

In-Between

Caroline Cloutier

THE INVISIBLE DOG



In-Between Caroline Cloutier

P.5 Outside the Inside — The Mimetic Resemblance by Melissa Bianca Amore

P.17 Inside the Outside — I See You? You See Me? by William Stover

This publication accompanies the exhibition "In-Between", a site specific installation by Caroline Cloutier, presented at the Glass House at The Invisible Dog Art Center, New York, September 8 - October 13, 2018.

The Glass House is designed by Anne Mourier, 2013.

Melissa Bianca Amore and William Stover are the co-founders of RE-SITED a non-profit organization dedicated to presenting a series of research-focused exhibitions that ask fundamental questions about the architecture of "site" and "space." RE-SITED examines how we think "space," travel between spaces, and how "space" becomes a "site."

Caroline Cloutier thanks The Invisible Dog Art Center, Lucien Zayan, Canada Council for the Art, the Conseil des arts et des lettres du Québec, Melissa Bianca Amore, William Stover, Martin Désilets, Nicolas Robert and the Cultural Services of the Québec Government Office in New York.

Editor: Caroline Cloutier
Design: Gabriel Jasmin

Cover: Caroline Cloutier, *In-Between*, 2018, mirror.
Site specific work at The Invisible Dog Art Center, New York
Photos: Caroline Cloutier

Printed at PhotoSynthèse in Montreal, Canada

© 2018, Caroline Cloutier
All rights reserved

ISBN 978-1-9994591-0-9



THE INVISIBLE DOG

Outside the Inside — *The Mimetic Resemblance*

"It is to suggest the labyrinth is always a split between the inside and an outside; that it can only ever be infinite insofar as it has an outside, in turn can only ever be understood as being inside. The split between the labyrinth and the world is always a choice between two paths in the labyrinth. There is only the labyrinth, but only insofar as we cannot be sure whether we are inside of it or not, whether it indeed exists or not."

— Jorge Luis Borges

Whether you are standing *inside* the outside or *outside* the inside you occupy the same space. This space as Borges infers is only the "labyrinth." Our reality, well what we know of it, seems to be contained within the labyrinth's structure. And, in many ways, our psychological and physical experience is shaped within these boundaries. Inside the labyrinth there are two paths, and to paraphrase *Light and Space* artist James Turrell, they are: "one that you look into or enter only with consciousness and the other you enter physically." ¹

The world of perception is characteristically formed inside the labyrinth. Generally speaking, perception is like a "labyrinth of knowledge," as it frames and navigates what we already know into an ordered system of correlative relationships. And our pre-conditioned perceptual faculty is also limited within this framework. For instance, we never see light; it is completely transparent and yet we perceive its presence through a tangible surface or object. Conversely, our understanding of objects, forms and things are also provisional to this exchange; light transmits the object's form. Physicist Arthur Zajonc discusses an exchange between light and eye: "Two lights brighten our world.

One is provided by the sun, but another answers to it — the light of the eye. Only through their entwining do we see; lacking either, we are blind." ²

Space is also perceived between two relational coordinates whether through an architectural partition or a type of psychological split. Most things, it seems, are transmitted or conveyed through a process of exchange. This symbiotic relationship between *object* and *light* or between *space* and *architecture* is necessary in forming our knowledge of them apart. We exist in a world made up of binary semblances, and in a world of appearances and of representation (to borrow a phrase from Schopenhauer), as objects, things and substances are represented through coming into contact with something else.

This relative co-dependency, however, does complicate our understanding of the very thing under observation. In other words, if we agree that objects and things emanate into being through this process of exchange or intertwining, we need to ask: which object (or thing) precedes the other? What object illuminates the appearance of the "real or pure" form? Is it the *light* or the *object's* surface? Or a space *in-between*?

Canadian installation and photographic artist Caroline Cloutier has devoted her practice to examining these complex relationships. Her large-scale photographic simulations and site-specific environments challenge the activity of perception and mode of representation. Employing materials such as mirror, vinyl and the photographic image, Cloutier's installations create both spatial and perceptual distortions that alter the reading of the environment. And by staging new presentations or abstractions from the existing architecture, her work moves us beyond the "spatio-temporal" world and into a metaphysical realm open to new perceptual possibilities.

Interested in liminal spaces, Cloutier constructs an *in-between* space — a spatial intertwining that blurs the boundaries between architecture, sculpture and the photographic image. In doing so, the artist re-defines the discourse of sculpture and of photography by employing an “image as sculpture,” to form a type of phenomenal architecture. Her works physically challenge how a body moves in space and conditions the way a person perceives.

Historically, within the discourse of art history, the 1960s and 1970s investigations into the activity of perception were primarily about moving away from “symbolic representation” and the “image” in the aim of returning to the origin of sorts, such as pure light or space. It was time of reductionism, a simplification of form and an elimination of representational subject matter. Minimalists including Donald Judd and Dan Flavin were experimenting with the way light structurally forms objects, and artists such as Larry Bell, James Turrell, Doug Wheeler and Robert Irwin, commonly referred to as the Light and Space artists, were de-materializing and eliminating the art-object altogether to examine the phenomenology of perception, and with this, light and space as a primary medium. Light, which was traditionally employed to disguise or disclose formal elements in painting or used as an optical device to reveal the space between objects, was the subject of investigation as a *pure form*.

Unlike her predecessors, although grounded within the discourse of phenomenology, Cloutier returns to early methods of representation, such as the photographic image, to re-examine the initial stages involved in forming perception and the process of the phenomenological reduction. She questions how an image affects spatial cognition and activates space.

In her installation *Hiding Behind the Corner* 2017 (FIG.1) produced during a residency at the British School in Rome, Cloutier “makes

space” simply by creating a replication of it. Inside the gallery space, a photograph of a doorway or passageway was re-configured in parallel site line to its physical counterpart. A perfected symmetry between the architecture and its imitation was achieved through meticulous application. The photograph *performed as architecture*: color, line, structure and perspective were simulated with mathematical exactitude that it dissolved back into the space, prompting the viewer to decipher between the copy and the real structure. The apprehension of space and the perceptual depth was challenged. In this deception, the architecture was experienced through its simulated image, as an opening to a new pathway — to a space beyond the corporeal.

Reminiscent of the false doorways and fictional landscapes often found in the interiors and the exteriors of ancient Egyptian tombs and in Roman wall paintings, these passages were traditionally seen as portals or thresholds to the “spirit world” or the “gateway to enlightenment” — an opening to the space of *prakrti* “...the starting point of the cosmogenetic emanation of the phenomenal world.”³ Re-addressing these traditional motifs, Cloutier re-contextualizes these classical renderings within a virtual contemporary environment.

Her preoccupation with early symbolic renditions of false doorways and Roman wall painting illustrates her knowledge in the staging of effective illusion, the allegorical and mathematical perspective. More specifically, the artist discusses her wonder with Baldassare Peruzzi’s architectural wall paintings at the *Hall of Perspectives* in the Villa Farnesina in Rome. “It’s the combination of the fictional alongside the real space that’s of interest in these spaces,” she says.

In this artifice, Peruzzi (FIG. 2) depicted a rural landscape framed by a series of columns as a continuation of the room and directed the

gaze outward towards an illusionary optical facade. Cloutier discusses: “In the architectural works of the Italian Renaissance, other virtual spaces having a theological function interfere with the real spaces of the places of worship. Here, however in my work *Hiding Behind the Corner*, the visualization of these virtual worlds depends not on the viewer’s imagination, but on a representation that is thoroughly detailed in the staging of perspective and illusion.”

In Peruzzi’s illusionary scenes, the viewer may well be aware that the extension is in fact a fictional painting. However, in Cloutier’s *Hiding Behind the Corner*, the staging of optical deception is achieved by the virtue of pure resemblance from the space it occupies. The image functions, primarily, only through its signifying substitutive nature.

Raising direct questions about authorship and the mode of representation, Cloutier proposes that the architectural reproduction opens up a *second space*. “I open a virtual space as a second space,” the artist explains. “It’s always a passage. The opening will always lead you to another second place. I can mimic light and space in the photograph, but it doesn’t mimic the space.” This proposition, in contrary, suggests that the duplication becomes something else altogether, transcending both the architecture and its imitation. Understood in this way, it leads one to think about the difference between experiencing the “materiality of space” comparatively to “thinking space.”

To further explore this visual system, in her most recent work titled *In-Between* 2018, Cloutier replaces the photographic image with a mirror. This new exchange and transferal from replicating the architecture in the form of an image to re-presenting it through a reflective surface changes the method of observation entirely. Constructed in direct response to The Invisible Dog Center’s Glass House, in Brooklyn, New York, which is made

from modest materials such as glass and wooden panels, Cloutier has installed a serial succession of mirrors, applied by a formative logic, within selected window frames. From the outside, we see the mirror’s gray toned backing. The visual composition reads as a geometric grid abstraction suggestive of Piet Mondrian’s gray *Composition with Grid 2*, 1915 (FIG 3). Cloutier’s attention to line perspective in painting and image making is evident here.

Inside this space, the fragmented projection produced from the mirrored reflection, *reflectere* Latin for “bend back,” opens a new window to perception and offers a fresh understanding of representation. Exemplified by the infinite rays of traveling light, the work evokes a sensation of floating inside the outside and vice versa. The mirror turns the entire edifice into a *camera obscura*, an apparatus that is central to Cloutier’s presentation of perception. The function of the window as a translucent looking glass becomes defunct, and as a result, the gallery transforms into a “conscious active image,” folding in motion, expanding and refracting in space.

Within this fold, the over-saturation of refracted light induces a type of “perceptual blindness” similar to what is traditionally experienced in an open desert land or within a pure white environment where the point of origin vanishes into the refraction of light. To elaborate further, the idea of perceptual blindness does not mean that the viewer stops perceiving, rather it is quite the contrary. The viewer is placed in a liminal space of awareness — a space in between — where the perceiver detaches altogether from the activity of perceiving and a type of suspension occurs, whereby the activity of perceiving is experienced with a renewed naked subjectivity.

This effect is also experienced in light filled environments, for example inside Turrell’s Ganzfeld spaces or Wheeler’s infinity environ-

ments, which are Non-Euclidean hyperbolic white expanses. And white, which is also commonly associated with an absence or presence, does appear to emit a translucency similar to that of light or a mirror reflection. In many ways, Cloutier's environment dissolves the horizontal and vertical site-line into an infinite inverted symmetry where the boundaries appear limitless and difficult to locate. In other words, the entire space operates as a framing device or labyrinth reflecting animated photographs of architectural fragments as projected light.

As a result, the distinction between subject and object, and the inference from sign to signifier between the real and reflected space, collapse, and dissolve forming an echo of light and interlacing site-lines. The process of "image making" also occurs independently to the artists' hand. The viewer becomes the author of constructing the image and controls what is being experienced and observed simply by movement and spatial orientation.

Here, Cloutier has reduced the art-object to a site-conditioned environment that consists of nothing more than pure reflection and a perceiving body. This process of de-materialization, consequently, places more emphasis on the exchange between *light* and *architecture*. The mirror, acting as a transmitter of information, reflects, through light, the architecture back onto itself, as a self-reflexive process or type of reversibility; both oscillating from *presence* to *absence* simultaneously. What is being observed at this moment is traveling light which is made visible by this "doubling effect." "When the mirror transmits the architecture you don't just have an image, it's a duplication of the entire space." Cloutier remarks. "I can double the room of the gallery simply by placing the mirror. It becomes a "double image."

As light requires a tangible object to be observed, Cloutier's *In-Between* space activates

a parallel between mirror and architecture. In this space, she reveals the hidden "apparatus," of "perception," which is the exchange between light and image. The artist employs the mirror in the aim of "bending back" the viewer's gaze to the surrounding space and "suspends" the viewer's expectation of what he/she is observing.

Generally speaking, the artist takes the viewer through a reflective process similar to what is referred to as the *epoché*, a type of phenomenological reduction. *Reducere* Latin for "lead back" is effectively about returning to "things in themselves," as original entities. Attributed to the founder of Phenomenology, Edmund Husserl's concept of the *phenomenological reduction* is described more so as a technique employed to return to the origin where our correlative understanding of things, objects and substances is first formed, in an attempt to move beyond what he calls the "naïve or natural" attitude.

According to Husserl the "naïve or natural attitude" is when you accept the pre-given world (the world of appearances) without questioning what is the apparatus that is making you see. For example, we assume to know an object simply by its association to a pre-given understanding of *logos* the Greek word for "reason," or through its interaction to another thing or substance *per se*, yet we know nothing of the objects' essence or it as a "thing in itself." Husserl is not suggesting that we disregard these categorizations, rather, that we return to where the "operative exchange" occurs in the aim of observing the act of perceiving itself. In Husserl's words:

Perceiving straightforwardly, we grasp, for example, the house and not the perceiving. Only in reflection do we "*direct*" ourselves to the perceiving itself and to its perceptual directedness to the house. In the "*natural reflection*" of everyday life,

also however in that of psychological science (that is, in psychological experience of our own psychic processes), we stand on the footing of the world already given as existing...⁴

Cloutier's installations attempt to reveal and conversely, expand the limitations of perception by inviting her viewer to participate in a process similar to the phenomenological reduction. In both her works, *Hiding Behind the Corner* and *In-Between*, the viewer is confronted with perceiving space either through a photographic image or through a reflective surface. She makes us ask: what is the object that is making the activity of perception possible?

Cloutier proposes these questions by physically locating the viewer inside a liminal *In-Between* space. She makes an intuitive connection between the process of reduction, that being, *Reducere* "to lead back" and reflection *reflectere* to "bend back." Through this activity of "bending or leading" back, Cloutier returns the viewer to the birth of "perceiving itself."

The central question remains, however, of which object (or thing) precedes the other? What object illuminates the appearance of the "real or pure" form?

In Cloutier's *Hiding Behind the Corner*, the photographic imitation became a secondary function to the architecture and subsequently, it was also the "thing" that illuminated the appearance of the real or pure form. Comparatively, the object that revealed the pure form in Cloutier's *In-Between* installation was the binary of both the mirror and the architecture, as a complete labyrinth or intertwining. In both cases, Cloutier brings our attention back to the most pure form of "image making" — the transferal of light and its reflection.

And, to some extent perception is nothing more than the appearance of things; which

is revealed by light and only light. Light is the enabler of sight. Thus, our physical reality is our experience with light. Everything begins with pure *eidos*,⁵ Plato's concept for the word "idea," which is primarily understood as "not just an image or likeness but an image reflected in water or mirror." The essence of pure sight is revealed only through this exchange between light and reflection. To make pure form visible we must recognize the limitations *inside* the *outside's* labyrinth. Inside the labyrinth we see, outside the labyrinth we have sight, and in-between we "see sight" by virtue of conceding that there is only the labyrinth.

— Melissa Bianca Amore is a curator, critic and independent scholar based in New York.

1. Julia Brown, *Occluded Front: James Turrell*, The Museum of Contemporary Art, Los Angeles, Exh.Catalogue, (California: Lapis Press, 1985), 42.
2. Arthur Zajonc, *Catching the Light: The Entwined History of Light and Mind* (New York: Oxford Press, 1993) 3.
3. Adrian Snodgrass, *The Symbolism of the Stupa*, ed. Benedict Anderson (New York: Cornell University, Southeast Asia Program, 1985), 191.
4. Edmund Husserl, *Cartesian Meditations: An Introduction to Phenomenology*, trans. Dorian Cairns (Massachusetts: Kluwer Boston Publishers Group, 1982), 33.
5. Francis M. Cornford, *Plato's Cosmology* (London Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1937).

FIGURES

Outside the Inside — *The Mimetic Resemblance* by Melissa Bianca Amore



FIG.1 Caroline Cloutier, *Hiding Behind the Corner*, 2017, digital print on vinyl. British School at Rome



FIG.2 Baldassare Peruzzi, 1481-1536, *Sala delle Prospettive*, 1515-17, frescoes. Villa Farnesina, Rome. Courtesy of Villa Farnesina



FIG.3 Piet Mondrian, 1872-1944, *Composition with Grid 2*, 1915, oil on canvas. Courtesy of Mondrian Trust









Inside the Outside — I See You? You See Me?

“The basic idea of reflection is an optical one, and it’s appropriate that we have this term in English for meditative, contemplative, deeper-than-normal thinking...it gives primacy to the role of the visual in our particular culture’s approach to thinking about thinking.”¹

— Susan Hiller

Embedded within the structure of the Glass House at The Invisible Dog Art Center, a building which aptly echoes its name, Caroline Cloutier’s installation *In-Between* is not only a new development within her oeuvre, but the logical trajectory of a practice that has an interest in the “reflective function inherent in specular and photographic images, and in their ability to evoke virtual spaces.”²

Constructed mostly of reclaimed and recycled wooden windowpanes, the architecture of the Glass House is reminiscent of a conservatory. Lacking the solid walls a house usually provides, the division between public and private, inside and outside, is broken-down. Like its namesake, Philip Johnson’s Glass House (built 1948-49, New Canaan, Connecticut) the Invisible Dog’s Glass House has a profound connection to its surrounding landscape. The play of the glass surfaces creates a layering of images, from foliage, fences and buildings to the shadowy figures of people strolling past, turning the scenery into what Johnson once described of his own view, its “wallpaper.” Unlike Johnson’s example, the framed panes here, rather than walls of glass, create a bifurcated view of the neighborhood. Cloutier takes full advantage of the gridded architecture to create an installation that both “represents” and “re-presents” the interior and exterior of the site.

Incorporating mirror with her photographs beginning in 2014, Cloutier’s site informed works such as *Vertige* (FIG 1), the first to include mirror, induce spatial disorientation by playing with reflection. By producing photographic images of details of the space itself (doorway, ceiling, floor) or placing a mirror in front of an architectural element to replicate it, Cloutier dismantles the exhibition space, creating a trompe l’oeil, rather than depicting the space itself. She uses the architecture of the exhibition site as integral to her piece.

In her work *In-Between*, she does not so much dismantle the space, but rather accentuates its existing divisions by strategically inserting mirror within the existing framework of the architecture. Using the mirror as extension of the camera itself, Cloutier here removes the photograph, allowing the mirror to function as both object and image. Though the mirror has been present in previous works, this is the first instance where the viewer is also intended to be the viewed. A mirror, a blank slate until a figure enters its field of reflection, makes the viewer essential to the function and meaning of the work.

Through her use of fragmentation, Cloutier momentarily disorients the viewer, disrupting their awareness of where they are in space and time. The artist provokes contemplation and self-reflection on the act of looking, drawing attention to the dynamics inherent in art viewership. Reflection not only implies the physical act, it evokes the process of thinking about thinking.

For Cloutier, the mirror functions as image in much the same way as a photograph. And like photography, a mirror can faithfully reflect the truth of its subject as well as manipulate it, transforming the subject into a new truth. Mirrors have been imbued with meaning in art from classical antiquity to the present day.

Images of mirrors have been used repeatedly over the centuries as a pictorial device to demonstrate an artists' skill at rendering reflection, distorting objects and depicting what might be taking place outside the picture plane. Two of the most well-known examples, which have an affinity with Cloutier's installation, are *Portrait of Giovanni (?) Arnolfini and his Wife*, 1434 by Jan van Eyck (FIG 2) and *Las Meninas*, 1656 by Diego Velázquez (FIG 3). Both of these complex and enigmatic portraits include a mirror to depict spatial expansion and throw the viewer off balance in their relationship to the space both within and outside the canvas. In each of these works, the mirror "reflects" what may or may not be there. The convex mirror in the Van Eyck shows what is in the room, as well as two figures outside the painting. However, as the mirror is positioned at the center of the painting, these two figures are sited, in what must be, the viewer's space. Therefore, we assume their position and become implicated in the story. The mirror in the Velázquez is also centered within the composition and, as with the Van Eyck, depicts two figures, again, located where the viewer is standing. This strategy collapses the space of the picture with that of the viewer, producing a constant questioning of what it is that we are truly seeing.

Cloutier, through her use of real mirror, like the Van Eyck and Velázquez representations, engages the viewer with fundamental questions of perception. As well, the interplay between observing and being observed is quite acute in all three and we become conscious of our own act of looking.

In the 20th century, the mirror was released from being just a subject or tool to becoming material and object itself. A vehicle, as well as the focus of theoretical and philosophical investigation, the mirror has defined some of the most notable trends in artistic discourse over the past fifty years. Artists including Louise Bourgeois, Robert Rauschenberg, Robert

Smithson, Joan Jonas, Lucas Samaras, Doug Aitken and Anish Kapoor have used mirror in their own distinct conceptual approach and with various intentions to engage with the audience.

As a bridge between historical painting and installation featuring mirror, one can look to Michelangelo Pistoletto's ongoing series of Mirror Paintings. Created by painting or printing photographic images onto human-scaled mirrored steel, his intentional use of reflection creates a dialogue between the viewer and the image in much the same way that Cloutier does. Both artists bring the viewer and the environment into the work, questioning the nature of reality and our place in the "real" location.

For each, the mirror becomes a gateway into a virtual space behind the work. As Pistoletto has stated, "In my mirror-paintings the dynamic reflection does not create a place, because it only reflects a place which already exists — the static silhouette does no more than re-propose an already existing place. But I can create a place by bringing about a passage between the photograph and the mirror: this place is whole time."³ Similarly, Cloutier writes, "...the spaces of my interventions become the locus of a truly upended reality, a virtual space of indeterminate boundaries into which the body is inscribed by mental projection."⁴

The difference here is that in the Pistoletto work viewers encounter the photographic representation of a figure alongside their reflection, whereas in Cloutier's *In-Between*, viewers confront only themselves.

Exploiting the basic human impulse to gaze upon oneself when faced with a reflective surface, artists use this for their own specific advantage, employing mirror to compel viewers into reflecting on their roles as spectators of art and contemplating their location in the world.

In 1965 Yayoi Kusama realized the mirror could aid her in overcoming the emotional and physical limitations within her practice and began her ongoing series of Infinity Mirror Rooms. Using mirror, she transformed the obsessive mark making inherent to her work into a perceptual experience. Alluding to art historical associations of the mirror with vanity, Kusama captures her viewers with their own reflections, creating a participatory experience by casting the visitor as the subject of the work.

Since that time the artist has produced more than twenty distinct Infinity Mirror Rooms. These immersive environments, such as *Infinity Mirrored Room — The Souls of Millions of Light Years Away*, 2013 (FIG 4), offer the experience of stepping into an illusion of infinite space. Kusama's desire to share something deeply personal is united with her desire to make viewers question their own narrative and relationship to the world. Her installations create a harmonious space for visitors to contemplate their existence and reflect on the passage of time.

Kusama ensures that each viewer observes not only themselves within the mirrors, but others as well. Caught between an endless confrontation of self and other, likeness may intertwine but never quite meld. Cloutier, also guarantees that viewers glimpse both themselves and others, however, her segmented mirrors guarantee that likeness never merge, always making one question Self vs. Other.

Within Kusama's environments, the body simultaneously vanishes into the infinite space, whereas in Cloutier's installation the body is grounded in the present. It is our mind that she pushes to another space — one that we cannot see but think is there. Cloutier makes us question whether the space around the corner or through the window actually exist. By keeping our body in one space and transporting our mind to another Cloutier places us "in-between."

Similarly, to Cloutier and Kusama, Dan Graham's work can be understood as exploring universals and, as with the other two, he investigates the relationship of the body in time and space. Manifesting his engagement through glass and mirrored architectural/sculptural "pavilions," such as *Heart Pavilion* (FIG 5), that serve as visual and cognitive instruments of reflection and perception.

Since the 1970s, Graham has been fascinated with the perceived "transparency" of the Modernist glass corporate skyscraper. Graham believes that when two-way mirror glass is used for office buildings (those on the inside can see out while those on the outside only see reflection) questions of surveillance and voyeurism are raised. Investigating these issues, Graham's optical environments transform the viewer into both surveilled and voyeur and hint at issues of consumerism, questions that may not be at the fore in Cloutier's installation. Each, however, demand that viewers continuously question their evolving role within the reception and perception of the artwork. In his essay *Subject Matter*, Graham has written that there is no distinction between the "art" and the spectator; the object and the subject are the viewer.⁵

Within their work, Graham and Cloutier produce a situation where the audience views themselves looking at one another looking. Instead of gazing at an object the viewer becomes part of artwork; the act of viewing itself is on display, objectified for all to see. For years, Graham has employed mirror and glass not simply to call attention to their visual qualities; he uses their reflective properties, to construct a shared environment in which the act of looking becomes the art itself. His pavilions place the viewers in context by reflecting them among the topographies of their environments. Simultaneously concealing and revealing, the pavilions perform optical games with viewers, interrupting everyday space

and asking them to pause and reconsider their roles in a larger social context. Through the use of the void (pane of glass) and the reflection (mirror), Cloutier's installation also conceals and reveals, dissolving boundaries between inside and outside, asking her viewer to question where they are. Situating her audience in numerous places at the same moment; she creates a sense of imbalance, emphasizing the ambiguities of seeing and perceiving.

The illusion of distorting or fragmenting form and directing the viewer's gaze to their surroundings re-familiarizes one with what the world around us actually looks like — something we may normally take for granted.

— William Stover is an independent curator and consultant to private collections.

FIGURES Inside the Outside — I See You? You See Me? by William Stover



FIG.3 Diego Rodríguez de Silva y Velázquez, 1599-1660, *Las Meninas*, 1656, oil on canvas, 126 × 110 in. Museo Del Prado, Madrid, P001174

1. Susan Hiller, "Reflections," The Townsend Lecture. University College London, London. 22 Nov. 1989. from *Thinking About Art: Conversations with Susan Hiller* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996): 69.
2. Caroline Cloutier, Artist Statement, www.carolinecloutier.net.
3. *Michelangelo Pistoletto*, Ex. Catalogue. Galleria La Bertesca, Genova, Italy, 1966.
4. Caroline Cloutier, Artist Statement, www.carolinecloutier.net.
5. Dan Graham, "Subject Matter", *Rock My Religion: Writings and Projects 1965-1990* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1994): 38.



FIG.1 Caroline Cloutier, *Vertige*, 2014, digital print on vinyl and mirror, dimensions variable. Site-specific work at Clark Center, Montreal



FIG.2 Jan van Eyck, active 1422; died 1441, *Portrait of Giovanni(?) Arnolfini and his Wife*, 1434, oil on oak, 32 × 23 in. National Gallery, London, NG186



FIG.4 Yayoi Kusama, *Infinity Mirrored Room — The Souls of Millions of Light Years Away*, 2013, wood, metal, glass mirrors, plastic, acrylic panel, rubber, LED lighting system, acrylic balls, and water, 113 1/4 × 163 1/2 × 163 1/2 in. © YAYOI KUSAMA, Courtesy David Zwirner, New York; Ota Fine Arts, Tokyo/Singapore/Shanghai



FIG.5 Dan Graham, *Heart Pavilion*, 1991, two-way mirror glass and aluminum, 94 × 168 × 144 in. Carnegie Museum of Art, Pittsburgh, A.W. Mellon Acquisition Endowment Fund and Carnegie International Acquisition Fund





3

ANA VIDA

