

EXTENSION/ENHANCEMENT

Artistic process and the prosthesis in image-making

DO NOT COPY

Kristina Fiedrich
December 19th, 2011

The artists and works introduced in this paper examine bodily presence and absence, points of connectivity, and negotiate the terrain of the body enhanced by technology. By exposing various interpretations of “prosthesis” in the work of artists Rebecca Horn, Matthew Barney and Stelarc, it is my intention to develop a context for my own practice and an expansive understanding of prosthetic terminology and the presence of a prosthetic metaphor in artistic practices.

The practice of drawing is constantly adapting through new methods of mark making and the incorporation of new technologies as an exploration of possibility. ‘Prosthesis-as-extension’ and the potential to explore beyond bodily capacity emerge in the work of Horn and Barney through the expressiveness and immediacy of drawing. The simplicity of the technologies used in exploring and conveying an embodied experience allows the viewer to access and inhabit the physical sensations of the artist. This can be understood as an emergent capacity, signaling perhaps future adaptation, expansion of bodily limitations and a greater understanding of the embodied experience.

Performance, beginning with the art movement of the 60s and 70s, and integral to an authentic representation of the physical experience, allows for explorations, interpretations and figurations of the body. While drawing as performance has a strong presence in Rebecca Horn and Matthew Barney’s praxis, Stelarc performs the body as sculpture, reducing its form to an evolutionary architectural element. Stelarc’s interpretation of the body itself as prosthesis points to a discourse that revolves around the adaptation, extension and incorporation of technology. The interaction of technology and its various points of contact and infiltration in

the body throughout Stelarc's practice reveal an attitude that technology is, and always has been, an appendage of the body.

Philosopher Jean Baudrillard described the prosthesis from a more traditional perspective as "an artifact which replaces a defective organ, or an instrumental extension of the body." (134) While this definition suffices to describe the expected medical function of the prosthesis, it fails to include the potential of the body-technology relationship. From a cultural and social anthropological stand-point, Sarah Jains has expanded on this traditional understanding of prosthesis, stating: "'Technology as prosthesis' attempts to describe the joining of materials, naturalizations and excorporations [...] that go far beyond the medical definition of 'replacement of a missing part.'" (Jains qtd. in Sobchack 19) If the contemporary discourse of prosthetics is assigned to corporeal extensions and the joining of materials, then can an artistic practice which integrates a drawing tool be interpreted as prosthesis for the artist?

Through a practice involving the intimate, personal and conceptual subject of embodiment, I am questioning the ability of a chosen technology to convey an experience of the body. Here I turn to Merleau-Ponty and phenomenology to define embodiment as a means of becoming conscious of the world through the medium of the body. Merleau-Ponty states: "I cannot understand the function of a living body except by enacting it myself, and except in so far as I am a body which rises towards the world" (87). Embodiment is a private experience of attachment and detachment, confinement and extension, inside and outside. Using the example of a stick to find one's way among things, Merleau-Ponty explains that by becoming

familiar with the instrument, the tactile world recedes and begins no longer at the hand, but at the end of the stick. The instrument becomes an extension of the body's sensory abilities, expands perceptual capacities, and becomes a tool with which to perceive the world (176).

In forming a practice around the use of prosthetics in image-making, I am questioning what it means to be at a distance. The interpretation of 'distance' can be quite literally the measure of space between the drawing tool and the hand, as suggested by Merleau-Ponty, or alternatively a dislocation of the physical body and the technology creating the mark. What is of interest to me is the paradox of looking for connections by investigating disconnections, whether informed via medical prosthetic devices or image-making technologies. These 'disconnections' can be interpreted as a difference in physical appearance between the prosthetic device and the body or the varying definitions and metaphorizations of prosthesis as extension/enhancement. How can I then convey through drawing the potential of the body through an expanded understanding of the prosthesis?

The re-presentation of the body, while a provocative proposition, might be better served when charged through "refiguring, transforming and functioning at the very limit of the body's capacities – especially if (as Nietzsche outlines) [...] the origin of art is the very exploration and use of the body" (Grosz 193). The challenge, and perhaps the impossibility, of representing embodiment sets forth a desire to create a visual language of bodily interaction, and explore the capacity of the viewer to consider, empathize and acknowledge not only the artist's sense of embodiment but also their own.

Part of my research involves interpreting the visibility and invisibility of prosthetic devices and embodied experience. By examining the medical prosthesis from an artistic perspective, I intend to investigate its capacity for altering the figuration of the body, to be both extension of, and integral to the body, and for this discourse to inform my artistic praxis. My approach to prosthetics acknowledges the terms' primary contextualization within medical research, materials research for the advancements of prosthetic development and its literal function for amputees. The recognition of medical prosthesis terminology is imperative to informing my praxis in order to illuminate other potential contexts. The medical prosthesis when used as a metaphor points to an addition, replacement, extension or enhancement and for the interactions of the body and technology. The refiguration of prosthetic terminology as a creative endeavour has the potential to penetrate the cultural experience of loss, trauma and adversity, reworking a prospective understanding of the body as adaptable and expandable.

Using the drawing medium, it is my intention to test the limited "prosthesis" terminology in health research and find a re-articulation of the term "prosthesis" within an artistic context. Drawing as a practice often provides critical distance from technological production. This is not to say, however, that drawing cannot involve technology and other forms of production. Drawing's process has progressed to involve other mediums and disciplines through the investigation of line and mark-making. My continuing fascination in the drawing medium lies in its direct relationship to the body: the physical connection of the drawn line to the hand of the artist; the variety of tools and technologies available for mark-making; the extension of the artist; the proximity of the body to the finished work.

Expanding upon traditional drawing practices, I am interested in technology¹ and the place where technology meets the body. Pursuant to a discussion of the technologically enhanced body, my research involves bodily extensions and enhancements within which the medical prosthesis is an aspect of a larger exploration. By means of an art-based research practice I intend to experiment with and explore a concept of the body extended and enhanced by technology.

Technology not only changed the way we negotiate the everyday, but strongly conditions the experience of ourselves and others, and thus can be seen as a type of mediation. Media theorist Marshall McLuhan wrote, “Physiologically, man in the normal use of technology (or his variously extended body) is perpetually modified by it and in turn finds ever new ways of modifying his technology”² (51).

Professor of Women’s and Gender Studies, Elizabeth Grosz hypothesizes in her essay “Naked,” for *The Prosthetic Impulse: From a Posthuman Present to a Biocultural Future* that we don’t know what bodies are capable of. Whether in the realm of genetics, molecular biology, sports or production of labour, we have a general understanding of bodily capacities but have refused to accept limits and boundaries of what is bodily possible and impossible (193). Throughout history, the body has transformed and extended its limits. This constant state of becoming is an integral part of a natural cycle of human development: “the ever-transforming, ever-recontextualizing of what has been done so that it can be done differently” (Grosz 193).

¹ In 1937, American Sociologist Read Bain defined technology to include all tools, machines, utensils, weapons, instruments, housing, clothing, communicating and transporting devices and the skills by which we produce and use them. My use of the term ‘technology’ is meant to broaden the scope of a drawing practice to potentially include rather than exclude a wide variety of mark-making and investigative techniques.

² Though ‘mediation’ in the McLuhan sense is not necessarily an integral element of my research, it is important to mention as part of the process of investigating the meeting of body and technology, both being susceptible to modification and adaptation.

Bodies and technologies can thus be seen to function in relationship: transformations and modifications in one will produce transformations in the other, in cyclical feedback.

While it is generally recognized that technologies have transformed everyday life, the focus of this paper is not on specific technologies, but the appearance of those specific technologies as bodily extension in art. Technology can be described as all tools, machines, utensils and instruments which in turn mirror, extend and enhance bodily capacities, therefore it is not only the function of the technology, but its original intention and modified application which may allow it to enter into a new dialogue and further artistic interpretation.

REBECCA HORN - bodylandscapes

Working within the Conceptual and Body Art movements of the 60s and 70s German installation artist, Rebecca Horn exploits the entire physicality of the body. With an oeuvre spanning several decades and largely characterized by kinetic structures, apparatuses and machines, Horn continues to place importance on drawing and the drawing apparatus within her practice. In 1968, after a long illness which kept the artist isolated and unable to leave the hospital, Horn began creating body sculptures as a means of communicating her loneliness. Meditating on the body's paradoxical ability and inability to communicate, these prosthetic extensions provide insight into the artist's interpretation of the body as a limited, fragile system. Early works representing physicality and vulnerability spoke to the artist's interest in the body as an object of manipulation, transformations and extension (Horn 9). Often the

figures are restricted, bound or bandaged as a metaphor for the captive and disabled body, a theme further enacted in her body sculptures and kinetic works. Exploring and pushing against boundaries, whether physical or psychological, Horn employed images of amputation, bondage and prosthetic extensions of extremities and other parts of the body. These disabilities can be read as metaphor for traumatic experience and though they are of an autobiographical nature, Horn's work has the capacity to bridge everyday life and art by placing familiar objects in different contexts, allowing the viewer to consider their own bodily experience as an entry point to inform the interpretation of her work.

The nature of the prosthesis in Horn's work fits within the medical definition of bodily extension however she uses artistic license to further interpret the prosthetic device as a metaphor for trauma, limitation and adversity. There is both a desire to overcome loss and to expose the sense of loss itself, intrinsically linked to Horn's personal experience of illness and confinement. What transcends Horn's practice is a longing for communication, through the body transformed. The medical bandages that acted as both healing support and bondage, transformed into body sculptures like *Arm Extensions*, which, when strapped onto the wearer's extremities, render the limbs useless. The purposeful binding of bodily movement and sensory perception can be interpreted as loss of communication and a need to better understand the body. This in turn provides insight into the artist's themes of personal struggle and an incapability of fully sharing an embodied experience.

The discourse of prosthesis within a medical context is one that generally exhibits/manifests rehabilitation, empowerment, stability and mobility. While the appearance

of prostheses in Horn's work is in direct conflict with the medical intention of prosthesis as assistive or instrumental device, perhaps the artist's intention is instead to consider the enlarged limbs as a visual indication of the body in crisis and the examination of difference and failures in our own bodies.

Working with a balance between body and space, *Handschuhfinger (Finger Glove)* extends the physical presence of the body and creates an illusion of interaction and touch. The artist performed one instance of *Finger Glove* in Berlin, the sculptural extensions scraping along the opposite walls as she walked back and forth the length of the room. The long wooden finger-extensions on one hand allow the physical boundaries of the body to be expanded keeping the wearer at a distance from a more intimate and direct level of bodily touch. The failure of the prosthetic extensions to convey the body's sensory perception and a restricted physicality speak to the failure of interpersonal communication (Horn 15) and recalls Merleau-Ponty's stick.

Bleistiftmaske (Pencil Mask) is an example of body sculpture employing drawing elements, the artist wearing a lattice mask covered in a web of twenty-one protruding pencils. Swinging her body back and forth, Horn became the instrument of a drawing performance, creating a wall drawing later described as a portrait of the artist. The absence of the hand in this particular work analyses the adaptability of the body and the variety of mark-making created by extending the body. The gesture generated by the *Pencil Mask* is uncomfortable and evokes painfulness in its production. In conversation with Rebecca Horn, Joachim Sartorium of Berliner Festspiele, says, "Don't all the best things start with illness?" (Novalis qtd. in

Sartorium), interpreting Horn's entire oeuvre as an in-depth consideration of the body's ability to react in a state of crisis in ways you never thought it capable (189).

My specific interest in Horn's practice is the appearance of prosthetic extension as communicative device, whether through a drawing apparatus or body sculpture. Illness and disability are themes which remain present throughout Horn's practice. I am particularly drawn to the autobiographical nature of the artist's oeuvre, as communicating through the body must invariably come from personal experience and investigation. Horn's work finds a balance between communication and isolation, separation and interaction, distance and intimacy. The oppressive personal experience suffered by the artist was also the means through which Horn set free an extraordinary insight into the body, its limits, complexity and fragility.

MATTHEW BARNEY – athleticism & adversity

American artist Matthew Barney began working on various incarnations of *Drawing Restraint* in 1987, with over 18 versions to date, all varying in their complexity, narrative elements, staging and collaborative involvement. For my current purpose, I am focusing on *Drawing Restraints 1* through *6* (1987-1989) and the performances' relationship to examples of bodily extension. In an interview with the Museum of Modern Art from the SFMOMA YouTube channel, Barney expresses his interest in the body as a tool of creation, using his own body to develop a relationship to, and express experience through the work.

Early in his career as an artist, Barney mined what he refers to as his profound bodily experience as an athlete, training on the football field in high school, as a means of accessing

and inserting his body into his work. In athleticism training, Barney explains, resistance is put against the body as means of breaking down muscle tissue in order to encourage it to grow (Barney).

Influenced by the Body Art movement of the 1960s and 70s and Performance movements of the 1980s, specifically Vito Acconci, Bruce Nauman and Richard Serra, Barney recognized his own physical form as a tool through which to develop an understanding of body-based work. To work with the corpus in art and to express a sense of embodiment through art is to return to the site and source of productivity and pleasure, adversity and trauma. To act with and on the body can lead to different interpretations, understandings and sensibilities of one's own body. Recalling McLuhan's definition of mediation, Grosz states: "Acting differently also leads to being acted on differently – to sense differently, [...] and inquiring into the limits and transformability of biology itself" (200). Like Horn, Barney uses the experiential knowledge of the body to inform the nature of the extension pursued in each variation of the *Drawing Restraint* series. Through athleticism, Barney is investigating the capacity for his own transformability and the restraints evolve in response to each previous experience.

Equating the act of being in the studio and generating form to a kind of self-resistance, Barney utilizes the physiology of body development through resistance as his medium. The artist filmed *Drawing Restraints 1 - 6* as performance works, jumping, reaching and lunging against various self-restraints. Using various homemade drawing tools, Barney recorded the often random marks as repeated evidence of overcoming adversity.

Reminiscent of the drawing performance *Up To And Including Her Limits* (1970)³ by multidisciplinary artist Carolee Schneeman, *Drawing Restraints 1 - 6* emphasizes the artists' self-imposed bodily struggles. While the artist's body creates the traces made on the paper, the drawing process also affects the body through transformation, physical traces on the skin's surface, or through physical exertion and exhaustion. As is the case with Schneeman and Horn, Barney's body becomes the instrument of the work itself.

The appearance of athleticism within Barney's practice, however, highlights a machismo that was not present in either Schneeman or Horn's body-based performances. The repetition, endurance, physicality and presence of the body in this series of work demonstrate both the importance of the process of drawing more than the result (as in some cases where no drawings were produced as a result of the performance), and the triumph of the masculine form.

The first in a series of performances, the set for *Drawing Restraint 1* [fig. 4] was constructed in Barney's Yale studio. Two slight inclines were constructed on either end of the studio, with the point of resistance in the center of the floor. The artist strapped the elastic line from the floor to his thighs, the first variation of a self-restraint. As Barney's body moved away from the center of the room up the incline, resistance increased, and drawings were generated at the top of either slope and along the walls. Drawings from this performance were diagrammatic, frantic and repetitive.

³ Partially suspended in a harness, artist Carolee Schneeman held crayons in her extended arm, moving only as far as the harness would allow. The accumulation of colored marks acted as traces of the body in motion on the large seamless paper backdrop.

As an elaboration on *Drawing Restraint 1*, *Drawing Restraint 2* involved steeper, more challenging ramps. Using longer and heavier tools to generate drawings, Barney hoisted himself on climbing holds, struggling against his restraints. *Drawing Restraint 2* is described as “mediation on the desire to make a mark, and the discipline imposed on that [desire]” (Barney). Finished drawings were never produced, but the collection of marks generated in this performance exemplifies the artist’s determination, endurance and struggle. Variations of this performance included the artist wearing hockey skates, which undoubtedly would affect balance, grip and the ability to use the climbing holds placed around the set.

Drawing Restraint 6 differs from 1 and 2 in that there were no physical restraints worn by the artist. The minimal set for the performance included a mini-trampoline, fixed onto a base with a fifteen-degree angle. Using a simple drawing tool the artist recorded one mark on the ceiling of the studio with every jump, and over the course of a day, the marks merged to form a self-portrait. The angle of the trampoline creates a situation where Barney must repeatedly reinvest the energy required to reach the ceiling.

If we return for a moment to the definition of prosthesis set forth by Jains as a joining of materials, Barney’s *Drawing Restraint* series continuously and variously explores the joining of his body to the environment in which he performs, evidenced by the repetitive mark-making both in the space and on drawing surfaces distributed through the space, demanding a continuous physical exertion on the part of the artist and the body’s need to adapt to an environment of limitation restraint. In the case of *Drawing Restraint 2*, the lack of finished

drawings speaks simultaneously to frustration and determination, the body's ability to excel even when in crisis, self-imposed or otherwise.

It is also important to mention Matthew Barney's use of prostheses in collaboration with double below-the-knee amputee Aimee Mullins in Cycle 3 of his *Cremaster* series. American Paralympian, model and activist, Mullins appears in this film wearing various prostheses, symbolizing for Barney different stages of Masonic initiation rituals. In the film's final sequence, Mullins is shown wearing clear, anthropomorphic, tentacle prosthetic legs that do not permit her to stand by herself, let alone walk. This was a compromise on the part of the artist, having originally requested that Mullins be without any prosthesis, her residual limbs exposed. *Cremaster 3* (2002) has been criticized for its careless disembodied technofetishism, the artist's attempt to strip Mullins of her legs raising issues of vulnerability, intimacy and a fetishization of the image of the amputee, a far cry from the prosthetic imperatives of rehabilitation, empowerment and stability.

As an amputee, Mullins has herself contributed to the fetishistic discourse around prosthetic devices, having several interchangeable legs, appearing on Alexander McQueen's runway wearing a pair of intricately carved wooden legs. Mullins presents herself to the public as a shape-shifting figure, each of her prosthetic legs performing a different function, whether athletic (C-Legs), cosmetic (dubbed 'Pretty Legs') or fetishistic (Barney's cheetah woman). Most importantly in relation to Barney's practice, she embodies athleticism, physical strength and the artist's desire in *Drawing Restraint* to use the body as a tool of empowerment and determination, a true symbol for the opportunities/possibilities presented through adversity.

The issue of prosthesis-as-metaphor, where 'prosthesis' is simply a symbol of something else, whether loss, disability or body-machine interfaces, is that it misses the fact that the prosthesis is itself an incredibly complex device. Art historian Marquard Smith writes of Mullins' role in *Cremaster 3* and the fetishization of prosthetics in his essay "The Vulnerable Articulate" for *The Prosthetic Impulse: From a Posthuman Present to a Biocultural Future*, that we need to observe the shift between the animate and inanimate nature of the prosthetic, and "its effect on our understanding of both the material and metaphorical prosthetic body" (67). The ability, then, of artistic expression to undermine the preconceptions of what a prosthetic *should* be is of great importance to the contemporary prosthetic conversation and the enhanced body: the marginalization experienced by the prosthetic minority and the prostheses' historical representation of loss and disability is beginning to break loose. Barney's use of prosthetic imagery in *Cremaster 3*, as well as Mullins' endorsement of the fetishization of the different body plays directly into the discourse around possibility, and a surpassing of existing human function. It is precisely this expanded prosthetic metaphor of potential human capacity that informs the practice of the last artist in this investigation.

STELARC – the body is obsolete

Australian performance artist Stelarc (Stelios Arkadiou) explores the limits of the body and its potential invasion and transformation by technology. Stelarc's performances have moved from the theatrical, skin-hooked body suspensions of the 1960s and body imaging of the 1970s to an exploration of the relationship between the body and technology in the prosthetic

work of the 1980s and 1990s. The artist's practice explores two trajectories: first, the augmentation of the natural body through technological resources; second, the body as becoming obsolete or "biologically inadequate" and the subsequent need for a technological reorganization of the body (Caygill 46). Navigating the technologically enhanced body, his focus dwells on the body's obsolescence and disappearance. According to philosopher and social theorist Brian Massumi, Stelarc's statement regarding the body's obsolescence is less a proclamation of the death of the body and more a challenge of its potential, explaining that "the body's obsolescence is the condition of change" (Massumi qtd. in Fernandez 107).

Exploring the possibilities and limitations of an existence where the body becomes the object for physical and technical experiments, Stelarc's work considers the body as an extendible evolutionary structure, enhanced by technology. In a 1992 interview with *L'Autre Journal*, Stelarc states: "Tools have always been considered outside of the body. They have extended perception, enlarged the vision, and generated other models for the world. Today technology is no longer exploding out from the body [...] but is imploding and sticking to the skin. It is imploding and entering into the interior of the body." (qtd. in Caygill 46)

Through the use of medical instruments, prosthetics, robotics, virtual reality systems and the internet, Stelarc explores alternate, intimate and involuntary interfaces with the body. From a fundamental physiological approach, he is attempting to radically redesign the body, regarding the prosthesis as an integral part of a reorganization and advancement of the bodily structure promised by technological developments (Caygill 46).

Stelarc's *Third Arm* has become the best-known and longest-used performance object for the artist. Originally designed as a semi-permanent bodily attachment, *Third Arm* weighs approximately 2 kilograms and has been described as a prosthetic *addition* to the body rather than a replacement. This prosthetic device would come to symbolize a symptom of excess rather than a sign of a missing part. Contributing to cyborg discourses on the body, *Third Arm* is a mechanical human-like hand attached to the artist's right arm as an additional hand, with grasping and pinching capabilities, a 290 degree wrist rotation and a tactile feedback system to mimic a sense of touch (Stelarc).

As an example of prosthesis, Stelarc's *Third Arm* described as the amplified and involuntary body, is perhaps the most direct in appearance to the medical prosthesis, and exhibits the potential of bodily additions and extensions. However, *Third Arm* appears to neglect the terms of those who incorporate and live the prosthetic reality, who neither sense a lack, nor something added on to their bodies. Instead, Stelarc views the body itself as prosthetic, a site for radical experimentation, challenging the perception of a previous bodily whole and following Massumi's logic that "the object can be considered prostheses of the body provided that it is remembered that the body is equally a prosthesis of the thing." (Massumi qtd in Fernandez 120).

The postmodern world promotes the blurring of boundaries, new inventions and relationships between otherwise disparate ideas or subjectivities. As contemporary philosopher and feminist theoretician Rosi Braidotti has argued, technology, at the heart of the

process of hybridization, results in the powerful image of the posthuman⁴ (214). Stelarc explores the concept of the posthuman (and is perhaps himself posthuman, by using his own body as subject) through ideas of progress, self-awareness, and modern technological advancements determining a natural progression to a better life, constantly transforming identity and the body. Experiments through bodily modification demonstrate the future potential of the expanded human, re-defining identity and improving human capacities in order to become a crossbreed of the technological and organic body. Foucault describes the posthuman as “living forms [that] may pass from one into another, the present species are no doubt the result of former transformations, and the whole of the living world is perhaps in motion towards a future point [...]” (Foucault qtd. in Baron 9). What Stelarc performs through investigations and developments of different technologies “is the way in which technology escapes the control of its inventors to produce unseen and unforeseeable changes and possibilities [...] and thus a future - for the self, the human, for the body and for technology - which can be neither programmed nor predicted” (Hall 139).

In this preliminary investigation into the appearance of prostheses in artistic practice, I have had to acknowledge various terms and potential problematic content. Historical and medical definitions of the prosthesis have bound both the device and its visibility in social and cultural contexts to a discourse surrounding disability, loss and trauma. Challenges from the prosthetic community to engineer and design better prostheses, alongside the image of the

⁴ Rosi Braidotti’s image of the posthuman situates the human as an extension of and intimately connected to the technological, but also stresses that the post-human does not really mean the end of humanity: “None of this need to catastrophic but rather a way to allow for new life-forms and new forms of cohabitation between humans and technological others” (256).

improved, modified human body has propelled the prosthesis toward a multitude of new possibilities and metaphorizations of prosthesis as emergent technology. With figures such as Aimee Mullins shattering the public perception of the disabled body, and the image of posthumanism presented by Stelarc, contemporary discourse surrounding prosthesis-as-extension and prosthesis-in-art provide potential re-figuration.

I have discussed Rebecca Horn's use of prosthetic imagery to uncover a sense of failed communication and a self-imposed restriction of physical and sensory perception. The trauma experienced by the artist, both psychologically and physically, contributed to an embodied practice that explored and exposed a deep sense of failing and desire. Matthew Barney used his athletic training to create a practice steeped in experiential knowledge and adversity. The reiterative nature of Barney's practice evokes the physical brutality of athleticism, to break down and rebuild the body through repetition and obsession with ritual. Both Horn and Barney deal with direct experience of the body as a means of understanding and coming to terms with the limitations and capabilities of the human form. As is the case with both artists, the focus remains on bodily presence and the impulse to translate expression.

Alternatively, Stelarc's practice engages with the body as architecture, a form one might manipulate or augment. His works thus become experimentations of expanded potential and future manifestations of a posthuman body, accepting that the natural human figure has become biologically inadequate. Though Stelarc's work relates closely to the medical prosthetic device, he differs from Horn and Barney, as he does not draw on his own embodied knowledge, but rather an outward investigation of the body's need to change.

The focus of my practice resides in the realm of embodiment and experience, relating closely to the practices of both Horn and Barney. Though Stelarc's practice is extreme in its dissemination, I am drawn to his interpretation of the body as prosthetic, and the reorganization of the body through technology. The role of technology acknowledges the attachment, connection and mediation that exists in both the prosthetic metaphor and the expanded art practice. Without undermining its traditional implications, I am interested in making visible various interpretations of the prosthetic. While the manifestation of the prosthesis-as-extension has yet to reveal itself in my studio practice, various themes visited in this paper (illness, adversity and trauma) and the prosthesis-as-metaphor will continue to be explored. Through a re-figuration of the prosthesis, it is my goal to examine and articulate an expanded understanding of bodily limitations and capacities.

WORKS CITED

- Barney, Matthew. Drawing Restraint. Personal Website, Matthew Barney. 2006. October 20, 2011.
<http://www.drawingrestraint.net/>
- Baron, Denis. The Mutant Flesh: Fabrication of a Posthuman. Paris: Éditions Dis Voir, 2009.
- Baudrillard, Jean. The Transparency of Evil. Verso Press, 2009.
- Braidotti, Rosi. Metamorphoses: Towards a Materialist Theory of Becoming. Cambridge: Polity, 2002.
- Caygill, Howard. "Stelarc and the Chimera: Kant's Critique of Prosthetic Judgment," *Art Journal* (Aesthetics and the Body Politic) 56.1 (1997): 46-51. Print.
- Fernandez, Maria. Rev. of "The Body Is More than Flesh," *Art Journal* 65.3 (2006): 120-122. Print.
- Grosz, Elizabeth. "Naked," The Prosthetic Impulse: From a Posthuman Present to a Biocultural Future. Eds. Marquard Smith and Joanne Morra. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2006. 187-202.
- Hall, Gary. "Para-site," The Cyborg Experiments: The Extensions of the Body in the Media Age. Ed. Joanna Zylińska. London and New York: Continuum, 2002. 139-140.
- Johnson, Mark L. "Book Reviews." *Philosophical Psychology* 5.1 (1992): 103. *Academic Search Premier*. Web. 26 Jan. 2012.
<http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.eciad.ca:2048/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=9610290636&site=ehost-live>
- McLuhan, Marshall. Understanding Media: The Extension of Man. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1994.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. Phenomenology of Perception. New York and London: Routledge, 2008.
- San Francisco Museum of Modern Art. "Matthew Barney on the origins of "DRAWING RESTRAINT"." YouTube. Video. May 13, 2010. October 21, 2011.
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=83WTxmkye04>

- San Francisco Museum of Modern Art. "Matthew Barney discusses his influences." YouTube. Video. October 12, 2011. October 21, 2011.
http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pjBOTS7xTg8&feature=list_related&playnext=1&list=SP50A6BF39DB04E9
- Smith, Maquard. "The Vulnerable Articulate: James Gillingham, Aimee Mullins, and Matthew Barney," The Prosthetic Impulse: From a Posthuman Present to a Biocultural Future. Eds. Marquard Smith and Joanne Morra. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2006. 43-72.
- Sobchack, Vivian. "A Leg to Stand On: Prosthetics, Metaphor, and Materiality," The Prosthetic Impulse: From a Posthuman Present to a Biocultural Future. Eds. Marquard Smith and Joanne Morra. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2006. 17-42.
- . "Real Phantoms/Phantom Realities: On the Phenomenology of Bodily Imagination." *Journal of Neuro-Aesthetic Theory* Phantom Limb (2004): n. pag. Web. 17 Jan. 2012
<http://www.artbrain.org/real-phantomsphantom-realities-on-the-phenomenology-of-bodily-imagination/>
- Stelarc. Stelarc. Personal Website, Stelarc. 2011. October 20, 2011.
<http://stelarc.org/>
- Zweite, Armin et al. Rebecca Horn: Bodylandscapes, Drawings, Sculptures, Installations 1964-2004. Hayward Gallery, London, 2005.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Athanasiou, Athena. "Technologies of Humanness, Aporias of Biopolitics, and the Cut Body of Humanity." *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies* 14.1 (2003): 125-162.
- Augaitis, Diana et al. "For the Record: Drawing Contemporary Life." For the Record: Drawing Contemporary Life. Vancouver Art Gallery, 2002. 11-22.
- Barney, Matthew. Drawing Restraint. Personal Website, Matthew Barney. 2006. October 20, 2011.
<http://www.drawingrestraint.net/>
- Baron, Denis. The Mutant Flesh: Fabrication of a Posthuman. Paris: Éditions Dis Voir, 2009.
- Baudrillard, Jean. The Transparency of Evil. Verso Press, 2009.
- . Passwords. 2nd Ed. Verso Press, 2010.
- Benjamin, Walter. The Work of Art in the Age of its Technological Reproducibility, and Other Writings on Media. Eds. Brigid Doherty, Michael Jennings and Thomas Levin. Trans. Edmund Jephcott. Harvard UP: 2008.
- Bois, Yves-Alain. "To Introduce a User's Guide." *October* 78 (1996): 21-37. Web.
- Braidotti, Rosi. Metamorphoses: Towards a Materialist Theory of Becoming. Cambridge: Polity, 2002.
- . "Posthuman, All Too Human: Towards a New Process Ontology." *Theory, Culture & Society* 23.7-8 (2006): 197-208. Web.
- Caygill, Howard. "Stelarc and the Chimera: Kant's Critique of Prosthetic Judgment," *Art Journal* (Aesthetics and the Body Politic) 56.1 (1997): 46-51. Print.
- Codrescu, Andrei. The Posthuman Dada Guide: Tzara and Lenin Play Chess. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2009.
- Demos, T. J. "Duchamp's Labyrinth: "First Papers of Surrealism, 1942." *October* 97 (2001): 91-119. Print.
- Descartes, René. "Animals are Machines." In *Environmental Ethics: Divergence and Convergence*, eds. S.J. Armstrong and R.G. Botzler (New York: McGraw-Hill), 1993, 281-285. Print.

- De Zegher, Catherine. "A Century under the Sign of Line: Drawing and Its Extension (1910-2010)." On Line: Drawing through the Twentieth Century. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2011. 21-124.
- Falconer, Morgan. "Suffering for her art," *Art Review* 3.5 (2005): Print.
- Fernandez, Maria. "The Body Is More than Flesh," *Art Journal* 65.3 (2006): 120-122. Print.
- Foster, Hal. "Obscene, Abject, Traumatic." *October* 78.Autumn (1996): 106-124. Print.
- . Prosthetic Gods. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2004.
- Grosz, Elizabeth. "Naked," The Prosthetic Impulse: From a Posthuman Present to a Biocultural Future. Eds. Marquard Smith and Joanne Morra. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2006. 187-202.
- Halberstam, Judith. "Automating Gender: Postmodern Feminism in the Age of the Intelligent Machine." *Feminist Studies* 17.3 (1991): 439-460. Print.
- Hall, Gary. "Para-site," The Cyborg Experiments: The Extensions of the Body in the Media Age. Ed. Joanna Zylińska. London and New York: Continuum, 2002. 139-140.
- Haraway, Donna. "A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and Socialist-Feminism in the Late Twentieth Century." Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature. New York: Routledge, 1991. 149-181. Print.
- Huyssen, Andreas. After the Great Divide: Modernism, Mass Culture, Postmodernism. Bloomington, Ind: Indiana UP, 1986.
- Jain, Sarah S. "The Prosthetic Imagination: Enabling and Disabling the Prosthesis Trope." *Science, Technology, & Human Values* 24 (1999): 31-54.
- Jones, Amelia. Irrational Modernism: A Neurasthenic History of New York Dada. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2004.
- . Self/Images: Technology, Representation and the Contemporary Subject. New York: Routledge, 2006.
- Jones, Amelia et al. "The Body and Technology." *Art Journal* 60.1 (2001): 20-39. Print.
- Joselit, David et al. "Biocollage." *Art Journal* 59.3 (2000): 44-63. Print.
- Krauss, Rosalind. "'Informe' without Conclusion." *October* 78 (1996): 89-105. Print.

- Kristeva, Julia. Powers of Horror: An Essay on Abjection. Trans. Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press, 1982.
- Lillington, David, Ian Monroe and Sally O'Reilly. Collage: Assembling Contemporary Art. Ed., Blanche Craig. London: Black Dog Publishing, 2008.
- McLuhan, Marshall. Understanding Media: The Extension of Man. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1994.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. Phenomenology of Perception. New York and London: Routledge, 2008.
- Nochlin, Linda. The Body in Pieces: The Fragment as a Metaphor of Modernity. Thames & Hudson, 2001. Print.
- Poggi, Christine. In Defiance of Painting: Cubism, Futurism and the Invention of Collage. London: Yale UP, 1992.
- San Francisco Museum of Modern Art. "Matthew Barney on the origins of "DRAWING RESTRAINT"." YouTube. Video. May 13, 2010. October 21, 2011. <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=83WTxmkye04>
- San Francisco Museum of Modern Art. "Matthew Barney discusses his influences." YouTube. Video. October 12, 2011. October 21, 2011. http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pjBOTS7xTg8&feature=list_related&playnext=1&list=SP50A6BFCB39DB04E9
- Seltzer, Mark. "Wound Culture: Trauma in the Pathological Public Sphere." *October* 80 (1997): 3-26. Print.
- Smith, Maquard. "The Vulnerable Articulate: James Gillingham, Aimee Mullins, and Matthew Barney," The Prosthetic Impulse: From a Posthuman Present to a Biocultural Future. Eds. Marquard Smith and Joanne Morra. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2006. 43-72.
- Sobchack, Vivian. "A Leg to Stand On: Prosthetics, Metaphor, and Materiality," The Prosthetic Impulse: From a Posthuman Present to a Biocultural Future. Eds. Marquard Smith and Joanne Morra. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2006. 17-42.
- Stelarc. Stelarc. Personal Website, Stelarc. 2011. October 20, 2011. <http://stelarc.org/>
- Royle, Nicholas. The Uncanny. Routledge, 2003. Print.
- Thacker, Eugene. "Data Made Flesh: Biotechnology and the Discourse of the Posthuman." *Cultural Critique* 53 (2003): 72-97. Print.