

**The interpretation of a transcript of—
a spoken observation of— a thirty-minute video recording
of— a drawing conducted as artistic research**

Sections six, twelve and thirteen of a thirteen-section transcript of a spoken monologue later applied to a thirty-minute silent video recording of the development of the second layer of a drawing:

6



00: 06: 02 – 00: 07: 19 / 27: 37

I'm, I'm picking *up*, from where, he's left off, with black ink. Looks like a, a fold on the looks like the, *the* folds since I've moved to a second one, of *the*. . . cardboard projections. Okay I've moved on now to an actual, projection. Up and up. . . to. . . the tab. . . . Again cardboard projection down, down down, below view. It's still me. I'm working with, Indian ink, Chinese ink sorry, Chinese ink rather than Indian ink, Chinese ink, um, a flat brush, and, Dermagraph pencil, pencils designed for drawing on glass, and plastic. In this case *the*, drawing surface is white laminated cardboard. You can see where it picks up *the* reflection of the window.

“Here I take up the drawing again from where you leave off, but I guess you'll be interested in how deferential I am to the projections and how they also determine the movement of the ink, through which they exert their characteristic behaviour, the shine of the cardboard interacting with the window. I *am* more the viewer/reader than the artist, even as I cite myself within the work.”

“Yes, it’s not so much either/or you or the work as a distancing, a withdrawing of yourself *into*, rather than from the work to know yourself better. Having viewed the video of the drawing process to comment on it, you – we both – in reading your monologue as text are on much the same footing as any reader. The text, and the drawing cited in and *as* the text, give to us and position us. It’s the cardboard projections that, themselves, “come down”, and the cardboard that “picks up” the light itself – across continents too! ‘Dermatograph’ is also used by surgeons to mark the skin for prospective incisions. In this sense, where you refer to “glass” is like being exposed by the text. You’re *in there*, you see, the better to know yourself from the vantage of being able to gaze back.”

12



00: 13: 04 – 00: 14: 42 / 27: 37

The things that you can't see *the*, cardboard joins inside *the*, plastic shield, are actually, almost the most obvious things to me. . . .

Whether they're obvious, most obvious to *him*, we don't yet know, unless or until, we can see what's below the frame. . . . You might notice or you might have noticed already that, what's *below* the frame, is actually a clear plastic overlay, the same material exactly the same material, the same thickness, as *the* face shield. This plastic, overlay, which is-- covers perhaps a quarter of *the*, of the drawing, from the base upwards. . . should, more or less define, *the*-- I was gonna say *the*. . . the tabs as they attach to the inside of *the*, face shield. They, they, do they are, mainly-- the plastic overlay is mostly *about* those tabs, but as I, as I, look upwards, towards the centre and top of the drawing, the tabs actually

move with me, and I integrate them into my section of the drawing, which is, most of the drawing.

“Here I’m addressing the viewer while talking of me, and you. I’m concerned with the plastic layer below the frame and if I, and the viewer, can work out from the glimpses we have of that layer whether you were also aware of the cardboard joins of the projections inside the shield. Actually, the plastic layer was supposed to be the main area of positioning of the joins, therefore pulling them forward from the rest of the drawing, but it’s not worked out as I expected. Of course, this sort of consideration is not new in the monologue. I repeat the issues in a similar manner to how the drawing iterates, reiterates, indexes and traces the same territory.”

“In this respect I’m in collusion with the camera against you and the viewer. We’ve already mentioned the authority of the camera, what it gives you of which you cannot be totally aware until after the recording. I’m like that in the drawing. You mostly cannot see the extent of my contribution until after the drawing event.”

13



00: 14: 47 – 00: 16: 03 / 27: 37

This section is *the* plastic overlay, for which reason, he needs to work with oil paint. . . . What happens is that, the glove picks up the oil paint, and, I inherit, the medium as a, as a, kind of aggravation; it aggravates what I’m doing. I’m not exactly trying, *not* to allow it to smear the drawing, um, but still it’s-um, it’s an unwanted, material element, and of course it’s everything for *him*. He can’t, operate without it-- Down down, down, I’m at *the*, beginning of the, plastic overlay. . . . He may at this point be working on there with oil paint. . . . Yes, he’s working with oil

paint very *finely* with a finger. He's trying to, draw *the* projection of cardboard-- a projection of cardboard, it seems to me.

“Interesting here, that I refer to the medium of oil paint as *aggravating*. I do prefer drawing these days, I think because of the latter’s relatively less obligation towards form and completion suiting my need of the open-ended.”

“But more precisely interpreted, you start by stating that it’s my need that determines the choice of oil paint as a medium, then suggest that I as a combination of the glove and the oil paint behave autonomously. Then you somewhat reinstate me as also trying to draw, but with paint, and as a hollow figure, a mere projection of cardboard, at your behest – ‘it seems to me’, you say.”

“At this point, where you suggest that we embroil, we could stop. While we’ve not reached the end of the transcript, we’ve covered most of its content.”