of painting, grounded in physicality. Such continuity – Irigaray argues as a linguist – is unique to painting: it is not offered by language. ‘Painting makes time simultaneous’ in that it materially presents various tenses at once. This flattening of the complex interdependence of painting as object and as activity is problematic for a practitioner. I’m following Irigaray’s thought, which is an example of a philosophers’ fantasy about painting. Conveniently, the English language presents us with a ready-made idea of painting in the continuous tense, pre-merging the distinction between the object and the activity.

Attractive to practitioners, Irigaray’s account poses little demand for the ‘Future of Painting’ as discipline and idea. Here, the emergence of painting occurs without a clearly projected Future of Painting. Naively, one wants to ask: does paint-*ing* make the past chronology of Painting, with its various tenses, similarly present?

Now, this *making time simultaneous* does not occur chronologically. The doing of paint-*ing* happens when the moment is ready to be seized, in *kairos time*. This action-oriented moment, although durational, constitutes a rapture with passing. In this kind of ‘now’ various times are simultaneous in painting and, at times perhaps, only then ripe to endure change.

Lawrence Chin

(Un)timely Object: Brief thoughts from the edges of paintings conservation

A painting arrives. In the studio, it is peered over and searched for material clues to its existing condition – benign or extreme; superficial or deep-seated; confined or overall. It is through scrupulous observation of the effects on various materials – such as cracking, flaking, surface dirt, discolouration, fading, tearing, de-lamination, staining – that one starts to piece together a plausible sequence of events and their causes affecting the painting in order to mitigate or disguise some of these entropic effects. Conservation work stands in a peculiar relationship with the painted object and its passage in time. On the one hand, conservation work attends to the painted object as actually and presently given. On the other, conservation work attempts to effect a return to a past condition (and hence, temporal state) of the object. Much akin to ‘time-shelters’ that David Wood describes as ‘local economies of time’ (in *Time After Time*, p. 26) arising from negentropic (creative) labour and organization, conservation work creates discontinuities that disrupt the expectation of smooth time-space continuum – enfolding the present into the past while displacing the painting into the future. In addition, such an intervention draws out the perception and understanding of the painted surface into a three-dimensional realm – as an object existing in time, subjected to both deterioration and regeneration events marking the painting as already past, yet already new. *And the painting leaves.*

Naomie Kremer

Time is both a soup and a ribbon. We do not always notice it. It is something that happens to us while we engage in various activities, some of which make time, and some of which take time. Paintings do both.

My paintings imply the passage of time by the sheer number of marks and the way colour and form force the eye to move rhythmically over their surface. Rhythm can only unfold over time. But a painting is an object, and by definition an object does not act, it simply exists in time like everything else. A painting encourages the illusion that it can be ingested in one glance.

To counter this illusion, since 2008, I have been making what I call “hybrid paintings”: fully realized paintings on which I project video specifically created for each painting. Projecting video onto a painting conflates the timelessness of a painting with the time-based medium of video.

Hybrid paintings exist in two equally valid states. When the video is on, what you see is not a painting. Looking closely does not yield more information. When the video is not on you are looking at a painting, and brushstrokes reward close looking.

Hybrid paintings contain both time and unfold over time.

Gordon Cheung

Where to start with such a vast subject as time and painting? Perhaps my age to signpost my timeline, I am 40 years old. Mortality is intensified nowadays and it has always sought expression in my preferred visual medium of painting. Death of course is a universal theme in western contemporary painting, especially as it flexes against the prevailing winds of

culture determined to force it into an existential crisis. Perhaps its current discursive and/or market incarnation is the so-called Zombie Formalist Abstraction. I recognized that this insular art was contemporary painting's borders from which I was to make art. With my cultural roots being Britain and Hong Kong, paradoxically both and neither, I have always been drawn to the in-between spaces to capture the fluctuating histories of Utopia and Dystopia. It was the 1990s' communications and digital revolutions of mobile phone technology and the Internet that compelled me to find a way to visualize it via the language of painting. At first I substituted paint for collage to simulate 'painting with information' and over the years I developed a language that could respond to a state of constant flux in the modern global and mythological landscapes of our time.

David Cyrus Smith

I often find the question 'how did it come to this?' arising from looking at artwork. When a painting is done it is obvious, but how do you get there? Painting is always a series of procedures but knowing the procedures does not always make it clear.

The image is always the main thing, but paintings are more than images – painting is an enactment or a physical occupation of material, in a way this speaks about time.

Inevitably it is a question about time, as in, might the work exist in the time that it comes into being, but simultaneously also be located outside of it- in a time we call the future, and is this something that perhaps postpones its relationship with arrival?

I need painting to occupy the space of resistance or at least the possibility of resistance- it should move against the inevitability of a certain thing happening.

So often you hear the issue of the role of a work of art, and therefore, perhaps a determined de-familiarization offers the work the opportunity to escape from performing what everything else is forced to do, which is, in essence, to be consumed.

Making a painting is a series of beginnings – not the perfected presentation of closure.

Charlie Gere

I am looking at a series of sketchbooks containing gouache and watercolour paintings that I did 30 years ago while travelling in India. Many of them include clouds, perhaps because I was there during the monsoon season. The clouds suggest the temporality involved in both making and looking at these sketches. The I who is looking at them has some undoubted continuity with the I who did them three decades ago, and yet is also different. There are scenes recorded in the sketches, and in the diaries I also kept in India, of which I have no recollection. They might as well belong to someone else, to the self I was in my mid-20s, not the self I am in my mid-50s. This seems to me to confirm the idea found in the work of Alfred North Whitehead, and others, that everything is ultimately process evolving through time. The physicist Henry Stapp, a follower of Whitehead, suggests that

[a]t each stage of the unfolding of nature the complete cloud of possibilities acts like the potentiality for the occurrence of a next increment in knowledge, whose occurrence can radically change the cloud of possibilities/potentialities for the still-later increments in knowledge.

Damien Meade

The painter stops. The mind is taken by something. Flowing through the surface of knitted marks recently laid down, it senses a residual trace of the fullness of cerebral activity through which the marks were forged: arbitrary thoughts and daydreams experienced while painting, swirls of music, phrases in precise tones as heard through a podcast, all flood back through the gaze as it drifts across the surface. Paint is traversed as a mapping of time recently lived. Surfacing in the wake of intentionality, this momentary state, like the luminosity of plankton on a beach, ultimately subsides.

Following this lapse, the mind returns to the task at hand. The gaze takes in one element, then another and so on. As it migrates it produces temporal relationships between elements, reassigning or concentrating significance in an ebb and flow. Returning to any element already visited, 'before' also becomes 'after', and through matter, the past coalesces with the present. Vilém Flusser likens this temporal quality of the image to the 'circular time of magic' (2000: 8–10)

Painting is a durational immersion in matter and space, and through it, time is emancipated from a linear, quantitative and mechanized bind, and revealed as something qualitative, variable and expansive.

References

Bonnefoy, Y. (1995), *The Lure and the Truth of Painting: Selected Essays on Art*, Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

Cocker, E. (2015), 'Kairos time: The performativity of timing and timeliness... or; between Biding one's time and knowing when to act', presented at the *1st PARSE Biennial Research Conference on Time*, University of Gothenburg, Sweden, 4–6 November.

Flusser, V. (2000), *Towards a Philosophy of Photography* (trans. Martin Chalmers), London: Reaktion Books.

Fried, M. ([1965] 1998), 'Three American painters: Noland, Olitski, Stella', in *Art and Objecthood: Essays and Reviews*, Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, pp. 213–65.

Greenberg, C. ([1959] 1993), 'The case for abstract art', in John O'Brian (ed.), *Clement Greenberg: The Collected Essays and Criticism, Vol.4: Modernism with a Vengeance, 1957–1969*, Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, pp. 75–84.

Harvey, D. (1990), *The Condition of Postmodernity*, Malden, MA and Oxford: Blackwell.

Jameson, F. (1991), *Postmodernism, or, the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*, Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Joselit, D. (2016), 'Marking, scoring and speculating (on time)', in I. Graw and E. Lajer-Burcharth (eds), *Painting Beyond Itself : The Medium in the Post-medium Condition*, Berlin: Sternberg Press, pp

Irigaray, L. (2004), 'Flesh Colours', in L. Irigaray (ed.), *Key Writings*, New York: Continuum, pp. 112-122.

Krauss, R. ([1972] 2010), 'A view of modernism', in *Perpetual Inventory*, Cambridge, MA and London: MIT Press, pp. 115–28 (originally published in *Artforum*, 11, September).

Lessing, G. E. ([1898] 2005), *Laocoön: An Essay Upon the Limits of Painting and Poetry* (trans. Ellen Frothingham), Mineola, NY: Dover Press.

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1960), 'Le langage indirect et les voix du silence', *Signes*, Paris: Editions Gallimard.

Nagel, A. and Wood, C. (2005), 'Toward a new model of renaissance anachronism', *Art Bulletin*, 87:3, September, pp. 403–15.

Ó Murchadha, F. (2013), *The Time of Revolution: Kairos and Chronos in Heidegger*, London and New York: Bloomsbury.

Roberts, J. L. (2004), *Mirror Travels: Robert Smithson and History*, New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Smithson, R. ([1966] 1996), 'Quasi-Infinities and the waning of space', in Jack Flam (ed.), *Robert Smithson: The Collected Essays*, Berkley: University of California Press.

Steinberg, L. ([1962] 2007), 'Contemporary art and the plight of its public', in *Other Criteria: Confrontations with Twentieth-Century Art*, Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, pp.3–16.

Virilio, P. (2010), *The Futurism of the Instant: Stop-Eject* (trans. J. Rose), Cambridge: Polity.

Artist details

Andrew Grassie was born in Edinburgh and moved to London, UK, to study at both St Martins School of Art and the Royal College of Art, where he continues to live and work.

Shirley Kaneda is an artist who was born in Tokyo, Japan, and lives and works in New York City, USA.

Brendan Prendeville studied painting at St Martins School of Art and now teaches art history at Goldsmiths, University of London.

Laura Lisbon is an artist and Professor in the Department of Art at The Ohio State University, USA.

Monique Prieto is an artist who lives and works in Los Angeles, California, USA.

Alaena Turner is a WRoCAH-funded practice-based Ph.D. candidate at the University of Leeds. She lives and works in London, UK.

Niamh O'Malley is a Dublin-based visual artist and part-time lecturer at Dublin Institute of Technology.

Damian Taylor is an artist who lives and works in London, UK.

Anna Salamon (b.1984, Warsaw) is an artist based in London, UK. Her work explores immateriality and time through painting, printmaking and drawing.

Lawrence Chin is a paintings conservator, writer and lecturer who lives and works in Singapore.

Naomie Kremer is a painter, multi-media artist and video-based set designer. She lives and works in Berkeley, CA, NYC and Paris, France.

Gordon Cheung studied at the Royal College of Art, lives and works in London, UK, and is represented by Alan Cristea Gallery and Edel Assanti.

David Cyrus Smith is an artist who lives and works in London, UK.

Charlie Gere teaches at Lancaster University and lives in Cumbria, UK. He writes on whatever takes his fancy.

Damien Meade is an artist who was born in Ireland, and lives and works in London, UK.

Contributor details

Stephen Moonie is lecturer in art history in the Department of Fine Art, School of Arts and Cultures, Newcastle University. He completed his Ph.D. in 2009 at the University of Essex on the subject of modernist painting and its criticism. He contributed to the catalogue *The Indiscipline of Painting* (Tate, 2011). His recent publications include 'Historians of the future: Harold Rosenberg's critique of *Artforum*', *Visual Resources*, 31:1&2 (April 2015); 'A poet of non-ressentiment? Lawrence Alloway, Ray Johnson, and the artworld as a network', *Getty Research Journal*, 9 (February 2016); 'October and the ends of painting', in Eva Ehninger and Antje Kraus-Wahl (eds), *In Terms of Painting* (Berlin: Revolver, 2016).

Contact:

School of Arts and Cultures, The Quadrangle, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne NE1 7RU, UK.

E-mail: stephen.moonie@ncl.ac.uk