

DIALOGOS: on Gary Hill's Happenstance

S: I was not on a couple of observations that I've not had before, about certain areas that this thing seems to me absolutely to locate <sup>are located</sup> certain problems, in a way that <sup>(in any other art)</sup> would in some way announce itself as semiotic—I can't think of any ~~other~~ thing that quite does it. <sup>the way this does.</sup> I might be wrong but what I <sup>just saw</sup> wrote is this: That several signs refer to the same object, simultaneously given along with them, opens a space that has a multidimensionality, not created by the mirror-play of recursion, but by the physical—i.e. spatial—temporal—coincidence of sign and reference. And the play of the multiple signs in the attention of the viewer <sup>(is such)</sup> that the experienter, viewer, auditor, reader must scan his own process of attention in order to perceive the object at all. ~~And~~ that the person experiences ~~his~~ "himself" in regions of his subjectivity as reader, auditor, viewer, listener—these different regions <sup>themselves</sup> become objects in the space of the art event among which "he" himself is also at play. So that in order to perceive <sup>an object</sup> in the natural situation of having to say, What is this? I am looking at ~~the image~~, the entire subject/object relationship is disordered in an utterly unique way by <sup>splitting</sup> ~~deconstructing~~ the subject into five different subjects: the subject that is hearing the voice speak, the subject that is looking at the image, the subject that is watching the words go by, the subject that's correlating the images to the words, not rationally but spontaneously, <sup>grasped</sup> ~~grasped~~ the location of the object itself that one is in the presence of is <sup>grasped</sup> ~~grasped~~ by a play of my own switching my attention to those different areas of myself. And ~~that's~~ that's created spontaneously, not intellectually. ~~It's~~ <sup>S</sup> simply to be there and ~~ask~~ to ask the question, What is happening, immediately creates <sup>a</sup> ~~me~~ a situation in which I'm opened into five different dimensions of my own subjectivity.

Q: What's interesting is that ~~everything about~~ <sup>all of</sup> that could be said about a certain amount of pure poetry but the way in which it is different is the way in which this work is unique.

I mean that sounds like a statement of the ~~the~~ poetics of [the work that interests us].

S: The difference would be that in the poetry we have the poetry present to itself as the signified of the signs, except that ...

Q: Except that it raises the question of all the other things too...

S: It raises the question but it doesn't spontaneously generate the circumstance in which those ~~things~~ are issued ...

Q: Except the performance situation ...

S: Performance does, sure ... There's something at the moment of the "THIS," when the "THIS" appears and you're seeing the word on the screen, right, and you have the pyramid of the dots moving and the word "THIS" is down here [gestures to screen bottom], and the voice says "This," so that the characteristic of the word "This" which is that it's immediately deictic, <sup>That is,</sup> ~~and~~ it has the possibility of pointing to itself, that ~~and~~ even that act of pointing to itself is split apart, since you're seeing a word -- you're seeing an object that it's pointing to, the object itself is in motion, in such a way that the activity of consciousness seems to be embedded in the <sup>xx object</sup> ~~word~~ itself, that is, the object itself is moving around and pointing to itself ...

H: I mean, part of the intention there ~~is~~ was that before the synchrony of "This" on the screen with the speaking of the word, there are the three dots <sup>[...]</sup> on the screen for "Therefore," but that's a two-dimensional ~~sign/symbol~~ sign/symbol. But then what happens when "This" ... actually is synchronous with the point that makes the vanishing point in a 3-d drawing, which makes it possible for three-dimensionality to occur -- not three-dimensionality as a picture but ~~it's like~~ it's like a symbol at that point of what's going on, from the past up to that point in order for it to go happen ...

Q: Orientation toward the expectation of three-dimensionality; as soon as you have a vanishing point you're oriented toward the expectation of three-dimensionality ...

H: But what I mean in this is that that only becomes like a symbol of three-dimensionality ...

the

S: The three-dimensionality is a multi-dimensionality, and you've got a visual image which is a symbol of three-dimensionality, which is already at least in four dimensions because it's in motion and because every single object in it is moving into the next position, so that the vector of a "This" which points is embedded in every little point along the surface of the object, moving to the next place. The voice is pointing to itself, the ~~xx~~ signified of the word "This" refers to the entire work, possibly, but also to this moment, and also to the vanishing point ...

H: But then what happens after that is set up: still it's sort of referring to pictorial 3-D, and then blows that apart -- not being a single point of attention, but all over the place ...

S: ~~If the activity,~~ <sup>The</sup> taking ~~the~~ image of the bouncing ball, <sup>[in cartoon ~~books~~ songs]</sup> the bouncing ball instead of going from word to word is bouncing from different kinds of activity of the subject, of the subjectivity of the viewer, for the moment. The whole point is that he is viewer, auditor, reader, listener, all simultaneously. And that ball is bouncing <sup>from</sup> those different activities in free play and looking for a point of rest; and you're constantly providing points of rest and then dissolving them in the space that you've created. So one point of rest is, oh we're now dealing with the language of perspective.

H: ~~The points of rest, though, they're almost there as a --~~ During the points of rest it's like then the viewer/reader -- the whole thing -- kind of leap-frogs and catches up to that point and <sup>sort of</sup> writes at the point -- it's assuming a certain amount of speed of organizing these things and also presupposes certain second guessing. (yeah)(right)

Q: Well there's always a gap happening. There are few points like the "This" where you have the opportunity for there not to be a gap, by perceiving holistically. But you must perceive holistically almost consciously.

S: But even that is going to be dissolved (right) because the "This" could refer to so many different specific points within the field that you can't

4  
even be sure it's holistic. That's only one of its possibilities, that it's holistic. (right)

Q: So there's always a gap and the gap is the space in which you are constantly questioning where the text is, (or where the image is, ~~where the image is~~ (or where the event is, or who the person is, (or who you are, ~~or who the person is, right~~

H: Besides those things happening at the point, it's also repeating a general cycle that has gone on of those words. It goes through that three times-

S: But you're in such <sup>completely</sup> different total worlds at each point that it's ~~unpredictable~~ unpredictable, and you've given up any hope that you're going to be able to rest in an abiding presence of an abiding meaning. You have to surrender.

H: That's what is so odd about it, is that just in terms of straight-forward meaning, as if you read the text ~~of~~ on the paper, it's very simple. It's so inside ~~of~~ the text that it's no longer that text.

Q: You see, that's true of a lot of poetry, too; which is if you turn the poem into a prose statement it sounds stupid (you mean if you read the words just in a straight line.)

S: Your <sup>[Q's]</sup> poetry, as being like the language, certain aspects of your poetry being like the language of this <sup>[type]</sup> in that your desire to determine the temporal presentation so that the actual fleshy quality of the mind-lag from word to word is materially part of what the poem is. That the aeration of the phrasing <sup>is</sup> ~~is~~ in an absolute presentational temporality is required in order for the different kinds of meanings that the poem has to \*\*\*\*

Q: That's why I had so much trouble in the 70's with what I was doing because it depended so much on the performance, and you <sup>[C. Stein]</sup> used to commonly complain that I wasn't scoring it <sup>S:</sup> right, that you weren't giving enough space to the thing that you actually were doing with it. Right, that I was unwilling to score the way poetry had asked us to score since, say, Pound and Olson and Duncan, to try to

give you a sense of how you should read it. Because I was trying to create a kind of modular line in which you didn't have any particular reading imposed upon you but the demand for it to be there at all was that you do something like that with it, that you give it some kind of unique space. And the only way I could get across that actual sense of it was by reading it.

S: So the sense was that they were incomplete, that they required some <sup>kind</sup> ~~type~~ of actual, not actualization in the sense of something <sup>potentially</sup> ~~factually~~ in them being brought out by an actualization, but they actually required some kind of contextualization in order for their potentials (to emerge.)

H: Now wouldn't that be similar to Jackson? <sup>[more low]</sup>

Q: No, actually, his things <sup>are</sup> ~~are~~ more textural, they tell you <sup>very specifically</sup> ~~you~~ what you have <sup>to do to</sup> ~~to~~

H: But as far as on the page (Cage does too) it's not really self-evident what to do.

Q: It depends on the poem, in some cases it is. That the event doesn't occur in any particular slowing down of time. Normal reading time is the adequate time for that because of the way he constructs lines like in the <sup>Light Poems.</sup> ~~light poems.~~

In fact, that's what's true of most poetry that succeeds in conveying itself, its time, self, its self in time, is that it creates a notational system which if you know how to respond appropriate<sup>ly</sup> to that notational system reading a lot of poetry, then you can grasp the event. My work was different in that it deliberately removed that and yet required it be there.

S: I would say that the thing that happens in all of those poetry<sup>ies</sup> which we easily saw as scoring, <sup>isn't</sup> ~~aren't~~ really scoring at all but really we're going in the opposite direction from scoring. Because scoring means somehow the real event is its presentation and the notation is an indication of some real temporality. What really was involved in the "scoring" of an Olsen or a Creeley or a Duncan, is to create a textual substitute for temporality. So that experiences of temporality, the meanings of those delays and of timing, the

meaning of the sense of timing, could be something that one could have while reading the poem <sup>(on the page)</sup> and it might actually be taking place in a different temporality depending on the particularities of the reader. ~~And then the~~

~~reader himself.~~ <sup>The</sup> poet reading his own work, gives you the clue about how to read the poem by yourself, rather than gives a true performance of the poem.

But <sup>[Q]</sup> you were doing it, moving it out into the other dimension, by saying that what <sup>Your</sup> ~~this~~ text is is something that requires a temporal completion in the performance space —

Q: Which for me stands for a consciousness completion, that the event occurs in the mind. That if you can create the situation where there's a question about how the voice is operative, then you raise the question of how the mind is operative. (sure) That article that I wrote on Jackson MacLo<sup>was in Paper Six</sup>, where I made the point that the reader who has not heard Jackson's voice is, in a sense, the free-est but also the poorest. It's a curious kind of paradox that once ~~of~~ you've heard Jackson perform those poems you can live in them in a different way but you are at the same time kind of stuck with his version of it. And the ultimate truth of his text is that you not be stuck with his, or anybody's, or any personality. And yet ironically, or paradoxically, you really require it. ~~At~~ at least I did but of course that was early history, twenty years ago. But now maybe the atmosphere is such that people don't need to hear that, they've heard enough of that kind of work that they are attuned to the possibility of that open space—

S: But reading <sup>Hereford Beson</sup> ~~MacLo's~~ = you have a whole other level of return to what it means to read a Jackson, <sup>[Mac Low]</sup> poem. I feel I don't know anymore. There's another point in the connection between your language and Gary's language which is a curious twist because what I'm coming to feel about this work is that ~~as though~~ <sup>his verbal</sup> ~~the~~ language is the same as your language, that <sup>is,</sup> the use of language is

~~directly,~~

directly related to yours, ~~but that~~ the sense of work, what the work is, is pushing towards another level of closure, actually. Not that it's a closure in the sense that the mind listening to any different element of it closes down, but that you're being driven by ~~this multiplicity~~ <sup>multiple-subjectivity</sup> and by something like an intuition of the coherence of all the different elements, towards a "transcendental <sup>p</sup>aperception" of what this thing is [an <sup>Q:</sup>aperception that you never quite arrive at]. Which a hermeneutics might arrive at, which ~~we~~ <sup>Q:</sup> might arrive at. [<sup>Q:</sup> allow us to dwell in temporarily]. And it brings to the question of where, this is a heavy literary question really, is the question ~~of~~ of the kind of ~~transcendental relationship of its symbolic inter-~~ <sup>inter-</sup> content. # That is, the point in which images, embedded, in this web of relationships of the different elements, ~~the~~ images stop being images and become symbols. Because what happens in the literary context is that at a certain point an image is no longer an image, it's no longer involved in its <sup>Q:</sup> idetic qualities and the fact that it calls up something before the mind's eye. But begins to stand for something that the textuality itself, the words going by, the discursive character of the language, cannot say, but which the whole work is trying to get to. \*And I think that something like that starts happening in ~~terms of~~ this piece. I mean it almost is a documentary, some kind of statement about the Logos because of the particular <sup>H:</sup> (what's Logos?) <sup>S:</sup> The Logos is the Christ as <sup>Q:</sup> word. (the word made flesh; in the Beginning was the Logos) is the actual text) <sup>S:</sup> The sword-crossed heart, that image at one point. There's a crossed sword inside a heart-shaped image that's like- <sup>H:</sup> (well really it's a cross not a sword) <sup>S:</sup> Part of the transformational sense of it is that surely it's the radiant heart, the holy cross, you get it ~~where~~ there and it's in a place. And you've got the word that's surrounded by nothing. And the whole notion of Happenstance is <sup>Kairos</sup> ~~chance~~ as finding these moments of something very magical and special about the appearance of certain moments (<sup>Kairos?</sup> ~~Chance?~~) (Is there

a star thing called <sup>Kairos</sup> ~~Chorus?~~) Well the configuration of the star of Bethlehem at the moment of the birth of Christ would be an instance of something called ~~Chorus~~ <sup>Kairos</sup>. Which means like the particular moment in history, particular moment in real time when there is a moment of grace. A moment when something descends through the Logos or through the Holy Spirit and you've got both. You have all the major Christian symbols moving in a space which creates wonder in relationship to them. That's what I would say is where the symbolism is loaded. Is that in the space of all this going on, and all this transformation, there's a sense of wonder in relationship to very specific images. And the image is the heart-cross-light, <sup>the</sup> ~~the~~ luminous heart, in transformation. The descent of dove-like words, a rain of language-

H: There's also this thing which I haven't said before, There's this sort of fairy tale in the general sense. Like, <sup>cross</sup> ~~cross~~ my heart and hope to die, and that's a child's thing. And also I should show you this other text I wrote when I first show this I read it first and it was written to be read before then show this and read it again and then show this again. And it has in it "sticks and stones will break my bones but words will never hurt me" <sup>which</sup> ~~me~~ which people are chosen before hand and when I come to this part where that overlaps with lying on a bed of sticks, I pause and they say this chorus from the audience) and then I continue on. When I wrote that, when I realized that quality in this, right before the Therefore symbol goes through those animal-like shapes and the sound almost sounds like a musicbox. It sounds like one of those little wind-up things. It's like it almost goes through a picture book of animals as I'm talking about the forest. There <sup>is</sup> ~~is~~ not representational in the least but there's a serpent and the snake comes across, and the serpent bites it and then releases it, and the soloman the frog comes up. And the Therefore symbol, the top point is its eye, and then it fades. These are what was going through my head when I made this. (right, that's interesting)



9

Q: Those are like hidden presences ( exactly, there made to be embedded in it) It's funny because that's exactly a process that I go through (calling in presences and hiding them and allowing them to be there without actually-)

H: It's: a way of having my motor run. I mean these are present in my mind that are very acutely objectified in my head as I'm working. That's what I'm working on is to try to get that so it is just that much that, so it's not like those came

S: I'm buzzing on two different levels of this thing . First of all what I want to say is that the symbolism, obviously, is not <sup>a problem</sup> heavy because it isn't foregrounded as symbolism at all (let's face it the main one would be the Logos) (the tree) The point is your attention is moving so much in this other space <sup>the image itself</sup> so ~~is~~ no more than the words themselves taken on the page, spell out its meaning . The images themselves don't spell it out either. ~~So~~ So that there is this continuous undercutting and there's actually the play between, say, ~~between~~ the symbolic resonance of the "breath-taking" image, on the one hand, And the attempt to create the verbal analogue. So that you're saying "cross my heart <sup>and hope to die</sup>" and for sure, somewhere in one's mind as one sees that one thinks "cross my heart" . Is it actually part of the text? (sure, it's the only thing that's sung in the whole thing) Right, but <sup>in a</sup> very <sup>improvised</sup> ~~modeled~~ ~~is~~ way. I think I heard that being said but you have to actually put your attention into that in order to hear it say "cross my heart." So you're getting "cross my heart" which is one level of language, which is extremely removed from the radiance symbolism of this glowing phallus. It's a kind of luminous phallus in the heart that becomes the cross . It's just a pole of light, which comes first?

H: What happens is that it's a heart and then part of the heart curls in and curls back out and then the cross melts down and forms itself . The ~~cross~~ becomes a cloaked figure, like a death figure. Those are stacked like tarot cards.

But after that happens, when I say cross my heart and hope to die, then I come back with a regular voice and say I never dreamed the likes of This. That is probably the place on the tapes with the most cut. That may be why all that cross and stuff works, it's just so heavy, and it goes back to the beginning to let you know that this is about something else.

S: You're not going to ~~say~~<sup>stay</sup> in Sunday school. Definitely it's cross my heart and hope to die, wop away from, cut away from "I never dreamed." But that has a double edge to it because on the one hand it's saying, "This is so much more ~~than~~ than anything I might have dreamed in that Sunday school space, and at the same time don't be deceived or captured by the triviality of those images by reducing the thing to a totally abstract level. Which immediately starts to return. Because as soon as you have that square (that's the return to the beginning) it immediately starts to triffulate and starts to produce its ethereal<sup>so that</sup> luminous stuff, ~~and~~ you try to take it away and there's a level of (interaction? destructiveness?)

H: As far as what the images were, what I was trying to do, and that's the word the text is saying at a certain point, at the bottom, while I'm saying "I never dreamed the likes of this... that's beside the point..... As ~~far as the images are concerned~~<sup>4</sup> far as the images there up to where the animals start to form the attempt was to sort of physicalize or muscle-size ...

Trying to hear and see how those were bouncing off, you know they had synchronicity <sup>of points</sup> and they lose it. And they're referring to each other.....

S: It's like you move from ... you try to say the point isn't this, it's the other thing, but the ~~point~~<sup>other thing</sup> turns out to be, o.k., it's not the sacred heart, it's the Logos itself that you're... I mean after you've deconstructed your own ~~error~~<sup>as in more</sup> ~~error~~<sup>Marigat</sup> ality we move into the heavy business of Christology.

H: Also during the heart part, I mean it's a very odd juxtaposition because of the line that goes into that where I say, Standing in the thick of things like sticks in mud, and then those sticks are sticks and <sup>they</sup> are on fire and those

sticks were once words. And it's sort of like the death of words as a certain thing into another thing. Very base.

S: I'm not going to be a stick in the mud, split the stick and find Jesus.

Q: Do you <sup>[S]</sup> have a strong Christian background?

H: I don't have any Christian background at all. Sunday school ~~is~~ for a while maybe.

S: But it's the question of using that space. <sup>Q:</sup> (there's something also in the air)

H: I don't want to make this what ~~that's~~ about at all. But I must say that a few years ago I may have been adamantly <sup>against using such symbols</sup> I'd just go into automatic. Whereas now that question of negation ~~is/isn't~~ or not is not the issue at all. (that's what's not the issue)

Q: That's why it can't become the issue because you're not fighting it. You would be reifying it and therefore it could become a symbol like in the work of ~~/Wah/de~~ Buñuel, for instance <sup>it's</sup> <sup>most</sup> the Christian work of our time, in Dostoyevsky's sense, that the atheist is the man closest to the true believer, the servant of God, because he's constantly creating God every moment by the intensity of his iconoclasm. Your work isn't iconoclastic, and therefore not religious in that sense.

S: But it is religious in the sense of a creation of a condition of awe.

H: Right, it's religious in that it believes in wonder. It believes in ...

S: ... in ~~the~~ the miraculous ...

H: ... in the process of from wonder into wonder ...

Q: It's one of the traditional differences between religion and mysticism. It's like Ezra Pound said, religion is a failed attempt to popularize art.

S: I was thinking of Bernard Shaw, a miracle is a something or other that instills faith, or say wonder instead of faith. There is a definite statement of the sense of the miraculous, where there is a reference to the entire thing, not to the particular symbols that emerge .... But you know, the images are so positive, actually, the continuing way that thing develops finally with the double tree that's on the <sup>screen</sup> ~~screen~~ for such a long time ...

Q: The underground, upperground tree.

S: ...as nervous system ...

H: You know it's funny, I talked with Woody [Vasulka] out there [in New Mexico] and showed him this tape, and he liked it all, but when we looked at it again he said, Gary, maybe it's too positive, especially the last part, it's too beautiful, it's too incredible [laughter]; and I told him that it's somewhat misleading because it's going to continue ...

(I see,  
S: Right, that's not an end. You know, seeing this now for the third time it has a very definite harmonious close ...

H: I know, it definitely is a part ...

S: You know, it's a little bit like the question of Phil Glass or something -- I have to think about talking about what it is -- about art which is, well, ultimately positive. The thing is that this is also so profoundly decentering ...

Q: That's the thing, it's not in danger of the things that are bad about over-positive art. It's not that there're positive that makes them bad, it's that we get scared when we see things get too positive because it turns into another attempt to popularize art, into religion. The visionary moment doesn't make you think of religion...

S: ...This creates a ritual space, in the sense that your own being is blown apart, the location of your self is blown apart and has to be healed, and this performs that work, it doesn't leave you in the disturbance of that sparagmos -- you've been torn apart but you've also been resurrected.

H: In a way the tree is a sort of gift, it's a gift ...

S: That's completely the sense of the birds coming out of the tree and the words coming out of the tree the sense of bounty ...

H: I knew I was going to have the language coming down but it just happened that the <sup>"I"s</sup> ~~eyes~~ on the character-generator distorted in a certain way happened to look like birds. So then to decide to do that -- of course it

was incredible-- I decided to do that because it was picturesque, picturesque,  
~~picturesque, picturesque,~~

picturesque. But one of the things that ultimately made me do it was the play on words, "The words are coming," like the birds are coming, because that leaves that little thing in there, and then later on after the stuff starts to come down and the dissonant sound comes in when the tree kind of gnarlates, there is a dissonant thing in there, just the sound of the chords is not an ending at the very end. Something else could very easily [have been there]; is not quite finite.

Q: The breathtaking thing is another one of those instances where if you just saw it as straight prose, couldn't possibly work <sup>S</sup>(wouldn't be very interesting)!! (you'd get the joke or--) You'd get the joke but it would seem like an easy joke on a very sentimental perception about breathtaking. The exact thing that you've been trying to avoid in moving from pure image construction to more conceptual linguistically diversified fields.

You mean

H: ~~It is~~ breathtaking in and of itself ...? "There is silence, silence is always there when I see breathtaking things."

S: Now, I think my original idea about the difference between language having its meaning by signifieds, as opposed to having its meaning by references, is crucial here in the difference between ~~that~~ whether that works or not. Because if it's on the level of there are silences there, I have to think of the meaning of those words, I get it, and that's nice... But when you have ~~it on the screen the words are going back and forth~~ instead of referring to their meanings and the processes of interpretation that the mind would have to go to in order to arrive at those meanings, you have the immediate visual <sup>on the screen</sup> input, that's continuously amplifying and changing and giving you different nuances of every aspect of ~~those meanings~~ <sup>the words</sup>, so that in ~~that~~ that context the words ~~now~~ no longer are ~~words as they talk~~ <sup>structured as</sup> ~~there no longer~~ big "S" over little "s" <sup>S</sup>[s], they're big "S" over little "s" vector thing:  $\left[ \frac{S}{s} \rightarrow \text{IMAGE THING} \right]$

The thing itself is an image which is also "S" over "s" so that <sup>a</sup>(there is immediately several more dimensions to the Logos than you would have...

Q: Explain what you mean by big "S" over little "s" .

S: O.K, the conventional French semiotic notation for signifier/signified; meaning, that which is signified, <sup>by a sign</sup> ~~doesn't~~ <sup>is not</sup> refer to things in the world ~~but to~~ the meanings of ~~the~~ words <sup>in the language.</sup> So you say birds and that goes to some place in my mind where I have stored the meaning of the word bird as opposed to any specific concrete image. ~~So~~ <sup>by</sup> It's the concurrent streams of having a completely smooth flow of imagery concurrent with the stream of language. And it's the concurrence of those streams that sets up a totally new relationship between language and meaning that is unlike the relationship of language and its text in its conventional semiotic situation.

H: There's some other stitch or something of how that's... in other words if you had water or whatever ~~if~~ you have the flow of images and the flow of words it wouldn't be that... It's got to be more than that they're concurrent.

S: No, no, that's a condition that you have these two ~~streams~~ <sup>streams</sup>, then what you've got is you've got the language which refers to the image stream <sup>(on the screen)</sup> by direct pointing, rather than by ~~sign-signifier~~ signifier/signified so that area of meaning that one experiences is not the area of meaning that one experiences ~~when one is reading a text.~~ When one is reading a text one is involved with ~~sign/signified~~ signifier/signified. But here you have signifier/signified constantly being cut into by a stream of images which are in a different process of formation and which immediately capture the possible meanings of the words and dissolve them. <sup>So that the words as</sup> They pass by in the sound undergo a process of dissolution which is the natural process of words going by, orally, because in oral language the words have to pass by. But on the other hand you've got this other thing which is passing by which is something like the stream of meanings that would go concurrently with...

H: But the whole last section, I really had to go through it. You know, there's the whole thing, is this too incredible. Is this too This? And finally it was just like, fuck it. This is what happened, this is Happen-stance.

Q: That's it exactly. But, you see, there it's exactly the same situation with the level of language, how do you get away with saying "silence" and "breathtaking thing" when I see breathtaking things. The place that it occurs is totally convincing, it's totally itself. You don't question it at all. It's only when you reflect on those words that you have a question. So what actually happens is that the word is reclaimed in the domain of words, in the domain of language. It's reclaimed within its own domain by virtue of it's presence with images. So because it has an opportunity to refer to a totally constructed image, and you see both the similarity (S: a process of imaging) /So that you have the opportunity to say, this word refers now or signifies now, this image but you're immediately aware that it doesn't, that they're also just simultaneous, they're just co-present. And because your process of attempting to attach it to an image then fails and you're put back to the word ~~again~~ again. Any temptation of referring it to (A) the cliché of breathtaking things... (H: But what you just said is also said which would be another instance of the breathtaking thing too is where I say, "They sit like deer in a field, if ~~they~~ I approach too quickly they fade into the quick of things." Which is just what you're talking about.) [ Exactly.

S: The other point where they fold up into the mud of the vanishing point, I mean that's happened. When you come to "they fade into the quick of things" you've already had that happen so many times that you identify it so completely with the experience of what's been done. (Q: It's something that normally doesn't have a concrete reference, signifier, signified, suddenly has one.) To say it another way, what I was saying about religion, Logos, and what you were saying about the return of the word, and what you say in the piece as "The words are coming," is basically a reconstitution of the notion of <sup>what</sup> ~~the~~ language <sup>is</sup>; as no longer having anything to do with that which can be divided up ~~up~~ into a linguistically analyzable set of signs in a system, but something

whose own being is utterly dependent upon the multiplicity of its contextual occurrence. And you create an actual field in which that is demonstrated continuously.

Q: But it also constructs the context itself so that you have the power of language to constantly create its own context. Not only does it not exist as an independent analyzable system which we might call language and study as such, but you cannot study language after such an experience without taking into consideration the power of language to constantly create its own context and to be in dialogue with the context that exists in some sense outside of it. It's just that you're not tempted to go ~~g~~ from that word definitely back to a reference in the world, except to <sup>the</sup> ~~a~~ power of the word in the world and all of the cases where that word might arise again. So the reclaiming is not a reclaiming of the word "breathtaking" because you lose it immediately afterward, it's mind-degraded, it goes back into the mind field. It's a cute thing but in the notion of words fading back into the quick of things, "quick" means "life", that's what the word means. I mean when you say "stung to the quick" you're stung to the life source itself. But also you can't shake the meaning of the word as quick, something that is <sup>rapid</sup> ~~quick~~. And particularly in this context that pun which actually has occurred in my play a lot, a long time ago, is actually created, that doubleness of *if* it. You have to see its quickness in both senses. So again when it reclaims the word, it doesn't reclaim the word in itself but the word as a generative reality. Because you don't stop with that word and say, ah so glad that breathtaking is back ...

S: That's the meaning of the fact that the words are coming or by these little ~~twig-bird~~ <sup>twigs</sup> that are sort of coming down or coming out and that that's what it means that the words are coming has a kind of cute meaning of the ghouls are coming, E.T., ~~here~~ <sup>here</sup>, not E.T., Poltergeist.

Q: But there is that eerie presence that they appear, the words, I mean that the beings behind the words. My favorite non-word is that Jane Robert's word



"cordella" which refers to the living reality behind the language or inside the language. Not so much behind or inside because there's no such topology really suggested but that the existence of the language really depended on its actual life, the fact that it is alive. And that's such a mysterious thing to be like little beings, does that mean we now have to worry about words having feelings the way plants have feelings: the secret life of words. But it's the fact that you cannot put the word in a ~~zoo~~ zoo without losing its actual ability to be, to take breaths. Because that's the other thing about breathtaking there that you ~~hear~~ <sup>is hear</sup> yourself taking a breath as you say it; there are certain very noticeable breaths that you take. There's one point where you actually laugh a little bit, saying a cliché...

H: That whole thing, I have to say, it's not really... When I thought of doing that part where it says "this is a song and dance, that's entertainment" another thing altogether unless I did think of Lori Anderson.

S: It comes off the hand, there's a hand, there's a figure that doesn't quite become a hand but does all the things a hand does, right around that time.

(H: I know what you mean. And then there's this sort of bird-like thing when I say "bats" ...) The word "silence" at the point in which it occurs in that breath thing, one notable thing about it is that there's no silence anywhere. The sentence stops, there's ~~no~~ breaths but there's a lot of loud stuff going on over there, and all kinds of stuff is going on on the screen, so that one is forced instantly in relationship to that silence to take that word <sup>metonymically</sup> ~~metonymically~~ as extending... The word has its reference in some kind of silence that isn't the literal ~~kind of~~ silence of sound-absence; but is some kind of silence that pervades the image or some kind of silence that represents any kind of space... (Q: Again, it's not referential to a silence that you already know.) You listen to it, because you say, oh yes here <sup>(as he)</sup> taking a breath, he means that by silence. But then there's the silence that has been there all along coming out of these silent images.

H:

H: But that which happens in another part of the tape is also a direct address to the person who has gone through this and presumably from this incredible complex image is sort of holding their breath. Because it has that thing of, how far is this going to go?; first there's this tree, then there's this house coming out, then the roots of the tree are forming this word, I mean *like* which it could go, layer and layer and layer.

S: But the point of it isn't simply that there are a lot of layers. *But*

(Q: But it's that the event is moving in all these different areas.)

H: Just in terms of what we've talked about of words being alive and this kind of, just how the tape is kind of alive, what will happen, *is that* say this <sup>is</sup> 45 minutes long. In other words, will that sort of continuous opening, you know, like doors almost, after you've gone through and said it 4 or 5 or 20 or 40, will actually have a quantitative super-effect. (S: That's the area of pure investigation, There's no way of answering that beforehand because there isn't any way of knowing that.)

Q: William Blake would have loved this medium, that's what he wanted to be doing. I mean that's what the pictures in the text are about. He does that, he makes it so that at any particular point where you're looking at a picture as though it was going to be an illustration, it doesn't work. There's always that gap, that disjuncture, and it's consciously put there because he moved these things around in every edition. He would never even have the *color* in each edition be the same. He would re-do it, he wouldn't allow it to be printed because it would make it one thing. He never wanted the work to be one thing, that's the first thing. So his only way of keeping it from being one thing was to constantly change the colors, the relationship of the plates to the text, so that you might on page 80 of Jerusalem recall an image on page 9 and say, Ah!, and then you go back and look at it. But he makes you move around in the work and that's what you do here, you make the mind move around in its known territory, its experienced territory,

something already said, some image, some referential possibility. And the fact that you have the two texts, the vocal text and the written text, approximate there are points where they cross over and they become identical, those are like counterpoints...

S: There's also something very peculiar of having two <sup>vocal</sup> streams that intersect like that that particular kind of crossing...

Q: That happens when we're doing texts like that, even the one that we recorded called "Picture This" There are times when we're saying exactly the same sentence and there are times when you're adding something or something is falling away, and you have that conjunction, the movement through. It's really hard to get it so that it works as well as this, I mean this really works.

H: One thing I noticed is that I definitely had to... I didn't want it to be the situation where that kind of ~~is~~ disjunction with the mind going in different directions, happen<sup>s</sup> because things <sup>are</sup> ~~were~~ happening too fast. ~~In other words~~ But I also didn't want to slow it down so it was like looking at something with a magnifying glass. There's a funny kind of speed that it had to be, in other words, where I'm saying "this is not a song and dance." If you listen to that by itself it's pretty slow but it had to be sort of invisible that it wasn't slowed down but that it's not that pace where... Is there something happening here whether I understand it or not or just happening fast, you know, just being bombarded. I didn't want that at all.

S: The only point in which it is bombarded is ~~only~~ at the moment <sup>near</sup> ~~at~~ the beginning where you have the "sound of one hand flying by on those triangles. At that moment there's more going on than you can take. <sup>But</sup> ~~And~~ all that does is sort of open up the space so that you're now alert for everything else that's much more manageable.

Q: But you see, this is what's great, is that it's not a question of speed

it's a question of total sets of right relationships and that's what's really important to me about the connection with what I'm trying to do in poetry, which is that the problem that we were discussing before about the rate <sup>at</sup> ~~with~~ which you perceive these things. Video, for me, and doing the few video texts that I've done now, gives me an opportunity to settle that issue in very particular ways. So for me it was ~~not~~ always ~~that~~ if I could read it then it would be the question of whether I could read it right. And then there was always the question of what was right because everytime that I would read it it would feel right or if it did feel right it felt right or if it didn't feel right it didn't feel right, but it was like I would have a text that out of the five times I would read a text, two times I would read it right. Those two times would be very ~~not~~ different from each other but they would both be right.

S: I've got this poem now that I read and I have a way of reading it very loud and very fast and very intense, and the same poem could be read very ~~slowly~~ quiet.

Q: But it's a question of striking those right times, those right timings, it's like T'ai Chi, ~~Shen Jung~~ <sup>Shen Jung</sup> (S: ~~totally~~ Kairos) In T'ai Chi there's a term called ~~Shen Jung~~ <sup>Shen Jung</sup> which is usually translated as "right timing". Now "right timing" doesn't mean any particular rate because Tai Chi can be done extremely slowly or extremely fast. It can be as fast as someone ~~is~~ pushing you and you hitting them, or it can be ~~is~~ so slow that you can barely perceive the movement. And the right timing is independent of the issue of speed. So that, as much as anything ~~is~~ else, has been the central point in my meditation about what rhythm, time, speed, all of that is in text., which is that it doesn't matter. Metronomes can be used...

~~Lamont~~ <sup>Lamont [Young]</sup>  
H: I remember reading ~~Lamont~~ talking about tuning, when things are in tune, and really you can tune forever. In other words it's a function of time, it's not fixed objects that you can set up and then they're identical.

It's like if you had two strings and they were vibrating and you were twisting one, since they're moving in time, you can tune forever (S: You have to continuously tune them.)

S: I have another brick in the language theory that has to be thrown in here.

Each  $\phi$ / word is ~~metonymic~~ <sup>metonymic</sup> for its own extension, because an instance of its reference is either present or absent. (Q: okay, let's do that again but first of all explain ~~metonymic~~ <sup>metonymic</sup> ~~Metonymic~~ <sup>Metonymic</sup>) ~~Metonymic~~ means if you use a part of a circumstance

to stand for the whole, in some way. (Q: figure of speech, rhetorical move)

And the significance of it is that most cosmologies ~~are~~ <sup>what we would call</sup> ~~basically metonymic~~ <sup>metonymical</sup>, whereas ~~if~~ you take one object of the world and blow it up into a picture of the world. The tree is a typical ~~metonymic~~ <sup>metonymic</sup>. (Q: So it stands  $\phi$  for all creation when it's mighty enough <sup>as in</sup> and powerful enough as an image. The tree...

H: I'll tell you something funny, locally, localized is that part of the thing of <sup>\*</sup> that tree definitely came out of that tree that's up on the field at Station Hill. (S: The oak tree? Oh man I have...)

The car accident that I was in was in the tree that was directly across from that so everytime I go through there it's like the tree of death and the tree of life and I pass through that and think that thought everytime I drive by there. So a lot of the impetus for sort of coming to that tree also has to do with the real life thing.

S: Well that's how ~~metonymic~~ <sup>ymc</sup> works. It's power is that it's able to locate, it derives from located specificities <sup>of</sup> which are invested with whole experiences.

Q: That's right, you can be sure that everyone's had an experience with a tree (S: Yet it derives from that specific tree that occasions the possibility for the universal...)

H: But the reason that that tree, as a tree image, has a universality. If someone pictures a tree it's a tree that's going to be like that tree.

S: Gary, there's a piece of my forest poem that got finished just last

week, a whole big part of it is about that tree in ways that have to do with that.

H: I heard recently that there used to be two of them identical and one was cut down, he looked to the right of it and there was a stump which used to be an almost identical tree of that tree. Do you know the ~~Podar Sturgeon~~ <sup>Theodore Sturgeon</sup> this jewel thing, "Dreaking Jewels,"? Within that story they find buried or something and then you can do something with the <sup>jewel</sup> ~~word~~, makes everything two of everything. And then it had about these two trees that were identical. I'm sure I'm not getting this right but it had something to do with these jewels being able to double things or they were found by double trees.

S: That oak tree is one of the keys to Barrytown (H: It's like the gates.)

The other weird thing, just talking about more doubles/ ~~it~~ and words because there is <sup>a</sup> ~~whole~~ <sup>te</sup> thing that happens there, is that just by pure accident

right across from that tree just a little bit up, there is a building which is called "The Oaks," that has nothing whatsoever to do with ~~oaks~~. <sup>oak trees. The people who own oaks are named Oaks!</sup>

H: One thing I want to know as perceiving this tape in relation to me, is whether ... is there a sense of <sup>some</sup> one discovering things in the sandbox of language. In other words, things that you guys have probably gone through long time ago of watching someone discover things in language.

S: No, I don't think it's that. I think the significance here ... What is happening is language is discovering itself in a totally new mode through you. What you're doing is not like what anybody else has ever done in any significant way, in terms of language. What you're doing precisely with language is interesting as language because it's not like what people ...

(Q: but it gets support from a whole lot of other things, other efforts that are in the air now.)

H: The thing is that, this is a whole other issue, that support and where the audience is, they don't cross.

COPIED 1/1/77

S: New age, it's for new people. New people will be created. This is another thing we haven't come around to yet. It's a serious question, the serious question of the definition of the medium, because I would say that insofar as the <sup>idea</sup> definition of the medium is interesting at all it would only be to circumscribe the different kinds of works which seem to be involved in these issues. This ~~would seem to be~~ <sup>has more to do with</sup> what we were saying the other day with Arakawa and in a curious way with Ben [Boritz] and so forth than it does with some other particular video work, Even video work which might use language in some way.

Q: And with Franz Kamin.

S: Yes, with Franz.

Q: Before you go back to your statement, there's the thing you say, Gary, in the interview in Afterimage about one of the changes you went through at a certain point, which you describe with the <sup>slogan</sup> ~~slogan~~ that you want to reach out and touch someone. ([S: I want to be the phone company. [H: I was being serious.]]) The image of the oak tree and the specificity of it in your life, it's as though reaching out to touch someone in that sense means being touched yourself. That the condition for that is not what is the cliché of contemporary real, getting real, being real, it's like, what's his name, Taylor, Mead shouting at Duncan, <sup>Robert</sup> Get real Duncan! That means do something that I can recognize as having to do with life now, be relevant, back to the sixties, right? But rather, the purely real world of the work in which you are touched continuously by that connection. So that notion of ~~tawil~~ <sup>dar</sup> that we've all been preoccupied with many years. It's a sacred hermeneutics, ~~was~~ talked about by Avicenna, as reported by Henri Corbin. What hermeneutics means in that sense, as Corbin defines it, is reading a text back to its truth, <sup>its roots</sup> -- "the exegesis that leads the self back to its truth" -- <sup>...and</sup> act of that, [H: So what we're doing is ~~xxxx~~ ...] yes, it's working our way back to essential truths of the text. So that if the text can sustain a true hermeneutics, then it gets to be a "real" sacred text, not because it talks about the right things,

holds the right point of view, quotes the Koran, or has Many other official religious sanction. It's the opposite. If ~~it~~ the real thing can happen in a truly authentic reading of the text, if you can travel back to your own truth in relation to the truth of the text; then the text has that miraculous quality we have spoken of. So in sense it's appropriate that we're doing this in the process of the work itself, as it goes on tomorrow being composed, because this is a work that is involved with the issue of it's own reality, e.g., can I allow that beautiful image to stay? What are the conditions under which that image can stay? Part of it is just the power of the image, and part of it is the sustaining context that you've created that allows that image to happen in this way. Another part of it ~~is~~ for you is the reference to the <sup>power</sup> of the oak tree which you have disclosed to us. This disclosure is appropriate to come out in the ta'wil or exegesis ....

H: You know the oak tree will appear in "Primarily Speaking" but as it is [laughter].

Q: Now, probably the most typical reaction to this work among the uninitiated will be to the effect of, Why doesn't this guy do something that I can relate to in my life; why is he existing in this pure realm of idea, concept, thought. For the people who aren't going to get it that will be one of their key reasons. It's like Louis Simpson said <sup>after</sup> to me about Blake, ~~who~~ he'd just been teaching at Stony Brook, "Blake's great but I want to recognize the reality shown in a work; I don't see my life in Jerusalem." So people could look at this work and see nothing that meant anything to them in terms of their lives as they see them, because they're not relating to the power of the whole text itself, in the larger sense of text.

H: Whereas for me it's a total physical experience. Recognizability seems so ~~irre~~ [irrelevant] ...

S: Video and language ...

H: In terms of me as a person, where this comes from, like the tree or something in terms of the process I go through, that it's about ideas and concepts-- but it's also living, it's me living, it's so real that it's as recognizable to me as anything, it's



not an object ...

Q: It's a process ...

S: If you take the notion fundamentally, the metaphysics or the metapsychology or whatever, I think, we all work on, is some idea that no specification of the nature of the subject or the object as such can specify the subject <sup>or</sup> ~~of~~ the object. What you basically have is a non-subject, your self as a non-self, and its non-selfness is of such a nature that it can only specify itself by specifying a problematic about itself, so that if you see it as my [metaphor of] a bouncing ball going between these <sup>er</sup> different subjects, the auditory subject, the listening ~~ing~~ subject, that's just a momentary attempt to specify a complex behind which is the real problem of who am I as I'm watching and who are you who're making it, that cannot be specified certainly in terms of any one of the dimensions of which the problem -- the fact that it's <sup>is</sup> being articulated as a problem ~~x~~ using all of the different elements to articulate that problem, so that there is no possible way in which what you are or your living ~~quality~~ <sup>\*</sup> or the way in which the project is you can be . . .

H: Right, right [general chaater here]  
[ reading from notes]

S: "Each word metonymic for its own extension ...." Now what I mean by the extension of the word is all of the <sup>possible</sup> things that it might <sup>refer</sup> ~~possibly extend~~ to. <sup>↑</sup> Because one ~~xx~~ instance of its reference is either definitely present or definitely absent. So that, <sup>↑</sup> the word "silence" at the moment that it appears you scan the field of things that are present for a silence, and the fact that at that moment there is no silence in the usual sense makes the word <sup>v</sup> ~~silence~~ stand, not for one of its meanings, but for all of them; the word jumps out from having a single meaning to all of the different possible things that it could mean; therefore the word becomes metonymic for its own extension.

Q: Yes, that's a great formulation, and it's related to what I was trying to say earlier ...

S: And it's precisely the presence of a reference and the vectoral relationship between <sup>and</sup> the sign and the reference as opposed to the reference to its signified ...

The signified aspect of a word would be what could be given in a definition, some kind of general statement about what the word means, some general description of the set of

As opposed to that, things ... as opposed to the word "silence" meaning the absence of sound, silence is all of the possible things that the word could be used to point to.

QQ Yes, that is what I was saying earlier about the word taking back its original life, that you have to see it as having that power, that what you get from it is that it has that power, but I like your formulation ...

H: There are two things that I thought of. One is what you said about people who won't get into the work because of what it's not ... I'm just wondering about the reaching out, you know, touching and being touched -- the overall thing, especially visceral experience of it, is a kind of ... the richness of it is perhaps there for them.

In other words, even determining on the last segment -- you know, to tree or not to tree [laughter] -- I'm just wondering how embedded ~~xxxx~~ is, if subconsciously I was taking that into consideration ...

Q: What?

H: An audience ... I mean this is the first time this has come up for me, because you brought it up. Even myself in the process, I got lost <sup>in this</sup> in the sense of a maze, thinking and being totally conscious of what's going on and then going through the process of doing that, actualizing it, and then in that process wondering how I got there and having to retrace my steps, or else not being able to retrace my steps and then days later coming to it from another pathway and then realizing that's what it was, very much like a labyrinth ...

Q: I've had this experience so many times ...

H: And then thinking [about others] ... And I'm as close to the work as one can be ...

Q: Maybe! [laughter]

H: Maybe, right . . . Thinking of that person, as opposed to this ...

Q: Well, you see, that's not true in a way, because it's interesting ... I'm closer to the work, and Chuck is too, in certain ~~xxxx~~ respects than you were then. You were closer

then in many ways than anyone will ever be, than you will ever be again -- you'll never recapture that exact matrix of relationships.

S: Sorry, but exactly in the same sense that what's serious about the work is that it calls into question the objectivity of the subject, it certainly calls into question the objectivity of the work ...

Q: ...as object...

S: ... so to talk about the work as <sup>(something as</sup> though we meant anything by it, when it's precisely that we can't mean anything by it -- you don't know what the work is. I'm sitting there and saying ~~that~~ the work is that it creates a problem, I have to deconstruct my own internal experience in order to even begin to move towards the object as a work. Now, you, since you've made it, may not have that experience at all ...

H: Right, that's what I was just describing. As close as I was ... I mean it's now so much more firmly embedded, since I've retraced it so many times, you know, I mean in terms of a certain one-dimensionality of ...

S: It's tree structure ...

H: It's true structure from what happened ...

S: There's a whole branch of mathematics that has to do with tree-theory ...

H: There's ~~another~~ thing I wanted to comment on, that in certain areas there's a kind of humor that appears first on the surface but later on it comes up that it wasn't so much on the surface -- this is again about whether or not something is intentional: the first part where I say "THIS THAT AND THE OTHER THING" -- the square, the circle and the triangle -- the reasons for choosing those, with those words -- the question is whether I'm playing with what someone else would signify by these[signs], or what if I'd identified them in another order, it would be different but ...

S: My reading off it as it was going by each time was, Not this world of heavily laden religious symbolism but abstract geometry ...

H: Say that again ...

S: Not -- the total moment, the glut of meanings could reduce out as not religious symbolism but abstract geometry ...

H: But remember this is in the beginning and you don't know ...

S: No, but it's that first move, you're talking about the point in which the heart ...

H: No, no, I'm talking about the very beginning of the tape, where you hear the base drum ...

S: <sup>why</sup>~~what~~ don't you go back to it [Gary <sup>sets</sup>~~marks~~ up video to beginning of tape]  
[plays to : "This that and the other thing"]

S: OK stop it there .... So what you do is you establish ...

H: It's as if I'm saying that these totally abstract things, I'm playing with them and using these words as ...

S: You're setting up your vocabulary, your multidimensional vocabulary...

H: Yes, three things ...

S: This~~is~~, that and the other thing -- and, the curve in it is that you have this that and the other thing, square circle and triangle, but in between you have a "catastrophe". You have a transformational process that's given in there. I mean before it becomes a triangle, it goes through a cusp or whatever, so that even though . . . there's a kind of parodic aspect to it. You were pretending to set up a univocal relationship between the word "this, that, and the other thing" and these signs, but at the same time you're already in a world in which the visual images are undergoing such transformations that even that very simple attempt to set up a one-to-one relationship between words and signs ...

H: But this is what I'm interested in terms of intention and the visualizing, for me, of ... and how in describing this, how it falls short of me going through this process and then what is there. You know, I want very consciously through why "This had the Square and the base drum, and the Circle had That", and it has to do with humor and all these various things .... So <sup>a</sup>This, to me, when I visualize the word~~s~~ itself and then I think of the first thing as ~~the~~ foundation, the square in relationship to the circle, which one would be ...

S: There's even a sexual joke in there ...

H: No, wait a ~~minute~~ second ... So, then, "That" also has a kind of... it could also be a square. But the Circle could not as easily be "This", because the Circle is much more of a universal symbol, even though the Square is a symbol, the Circle is more of a symbol ... plus the cymbal, the crash ~~symbol~~, is with the Circle. This is the basedrum So then the Other Thing, definitely, for me, the Triangle would be the Other Thing .. .. I mean, for everyone ...

S: For sure ...

H: There's no argument there, even though it's totally ridiculous [laughter] ...

S: No, it's not ridiculous ... I'll tell you what it is ... It's racial memory about ~~the~~ the history of geometry ...

H: Wait, wait, but then also the sound, you see, on the basedrum comes before This -- book This -- then the cymbal happens after the circle is formed, and then the Thing happens simultaneously, and the sound comes out of the word "Thing," the sound comes from ... --it's this handclap, Thing-- I mean the intention is to get not only a thingy sound like thinning [Nazalizes strongly], you know like weird or coming from a different place, not your basic trip, but also to come out of the sound of the word itself, the sound and the word are like this [makes sign with hand of unity]. So when the Triangle comes up, <sup>in the next section</sup> that part that's hard to see ... [goes to set up video]

S: [sound of drum comes on] Well, the drum is also the initiation of ... I mean there are so many fakes in here, in each phase, you pretend like it's going to be this geometrical discrimination and then ...

[Tape plays: "This that and the other thing" with sounds] S: [imitating gong-like sound of tape] ~~BEZZZ~~ Dawing!

H: Now this [laughs]-- the sound of one hand clapping in one man's mind, that's referring to that sound that you just heard, in terms of my making it. And then it goes from positive to negative, you know, after it goes across the screen, I mean definitely the part that goes underneath about drumming is just sort of like, hoo haa ...

S: Yeah, the fake is that we're now in uh multimedia sixties expo-67-land with bunches of images and words going by and nobody having thought about anything ...

[Tape plays: "Things are going to happen ... happenstance"]

H: OK, not only does the image invert, positive-negative, but the statement is a kind of inversion of what I said ...

S: "One man's mind clapping in the sound of ..."

H: ...I mean as much as you can invert ... as a negative image, OK, And that is also saying, I'm questioning whether this can be anything but something happening inside my mind. I mean is this only something that is inside myself?

S: You mean those relations? No, those relationships are all discoverable if one has the opportunity to do what we're doing now, that is, treating it as a text and reading it slowly ...

H: This image here is on the screen long enough for one to read ...

S: But that's where the question of hermeneutics is important here. I've been thinking about this all week, that at a certain point with mixed media question it just comes back to hermeneutics, it's no different from being a text. It's no longer the physical quality of the text that <sup>the</sup> gives it its character. The possibility that one has the opportunity of looking at it closely ~~XXX~~ and working out through discussion and through reflection and <sup>through</sup> examining the experience what it's all about makes it a text ...

Q & H: Right, right ...

S: So these things go by, and that they're embedded in there is part of the scatter of what's going by ...

H: That's why in the end I accepted, especially before this inverts, the speed of the amount of time that that was on there, was that ..., especially at the beginning of something, one's not going to be ready to read, and so it was OK that it was ...

S: ...slow...

H: It was like a detail that was embedded in there.. It's like if you were to take in this room and see the general things on the surface but you might not see the little pebble that's over there, but it's there ....

S: Well, there are so many amazing things about it, because you're parodying the beginning

of a film or a video work of art, I mean you've got an initial presentation and then the announcement of a title, a statement about what's going to happen, and then another set of titles, and a creation <sup>in</sup> its sound effects of an ambiance as if that's what it's all going to be about, and all that's completely fake, because what's going on is completely different. What's ~~xxx~~ happening is that the mind is being prepared physically, the mind-body, to get into a space to deal with everything else that's coming on, by giving you the optimum shatter. And the shatter is created by the fact that a demand is being made to read something that can't be read ....

H: In that sense the last fake is the whole cross-section, the fake of the subject-matter.

S: Well, except that that's sustained, the problem is that you ~~take~~ <sup>fake</sup> yourself out there, it just recurs in another facet of its own....

Q: Well, it's good to have made the point in this way that the dialogical process becomes integral with the work in different ways. The thing that we've been driving at in the dialogical criticism is that it's not criticism that stands aside.

H: That's what I discovered by writing this thing which I should definitely show you. In other words it was the situation of [being?] asked to show this, I'd just finished it, and I'd already promised this place that I was going to do a lecture, and on the train I wrote a thing, ..... which then became embedded in the tape in the sense of playing again on another level, of playing with [the fact] that this is preceding the tape and setting certain things up that would be repeated but in a little different way, like different angles, like those sentences, you know, the hand clapping ... . Some of those phrases are even in the lecture, but they're a little different, or a phrase will come up in a different order. And I talk about certain intentions but in a sort of embedded way, and I don't say well this is what I did, it's totally another work. It was ~~xxx~~ really interesting because I first read that, which obviously sets it up in some ways, but then I showed the tape, and then I read it again, and the tape actually set up the second reading of the lecture in a totally different way, because the lecture actually becomes a work that the tape sets up, that goes in a little different direction ....