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There is a famous fight in art history about how objects should relate to each other. In his polemic “Art and Objecthood” (1967), Michael Fried lambasts the artists we now associate with Minimalism for their inability to cultivate “presence” in their objects; and by presence he means an autonomy generated by discreteness, self-containment, and self-reference. One could argue that held within this idea of presence is an individualism that carries the seeds of competition with other objects. Fried identifies proto-Minimalists as a “perversion” of art transmogrified into theatre for its acknowledgement of context, dependency on audience, and relationship to similar objects that consolidate and multiply an effect in space and time (Puleo 1).

This project [that is, my thesis work and this associated script] looks at objects and their relationship to other objects, really objects as friends. In particular, Giorgio Agamben’s 2007 “The Friend” has set a framework for the ontological and political nature of friendship. Further, Michel Foucault’s “Friendship as way of Life” queers this relationship, providing a look at homosexuality as not a form of desire but as something desirable.

What does it mean for objects to come together but maintain a degree of independence, for each work to be a singular entity in its own right but share space with its companion works, and to be an object that is interconnected and non-hierarchical without being reliant or serial?

The notion of queer friendship – and perhaps two queer artists, Roni Horn and Felix Gonzalez-Torres, and the pairing of their work, can serve as a model – asks essential questions about relationships among and between subjects and objects, particularly in thinking about the phenomenological (a term strongly associated with Minimalism) and ideas of the body in constructing identity. An other, alternative, and non-perverted space is created through the
consideration of context (material connotations and the political environment), audience (when considering the queer phenomenological), and each object’s relationship to the other.

In thinking about queer friendship, the phenomenological, material possibilities, and subject and object relationships, essential tenets of my work, I would be remiss not to mention *Paired, Gold* (figure 1), the 2010 New York City Guggenheim exhibition that brought together Felix Gonzalez-Torres’ “*Untitled* (Golden)*” (figure 2) and Roni Horn’s *Gold Field* (figure 3). The pairing of these two artists and their corresponding works represents an aesthetic dialogue between Gonzalez-Torres and Horn as embodied in an exchange of gold (a color, signifier, and faux-finish I employ in my own work), a reciprocal gift between the two artists that resonates with the poetry of their respective projects. Gonzalez-Torres, in 1990,

visited Horn’s solo exhibition at the Museum of Contemporary Art in Los Angeles, where he first encountered *Forms from the Gold Field* (1980–82) (figure 4), in which Horn compressed two pounds of pure gold into a luminous rectangular mat. After meeting Horn three years later, Gonzalez-Torres received a square of gold foil in the mail from her as a symbol of their new friendship and shared sensibilities. He was so inspired by the generosity of her gesture and the expansiveness of her subtle work that he fashioned his own “gold field” in her honor: “*Untitled* (Placebo – Landscape – for Roni)” (1993) (figure 5), an endlessly replaceable candy spill of gold cellophane-wrapped sweets (Spector 1).

Building upon this friendship, the Guggenheim’s *Paired, Gold*, full of elegiac grace, highlights how a friendship of rare intensity can reflect the “emotive possibilities of form” (Spector 1). Experienced together,

Horn’s *Gold Field* (1980–82) and Gonzalez-Torres’s “*Untitled* (Golden), reflect on the artists’ respect for the evocative potential of minimal form and the

symbolic valence of pure color. The fragile beauty of the works suspends commonplace meanings attached to gold as a source of wealth and extravagance, inviting instead a kind of poetic reverie on its materiality and symbolic resonance (Spector 2).

This “symbolic resonance” extends beyond material relationships found between *Gold Field* (1980-82) and “*Untitled* (Golden) (1995), and can be applied to each subject’s relationship to the other. Objects have been made for and then gifted to a friend. It is important, too, that both Gonzalez-Torres and Horn queer objects by challenging ordinary associations of materiality. They are, in fact, queer artists making work for one another. As such, the question of queer friendship, the importance of a queer audience, and the role of a queer phenomenological experience surface. The possibilities for a creation of an alternative space are offered through this intra-subjective (queer to queer) offering.

In “The Friend,” Agamben offers a philosophical understanding of friendship, arguing for a conception of politics as a heightened form of being-together: a relation based neither on what is shared – birth, law, place, taste – nor on appeals for recognition of the other, but on the constitutive experience of friendship itself. He first turns to Aristotle’s *Nicomachean Ethics*, reiterating Aristotle’s well-established theses

that one cannot live without friends, that it is necessary to distinguish between friendship founded on utility and on the pleasure of virtuous friendship (in which the friend is loved as such), that it is not possible to have many friends, [and] that friendship at a distance tends to result in oblivion (Agamben 26).

Friendship rests between the shared and the accepted, and can be understood as being fairly divided without being quantifiable. Because friendship sits in a more qualitative realm and is understood
best through this intra-subjective offering, it is something that challenges traditional notions of exchange value. Illustratively, through friendship, gold can potentially exceed its market value, allowing for a new value through a friendship system of exchange.

In thinking about the possibilities offered through friendship, Foucault, in his interview 1981 “Friendship as a Way of Life,” looks at “what relationships, through homosexuality, can be established, invented, multiplied, and modulated” (Foucault 135). What he makes most urgent is the need to use one’s sexuality to “arrive at a multiplicity of relationships,” suggesting that “homosexuality is not a form of desire but something desirable” (Foucault 136). He asks for the celebration of “what it means to be ‘naked’ among men, outside of institutional relations, family, profession, and obligatory camaraderie” and uses the notion of friendship as the vehicle by which to arrive at this point (Foucault 138). And it is through this queer notion of friendship that an escape from “the two readymade formulas of [1] pure sexual encounter and [2] lovers’ fusion of identities” can be established (Foucault 140). A space between these two poles is called for.

Foucault is thinking about the traditional gendered male to male homosexual relationship, arguing for the “historic occasion to reopen affective and relational virtualities not so much through the intrinsic qualities of the homosexual but because of the ‘slantwise’ position of the latter, as it were, the diagonal lines he [the homosexual] can lay out in the social fabric that allow these virtualities to come to light” (Foucault 140). So, it is the phenomenological, or a subjective experience, that allows for this relational moment to exist.

Through the lens of friendship, Agamben expands the nature of being, becoming, existence, and reality:

Inherent in this perception of existing is another perception, specifically human, which takes the form of a concurrent perception of the friend’s existence. Friendship is the instance of this concurrent perception of the friend’s existence in the awareness of one’s own existence. But this means that friendship also has an ontological and, at the same time, a political dimension. The perception of existing is, in fact, always already divided up and shared or con-divided. Friendship names this sharing or con-division. There is no trace here of any inter-subjectivity—that chimera of the moderns—nor of any relation between subjects: rather, existing itself is divided, it is non-identical to itself: the I and the friend are the two faces—or the two poles—of this con-division (Agamben 28).
Enter the bath first; you must wash your dirty asshole, as you shat only two hours ago.

Collect your body in the Silver Pond.

Stage 1: Silver Pond*
(see Diagram X)

Self: The water is too hot.

Friend: Boil away.

[As Self steps in to t(h)(e)(r)(s) bath, a sound gives way through mirrored ceiling pieces that have fallen to the floor. Where is Chicken Licken’s sky? Has it been displaced, reoriented, and/or relocated? It sparkles, shines, radiates, and refracts. The lighting grid has become the dance floor. Crack. Snap. Pop.]

Self: [Pausing, looking down] When am I?

Friend: The bath will dirty you up right away. Strip. Let the materiality of this precious plastic embalm you. A cleanse from internal to external. Restless self, rest Self.

Self: But the shards are too prickly. I don’t want them to penetrate my façade.

Friend: Oh, dear Self, take on this cleaning process. Your clit-penis will be just fine -- it won’t get pricked, I promise.

[Self begins to clean and then pauses]

Friend: What do you need to spit out? Gargle, dear.

[Self inserts enema applicator into t(h)(e)(r)(s) starfish]

[Self as if self-aware of years of regret, repression, and solitude, embraces this cleansing, and inserts the applicator deeper and deeper. Self’s innards expand in spatial and temporal directions that avoid immediate location. And without indication or announcement, a giant waterfall explodes out of Self’s asshole that anoints Self with the Silver Pond.]
[The two, if ever to be understood as different entities, are now one. The feces water sparkles as it now inextricably merges with the Silver Pond. The sense of Self is forever fractured and infinitely clean.]

*The possibilities offered through the Silver Pond, part dance floor, part bath, are varied. Its ancestry can be traced to the same post-A.I.D.S. disco ball that adorns the cover of Martin Kippenberger’s LA MOCA retrospective catalog (published circa 2010). The Silver Pond has roots elsewhere, as well: the organization of silver on the floor is a twice-removed sister of Her majesty Felix Gonzalez-Torres. The body, its relation to material, the notion of abstraction (specifically related to queerness), and the phenomenological are key tenets of this work. What does it mean to step into this space? Key questions emerge, including: What is queer abstraction? And, what’s queer abstraction’s relationship to materiality and notions of the body?

Often artwork is described as queer when it depicts seemingly LGBT subjects or figures, is produced by a self-identified LGBT person, or references gay culture through specific motifs, references, or aesthetics. R.E.H. Gordon calls this the glitter problem. Or the leather problem. Or the pink yarn, 70’s craft, iconic diva, glory-hole, pre-AIDS sexuality, post-AIDS sexuality, bodies and body parts, blood and bodily fluids problem (Hall 1).

Representational art runs the risk of a one to one relationship, where what’s depicted becomes an immediate stand in for the thing it is trying to depict. There is a potential for a quick read that leaves little room for negotiation or interpretation, suggesting a straightforward coding of a topic that is inherently much more complex. So, by moving to abstracted forms, more room for interpretation is allowed, at least superficially.

Daniel Luedke, in a *Lifestyle Plus Form Bundle*, an exhibition at Biege Space (Memphis, Tennessee) in 2012 of screen printed multiples, asks the question of queer abstraction:

Can we make a political interpretation of non-representation? If formalism entails pure visual exploration devoid of context or content, is a feminist / queer formalism possible? OR without dicks, vaginas, menstrual blood, references, to Jean Genet, cum, anuses, bondage, surgery scars, reclaimed pronouns, reclamation of the male/female gaze, sidelong glances at Woman’s Work (Womyn’s Werq), etc., HOW DO WE KNOW IT’S FEMINIST/QUEER (Luedke 1)?

A queer phenomenological supposition is certainly one way to suggest this evocation. With sculpture and performance, the body is activated and questions related to role of gender and sexuality can become apparent. What are the ways in which the non-figurative suggest queer performativity in mediums? And, what acts carry the weight of resistance against the enforcement of the normal and supposed natural?

* * * * * * * * * *
[ (S)(t)(he)(y) step out of the pond towards a self-contained beacon that introduces a path forward.

Self's mouth becomes the light anus.

Where is William Burrough's *Naked Lunch* screaming asshole?]

---

**Stage 2: Solar Anus**
(see Diagram X)

["It's not a lamp, but a 'lamp', after Sontag***]

Self [to Self]: What light is light, if not to help dry me from my bath?

[(S)(t)(he)(y) realize that the heat from the solar anus has been defused. Looking into the sun no longer blinds (the)(i)(m)]

[Upon this realization (s)(t)(he)(y) come to understand that (s)(t)(he)(y) were never wet or soiled, only covered in pre-coital feces.]

[Over time the glare of light, though dim at first, becomes overwhelming and begins to burn (t)(h)(e)(i)(r)(s) face. To move forward, Self puts on a protective mask – had Self been more experienced navigating spaces like this (like many others who had traveled through here repeatedly… searching), the glare would have seemed less formidable. Dare those (dis)continuous (w)holes.]

Self [to Solar Anus]: Yes, dare you!

---

**Solar Anus**: “The Solar Anus” is a short Surrealist text by the French writer Georges Bataille, written in 1927. Albeit elliptically, its aphorisms refer to decay, death, vegetation, natural disasters, impotence, frustration, ennui and excrement. It makes ironic reference to the sun, which, although it brings life to the Earth, can also result in death from its unrestrained energies. Moreover, the anus may be seen as a symbol of the inevitability of residual waste due to its role in excretion (Wikipedia 1).

Sexuality is only one form of relation, after all.

***Sontag: Activating an environment and creating a participatory experience-based space, a tactic I hope to employ with this project, has roots in Minimalism. For the Minimalists to take on this new space was an outright affront to the celebrated medium (painting)
and convention of the 1960s, offering a critique or parody of objecthood, and emphasizes a shift from artist (maker) to visitor. This act of celebrating an other space is akin to camp, an essential operant in my work.

Susan Sontag’s essay “Notes on Camp” in 1964 provides an early basis for camp’s position within the aesthetics of art-making. Sontag’s notion of camp proposes that all identities are roles, which are echoed by Sontag’s remarks that Camp sees everything in quotation marks. It’s not a lamp, but a ‘lamp’; not a woman, but a ‘woman.’ To perceive camp in objects and people is to understand Being-as-Playing-a-Role. It is the farther extension, in sensibility, of the metaphor of life as theater (Sontag 53).

David Halperin, in Why Are All the Drag Queens Laughing, points out that Sontag’s read of camp ignores the politics that her position is actually supporting and may be “overplaying the insincerity in camp,” as these objects can possess a genuine love and an impassioned belief in their power for a queer community (Halperin 1). The employment of camp is far from an easy trick and actually needs to be understood for its potential to achieve subversive action. Sontag’s 1964 reading would suggest that “Camp is disengaged, depoliticized—or at least apolitical” (Sontag 55). Sontag sees style being promoted over content, her main motive for suggesting camp’s apolitical stance. It is clear that the queer victory of style over content makes her nervous, and it should. Sontag recognizes that “the whole point of Camp is to dethrone the serious,” but fails to recognize the politics of style (Sontag 56). A universalist gender hierarchy certainly in the 1960s — as it does now — associates the frivolousness of style with femininity. Calling into question the social order of dress is an outright challenge to conventions and power dynamics.

A reversal of conventions associated with content — if style is read to be feminine, content can be seen as masculine (or concerns with reality and their true content of things) — is exactly what camp does. As Richard Dyer notes, camp is “a way of pushing the form of someone away from its content, of reveling in the style while dismissing the content as trivial” (Dyer 3). A stereotype of gay men’s culture would place this lispy, effeminate, and limp-wristed man solidly in hairdressing, interior design, and musicals (or half-baked performative script writing). These professions are style for style’s sake from many accounts and do not rely on “serious” content — they do not have any practical use. And, for Sontag, this notion of reprising form from content and thereby converting “the serious into the trivial” is a “grave matter” (Sontag 58). Sontag’s concerns associated with dethroning the seriousness is appropriate and necessary, especially when such seriousness stands to lose its power over the trivial (when style’s preeminence is stated over content). This ironic distance from "the ethical-political value of seriousness" to which Sontag so intently holds on to allows “camp to pose a fundamental political challenge to what passes for politics” (Halperin 2). Camp’s political function performs through its very apolitical nature.

Identities become theatrical, or put on, as opposed to inherent fixtures of our bodies through this queer perspective that reveals “Being” to be a performance of being, or as “Being-as-Playing-a-Role" (Sontag 59). Halperin sees the vitality in this subversion:

By refusing to accept social identities as natural kinds of being, as objective descriptions of who you are, and by exposing them, instead, as performative roles, and as inauthentic, stigmatized groups achieve some leverage against the disqualification attached those identities (Halperin 4).

Camp, through its self-employed comic distancing, debunks any notion of authentic nature. These quotation marks that camp sees everything in allow for distance between self and “your” self, a necessary gap between identity and essence and actor and role. There is agency then in accepting and owning the stigma of homosexuality, and camp becomes a tactic for overcoming any degrading characterizations associated with homosexuality. Those
who embrace it also refuse to recognize homosexuality as the truth of their being, "when they decline to see themselves as totally, definitely, irrevocably described by it" (Halperin 5). Converting necessary and serious social meanings into trivial ones is not only an aesthetic practice then, it can also be the foundation of the political strategy of social contestation and defiance.

To prompt a subverted reading of an object or material – against the style of its intended use, the hallmark of camp, is a queer tactic. In fact, willfully using something wrong has been done by many as a tactic of allegorizing normativity’s disavowal of its own partiality. In this vein, it is important to remember that camp is never just about fun. It values the devalued, and its energy comes from its rejection of commonly accepted worth. For this reason, the object or image appropriated as camp becomes a site for interrogation of the ways in which cultural and comic value are assigned (Doyle & Getsy 62).

Stage 3: Gold Bodies (and Wall Drawing(s))
(see Diagram X)

[Now with the possibility of multi-dimensional sight (now that Self is masked), a shadow**** from the golden body, or rather, lack of body, points Self’s attention to the walls (a Wall Drawing appears)]

Self: How do I locate***** you?

Friend: Orient yourself through physical participation: touch to see.

[Greetings dance ensues for a while; communication is offered through participation.]

****Shadow: A place of refugitivity, sitting next to but not entirely within a (semi-permanent) environment. A suggestion of a thing, or the thing’s phantom.

*****Locate: Where, what, and how is the body the body (if not for markers for orientation)? How does Self anticipate the world if not through physical participation (hence the focus on hands, feet, and assholes)? The phenomenological is essential for understanding this reorientation of the body. Here, I am interested in what it means to locate the body, particularly if Gold Bodies have been made of faux-bronze (gold spray-painted hydrocal).

Judith Butler, in Gender Trouble, offers a materialist account of gender, distinguishing between gender and sex. She argues for the distinction between the physicality of bodies and the immaterial realm of ideas about bodies through

a return to the notion of matter itself, to retuning the very terms with which we understand bodies as gendered. Matter must lose its status as a priori and unconstructed surface on which gender is applied, in lieu of an examination of the ways in which the materiality and materialization of sex operates. There are not bodies first and then ideas about
bodies – bodies are always ideas about bodies (Butler 52).

*Gold Bodies* are a twin to the bronze body, especially if hydrocal is understood to be an early step in the process of making a bronze sculpture. Materiality can have significant meaning, if only thinking of Butler’s suggestion of the separation of object from matter or body from gender (or body from sexuality).

Conflating façade with ideas of bodies is a major operant in this work: the performance of gender has a relationship to façade, especially if gender cannot be located within the physical body. My interest in the decorative and ornamental material is rooted in the possibilities offered through the façade and the politics inherent in camp.

[Hands and feet ground Self (through the tactile).

* Solar Anus continues to guide Self, and Self comes upon a Lamppost.]

* * * * * * * * *
Stage 4: Lamppost
(see Diagram X)

(Lamppost) ****

[Light has faded away and Self is confronted with a tall, lengthy being. A sense of the far is near.]

Self [to Lamppost]: Can you help me locate the beyond?

Lamppost: When are you?

Self: I-I hardly know just at the present – at least I know who I was an hour ago, but I think I have changed several times since then.

Lamppost: What do you mean by that? Can you explain yourself?

Self: I cannot explain myself because I am not myself, you see.

Lamppost: I don't see.

Self: I'm sorry, but I cannot put it more clearly than that, for I cannot understand it more clearly myself – being so dislocated so many times in one day(?) is very disorienting.

Lamppost: Is it?

Self: Well, perhaps you haven't found it to be, but I cannot understand where I am, let alone when I am. Don't you think it a bit queer that you can easily locate yourself? Or can you?

Lamppost: I know exactly when I am. When are you? Take a look-see, won't you? Perhaps that will help locate you.

[Lamppost gestures towards its (w)hole.]

Self: Why?

Lamppost: So you think you've changed?

Self: I'm afraid I've been in the same place for at least a few minutes(?), though perhaps I've been constantly changing?

Lamppost: You'll get used to it in time. What do you want to be?

Self: I'm trying to (dis)locate…

[Self approaches Lampposts' (w)hole]

Lamppost: One side will take you forward, the other will take you farther.

[Self peers through the Lamppost portal]

Self: I see.

*****The Lamppost takes on a mode of image making quite literally by co-opting the lens by which we see. When peering through the (w)hole, the image that is presented is inverted. Sky becomes ground and ground, sky. I am interested in making literal the inverted retinal image, using the bodies’ intra-workings to dis/re-orient the bodies’ relationship to space.
Eye becomes anus. What kind of asshole is Self? And what does Self's asshole say about Self? Is Self anal retentive? As early as the Old Babylonian hymns, the anus has been recognized as a transposable body portal (Assante 33). So, where will Self be transported? And eye becomes wallpaper, the marker of another interior space (what does it mean to look into another space?). Anus becomes eye.

This notion of a queer phenomenological experience (Self to Lamppost) has been essential to my art. With this in mind, perhaps an exploration of the term queer is necessary, at least dimensionally, particularly in thinking about Lamppost's ability to alter positionality and potentially time and space. Queer, as a spatial term, comes from the Indo-European word twist. When sexualized, queer becomes a stand-in for a "twisted sexuality that does not follow a straight line"; rather, queer can be seen as crooked or bent, or, perhaps, as an alternative perspective (Merleau-Ponty). Maurice Merleau-Ponty in Phenomenology of Perception offers a reading on the topic:

If we so contrive it that a subject sees the room in which he is, only through a mirror which reflects it at an angle at forty-five degrees to the vertical, the subject at first sees the room slantwise. A man walking about in it seems to lean to one side as he goes. A piece of cardboard falling down the door-frame looks to be falling obliquely. The general effect is queer (Merleau-Ponty 27).

Merleau-Ponty asks how the subject's relation to space is challenged when considering a series of spatial experiments. In particular, these experiments point to the notion of seeing "straight" – the role of verticality – and the relationship between body and space. The purposefulness of the body guides this relationship and shapes a field of action. The queer moment – when the vertical axis seems out of line and the objects appear slantwise blocks bodily action, inhibiting the body from extending into phenomenal space – is eventually "straightened" by the body.

Reflecting on sexuality, Merleau-Ponty suggests sexuality and the body cannot be separated. He sees them as domains that are non-distinct: "insofar as a man's sexual history provides a key to life, it is because in his sexuality is his projected manner of being toward the world, that is, toward time and other men" (Merleau-Ponty 35). Here, the sexual body is one that shows the orientation of the body as an "object that is sensitive to all the rest" (Merleau-Ponty 41). There are number of critics, including Judith Butler, who object to Merleau-Ponty's universal orientation of general presumptions about the body's relationship towards the world. While acknowledging this danger of overgeneralization and universalism, Merleau-Ponty's sensitive body could be made queer, or rather, it could be suggested that the body is already queer in its sensitivities to the rest.

Can Merleau-Ponty's model of sexuality as form show how orientations exceed the objects they are directed toward, becoming ways of inhabiting and coexisting in the world? Sara Ahmed in Queer Phenomenology: Orientations, Objects, Others acutely offers:

If we presume that sexuality is crucial to bodily orientation, to how we inhabit spaces, then the difference between how we are oriented sexually is not only a matter of which objects we are oriented toward, but also how we extend through our bodies into the world (Ahmed 38).

Sexuality, then, involves differences in one's relation to the world – how one is directed towards or faces the world – and is not set by object choice alone. And, an orientation toward (sexual) objects can affect a number of experiences, such that different ways of directing one's desires (or one's orientation) means occupying a different space or a different world.

* * * * * * * * *
Stage 5: Eye Wallpaper + Wall Mount Ponytail: captured inside and looking further forward******
(see Diagram X)

[Eye Wallpaper comes from enabled viewing through Lamppost. Wall Mount Ponytail is reflected in Silver Pond; its reflection is slowly undulating. Eye Wallpaper looks back at Lamppost eye, and Self is relocated to the Silver Pond.]

[Step & Repeat.]

*******Like Robert Morris, who, while working in the Minimalist tradition, “drew attention to the idea that the vacant space between the otherwise separate sculptures belongs to the viewer” (Rorimer 68), I am interested in making work that can be celebrated as a “function of space, light, and the viewer’s field of vision” (Morris 228). All of which helps to activate space so that “one is more aware than before that one’s self is establishing relationships as [(s)(t)(h)e](y)] apprehends the object from various positions and under varying conditions of light and spatial context” (Morris 230).

Meaning, friendship, queerness, materiality, and otherness is found

in and outside the object,

through calling upon the body for (full and/or partial) activation,

and by navigating these partial-room/semi-stages/discrete-spaces.

* * * * * * * * *
Figures

Figure 1: *Paired, Gold* installation images, Guggenheim 2010

Figure 2: Felix Gonzalez-Torres, “*Untitled*” (*Golden*), 1995

Figure 3: Roni Horn, *Gold Field*, 1980-2
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Figure 5: Felix Gonzalez-Torres, “Untitled (Placebo – Landscape – for Roni), 1993
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[S discrete stages connected by light.

Enter the bath first; you must wash your dirty asshole, as you only shit two hours ago.

Collect your body in the Silver Pond.]