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ABSTRACT:

Drawing has consistently been the point of departure in all my research – be it practical or theoretical. Through various breaks and re-routes in my practical work, my conception of drawing has developed into a visual and spatial way of thinking. Hence, taking cue from the practical component, the text opens with an investigation into the aspects of drawing that has proven influential to my process. The dissertation traces a route parallel to the tendencies, developments and departures of my practical body of work.

The thesis maps theories of drawing and connects it to notions of memory, narrative and travel by way of the texts of Martin Heidegger, Jacques Derrida, Jean-Francois Lyotard, Walter Bejamin and Gilles Deleuze. The text indicates that in the context of my research drawing becomes a flânerie - a way of participating in and of responding to contemporary urban spaces. By referencing texts of key thinkers on space and place, the thesis concludes by positioning drawing as a situated practice that indicates (potential) ways of being-in-the-world.

KEYWORDS:

Being-in-the-world, drawing, flânerie, gesture, language, line, mark, horizon, inscription, journey, naming, path, pathmarks, place, presence, space, trace, urban, wandering, writing.
ABSTRAK:

Teken – op teoreties sowel as op praktiese vlak – was deurgaans die afstappunt van my navorsing. Deur verskeie onderbrekings en koersaanpassings in my praktiese werk het my begrip van teken ontwikkel tot 'n visuele en ruimtelike denkwyse. Die teks open met 'n ondersoek van tekenaspekte wat my praktiese proses beïnvloed het. Die praktiese komponent is dus aan die stuur van sake en die verhandeling teken 'n roete van neigings, ontwikkelings en afstappunte in my praktiese werk na.

Die tesis karteer teorieë rondom teken en verbind dit met begrippe rondom herinnering, narratief en reis deur middel van die tekste van Martin Heidegger, Jacques Derrida, Jean-Francois Lyotard, Walter Benjamin en Gilles Deleuze. Die teks dui - binne die konteks van my navorsing - daarop dat teken 'n flânerie word: 'n manier om deel te hê aan en te reageer op kontemporêre stedelike ruimtes. Deur te verwys na sleuteltekste oor ruimte en plek, sluit die tesis af met die positionering van teken as a gevestigde praktyk wat moontlikhede vir daaglikse bestaan daar stel.
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INTRODUCTION

MARKING SENSE

My research consists of visual, tactile, textual and printed components accompanied by a written text presented in this document. Throughout the document the reference to “research” refers to both the visual and the theoretical explorations of my interest in the spatial and experiential potential of drawing. This text is a re-search of my practical work through theoretical perspectives. It traces a route through tendencies, developments and departures encountered in reading theory. It connects these readings with personal and intuitive visual responses with the aim of establishing drawing’s capacity as a cultural repository which asserts the individual’s presence in contemporary urban spaces.

The research elaborates on the complex field where drawing moves between layers of intuition, thought, language and meaning and indicates the alternation between the double horizon of absence/presence, speaking/silence and space/place. The themes discussed in the text are drawn together by the central conception that drawing is above all an approach: a way of thinking. In the text writing and theory intersect with that which takes place simultaneously, silently, graphically.

Drawing is the central axis of my research which unravels the scribbles of its beginnings into a customised constellation of related concepts and ideas in which drawing becomes a metaphoric journey that interrogates and performs. Drawing is the departure, the journey and the object; both process and product. Drawing on paper makes up a significant amount of my output along with objects, installations and lithography. I do not make a distinction between drawing and making objects or assembling installations. Drawing - a way of thinking visually, spatially and formally - has seeped so deeply into my practical work that it is no longer separable from the other areas of output. When I work I conceive of every gesture as a drawing in a space. Whether on paper, or by combining and shaping materials the concern remains the same: I am drawing. I draw on paper... I draw with found things... I draw with and into objects. Drawing is mark making, inscription, residue, process and product – in short, the Work.
The text starts out by positioning my research within the broader field of contemporary drawing. The first chapter explores the problematic of the proximity of drawing, writing and speaking, in order to contextualise the research. It indicates my position which alternates between that which can be articulated about drawing and that which remains unspoken and unarticulated. I argue that the tension between these poles generates a productive space in which neither the language of words nor the language of drawing takes precedence. Instead I propose that such paradoxes may be reconciled by showing that speaking/silence, action/object, and thought/intuitive response are able to co-exist in the space of drawing.

I assimilate aspects of Cornelia Butler, Tony Godfrey and Emma Dexter’s writings on drawing, specifically with regards to the notion of drawing as process. Their emphasis on the materiality of the inscription, as well as the fundamental temporality of the gesture particularly influences my perspective. I lean heavily on Martin Heidegger’s notion of being-in-the-world and his conception of the artwork as “rift” in this regard. I pay specific attention to the notions of drawing as process and as finished product as well as the problematic of the proximity of drawing and language with the intention to set the stage for the second chapter.
Chapter two extends drawing beyond the limits of the page, by unravelling the complexities of the trace. I develop the conception of drawing as a way of thinking spatially by linking Heidegger’s philosophical wandering discussed in the previous chapter with Walter Benjamin’s *flâneur* and Gilles Deleuze’s nomadic thought. The notion of drawing as inscription is drawn out into social and collaborative urban spaces by way of the theme of journey.

The conception of my process as a path or journey implicates the notion of horizon: One moves in a direction but the destination is always deferred. The individual artworks are dots on a line. Each completed object, lithograph or drawing acts as a pause – or pathmark in the Heideggerian sense – along the way. The text draws a path which connects these markers by assimilating various discourses on the trace. Every work implicates an intersection and an imminent departure.

These visual pathmarks and can roughly be subdivided into the following “families” of drawings that *live* in the same neighbourhood:

- The private experience in which drawing is the *diarising* of my responses to everyday events, such as conversations with people and responses to places and events.
- Drawing as a way of thinking which directs all my research – on paper or spatially in my approach to materials and their reconstitution into spatial organisations.
- Drawing as an intervention in public spaces – a way of reactivating stale places and focussing public attention on that which goes unnoticed thereby generating renewed interest and new conversations.
- There is also the much broader conversation of teaching where one brief may be interpreted in a myriad ways. This not only points out the practical and conceptual pliability of drawing, but also suggests the extent to which one drawing may be *interpreted* by various people.
The research traces a path between these markers. The thoughts connected along the journey of this text are neither futile meanderings in many directions, nor a listless flânerie: It is rather a purposeful wandering which searches the value of journey as it is realized en route. The research thereby aims to establish drawing as a productive medium through which contemporary lived spaces can be explored, recorded, rearranged in new imaginary constellations and thus ultimately a medium which can enliven depleted spaces and places and ultimately a way of exploring new possible spaces and other ways of being and of being present in the world.
CHAPTER 1

SILENT DIALOGUE

SKETCH

This chapter traces the notion of drawing as an exchange, a kind of silent dialogue. This notion provides a central problem in writing and speaking about drawing, since drawing is that part of the conversation that remains unsaid. In the following pages, I examine some recent texts on drawing, which provide the ground for my research.

I used to understand drawing as a means to explore and develop the creative and practical concerns of my artistic work. I thought of drawing as a tool which would lead to the actual artworks. Drawing was a somewhere to start. Often I did not draw at all. I wrote down what I wanted to draw instead. There was constantly a play between writing and making marks. Words, at times, became scribbles or fields, sometimes practical, sometimes arbitrary.

Often while working I realise I have been on the wrong track the whole time, but then I draw it on paper and I feel much better. Not being satisfied is a great source of inspiration for me – my ideas stem from everyday life; I like to look into coincidence (Rapia 2006:7).

I pick up a pencil. The point touches the surface of the sheet of paper. The tremors and strokes of my hand leave marks on the page: The endless permutations of marking group together into shapes, values and fields, all of which combine visually to articulate a space that has rhythm and presence. Somehow the lines, traces and smudges transform the page to a spatial entity. The page is no longer a flat object. How, if at all, do these basic elements of drawing come to be understood as meaningful spatial organizations?
Drawing, for me, springs from a tactile impulsive desire to make something dirty – to leave one’s mark – to mark one’s presence in the pristine whiteness of a page and to trace one’s passage through everyday spaces which contextualise day-to-day life.

I tend to draw because I cannot say the same thing in words. This desire is coupled with the frustration of having to write logically and eloquently about an impulse which manifests in scribbles, illogical marks, blotches and stains on pieces of paper – the frustration of having to speak about these traces which ultimately withdraw from speech – motivates my research.
The threads of language

You must be aware that words and commonly used languages are, so to speak, incommensurable among themselves, and can’t communicate the idea of a given curve... My secret lies in an image that would be easier to draw than to describe – but I can hardly draw it either, because it is not just lines and colour nor a well-known object. It does not resemble anything – that is why it is so powerful (Bourjea 1994:138).

It is when the language system overstrains itself that it begins to stutter, to murmur, or to mumble; then the entire language reaches the limit that sketches the outside and confronts silence (Deleuze 1994:28).

Figure 1

The gesture of the hand is an originating action that provides a common ground between drawing and writing. However, despite the shared origin in the gesture, one simply does not ‘read’ drawn marks in the same way one reads the words of a text. It is more difficult to rationalise what actually happens in drawing.
I tend to position drawing as an area of creative production which functions between the explicitly textual or legible and the illegible. It is my view that through drawing something of the unsayable becomes manifest and exists simultaneously with what can be said about a drawing. Thus I propose that drawing takes place in the uncomfortable space between speaking and silence.

Deleuze (1994:24-25) writes “[l]anguage quivers in all its limbs, and we discover at this point the principle of a poetic understanding of language itself: it is as if language were carving a line to stretch—both abstract and infinitely varied”. In Drawing Now Tony Godfrey (1990) registers a similar doubt as to the extent to which drawing can be likened to a language with grammar and syntax. Godfrey (1990:16) suggests “at the heart of contemporary drawing is a question about this supposed linguistic equivalence of drawing”.

Drawing as a way of thinking is certainly bound up with the problems of language. Roland Barthes (1964:10) writes

…it appears increasingly more difficult to conceive of a system of images and objects whose signifieds can exist independently of language: to perceive what a substance signifies is inevitably to fall back on the individuation of language: there is no meaning that is not designated, and the world of signifieds is none other than language.

My intention is not to renew the debate on text and image but to reference it to map out the border areas where distinctions of writing, drawing and speaking overlap in order to lead away from the interpretation of drawing through textual or semiotic analyses. I believe drawings tend to resist an easy ‘reading’. In this regard I am attracted to James Elkins argument against the tendency to interpret images as examples of visual language in his book On pictures and the words that fail them (1998). Elkins expands on Serge Tisseron’s (1994:30) assertion that “nothing proves that thought travels along in complete signifying units”.

---

1 This understanding that everything can be understood as a text was precipitated by the field of semiotics. Ferdinand de Saussure defined semiotics as the study of the function of signs within social life. Roland Barthes inverts Saussure’s definition and argues that semiology is part of a linguistic study of the signifying units of discourse (DCT 2000 5v “semiology/semiotics”). In Elements of Semiology (1964) Barthes broadens the definition to include all sign-systems, including images and gestures. The contribution of structuralist linguistics to discourse broadened the notion of the “text” and textuality to include notions like intertextuality in which everything could be established as a text in obvious or discreet relation with other texts (Reid 1994:2). In this view drawings, like all other signs, are understood as texts.
I tend to agree with Elkins’ (1998:xii) claims that images are “partly inside and partly outside” thematic, linguistic and logical structures of meaning. Elkins (1998:xi) writes that art historical literature has provided formulae for writing about images: “…everyone knows how to describe them, and how to pose and solve problems about what they mean”\(^2\). He argues that what gets lost during such explanation is the picture “as picture, as a mute collection of funny-looking smears and shapes that somehow lends itself to endless streams of eloquent historical writing” (Elkins 1998:xi). Elkins’ (1998:xii) project is to make pictures more difficult by attempting “to say what happens in this inchoate half-light between the splendor (sic) of rational representation and the darkness of non-verbal marking”.

Although I share Elkins’ sentiments in this regard, I believe precisely because we are bound by the limits of language when we speak and write drawing makes provision for an analogous space where that which passes unarticulated exists in parallel to what can be said. In this manner, the ways in which drawing is conceptualised exists in parallel with the aspect of drawing that must be experienced visually. These two modes support and inform one another reciprocally.

Julia Kristeva’s text, “Giotto’s Joy”, in Norman Bryson’s collection of essays, *Calligram* (1998) calls to attention the difficulty facing any theory that attempts to suggest an understanding of its own practice. Although Kristeva delves into Giotto’s painting in an effort to theorise painting in general, I believe her inquiry as to the nature of the relationship between language and images, are relevant to this research of drawing as well. In the essay, Kristeva draws the experience of Giotto’s painting into a theoretical paradigm. She locates this endeavour somewhere between an “immediate and subjective deciphering and a still incoherent, heteroclitic theoretical device yet to be worked out” (Kristeva 1988:28).

Kristeva’s project seeks to mediate between the intuitive solitary experience of a painting and theoretical concepts. I identify with the questions that guide her train of thought. She asks: “How can we find our way through what separates words from what is both without a name and more than a name: a painting?” (Kristeva 1988:27). Here I prefer to read ‘drawing’ into the question: How can one trace the ‘speaking thread’ back into something, a drawing, from which words are withdrawn?

---

\(^2\) I tend to resist this kind of formulaic explanatory writing about my practical research. I take my cue from Jacques Derrida’ (1987:9-13) *The truth in painting by writing around the work.*
Kristeva confirms drawing is a reality within another spatial reality. She suggests that in the space of this reality there is an ‘I’ or a number of ‘I’s speaking differently before the sign – a conversation. This articulates the central problem: how does one “insert the signs of language into the already produced reality-sign?” (Kristeva 1988:27).

Kristeva (1988:27) suggests the solution lies in finding a way through the “place where the ‘I’ speak, reason and understand from the one where something functions in addition to my speech: something more-than-speech, a meaning to which space and colour has been added”. This pinpoints a dilemma: How does one negotiate the break between linguistic conceptualisation and non-verbal sensory experience? Kristeva (1988:27) proposes a “second-stage” naming which “name an excess of names”, a “more-than-name to which space and colour has been added”. In other words, the speaking thread must be retraced back into that place (the drawing) for which words are withdrawn.

These sentiments with regard to tension between the spoken and the unspoken are articulated by artist and activist Jimmie Durham (1994:147).

When Europe invented art it realized that it had invented a monster. To keep the monster pacified Europe asked it to tell stories; to uninvent itself and become text. To say that one picture is worth a thousand words is to say that one picture is like a thousand words… I am sure art should not be visual metaphor for text, and I feel that we give text more importance than it actually carries in life. It is not the only way of meaning, nor the only intellectual way of meaning.
The question is further complicated by the longstanding deduction that drawing and writing are analogue activities. Whilst the tendency to treat drawing as text, a kind of writing, certainly is conducive to making meaning, I tend to think articulation of the visual sign (in this case the drawing) that depends on linguistic models does have its limitations: We can only say and write what we can articulate in language. Barthes (1988:178) writes of the “small tortures of language”

...one can never explain why one finds something beautiful; pleasure generates a kind of laziness of speech, and if we want to speak about a work, we have to substitute for the expression of enjoyment discourses that are indirect, more rational – hoping that the reader will feel in them the happiness given by the paintings of which we speak (Barthes 1988:178).

In my opinion this is where the drawing starts: the space where the words make contact with what they cannot say. I appropriate Kristeva’s line of questioning as a directive to proceed through the speech-less areas of drawing. I hope to indicate that it is precisely the alternation of linguistic and extra-linguistic aspects in the space of drawing, which makes drawing a productive medium.
Process / Work

Drawing requires nothing more than “[a] few drops of ink, a sheet of paper as material for the accumulation and coordination of moments and acts” (Valéry cited in Godfrey 1990:8).

When I draw I do not, and cannot, distinguish between what is imagined beforehand and between what develops through mark-making and the intuitive responses to moments. The processes alternate. There is no separation. Only when the finished work is contemplated, can one conceptually separate theme from mark. Yet, within the parameters of the page, gestures and marks continue to be inseparable from the imaginative content.

I take the view that drawings consist of a variety of conceptual and intuitive processes combined inextricably with physical and material gestures. The drawing appears through the mark, as well as by way of subjective responses. The immediate environment intervenes into the mark, and to an extent directs the marks. In my work response to context, or more specifically, response to situations in the contemporary urban spaces in which I move on a daily basis, takes place in and though my drawing.
The word ‘drawing’ has a noun and verb function. It refers to a continuous action that takes place in the present, as well as that visible object created through the action of drawing (RDOCW 1993. Sv “drawing”). Such analysis of the word echoes two common historical views of drawing: One that foregrounds the act, the sketch, and the process of drawing, and one which gives precedence to the finished product. Whether understood as an action or as an object, drawing remains fundamentally connected to mental processes. I will elaborate on this connection in the following paragraphs.

Drawings have the potential to depict something that is found through the act of drawing, in the process of drawing. Drawings also tend to be projective as far as they may depict something that was imagined before it was drawn. Following Erwin Panofski (cited in Roque 1994:51), I propose that drawing has a double significance: it is both the visible residue of mental processes as well as the object of a series of manual gestures. However this does not intend to posit drawing as a dualistic force which may be either a product of thought or the residue of gestures. Instead I conceptualise drawing as a field in which the gesture, act, object and thought exists co-presently in the same space.

Laura Hoptman surveys these fluctuating attitudes to drawing in her review of contemporary tendencies in drawing, Drawing now: eight propositions (2002). She (2002:11) observes throughout art history the understanding of drawing has fluctuated between appreciations that foreground process, the sketch, on the one hand, and on the other a conception of drawing based on its being the finished work. In my opinion process and the finished work, are equally implicit and necessary to any encounter of drawing. I tend to agree with Hoptman’s (2002:12) view that these fluctuations between emphasis on the sketch and the finished work should be seen as a shift of focus, a preference specific to moments in time and taste, rather than fixed categories. Thus, in the effort to re-search the theoretical path that marks my practical research I borrow from both these views.

3 This to and fro tendency seems to have been continuous throughout the nineteenth and twentieth century with the predilection for process-oriented drawing reaching its apex in the sixties and seventies with the radical revision of the materiality of the art object under the guise of conceptual art. Hoptman (2002:12) furthermore identifies a trend in the drawing of the 1990s that is more akin to nineteenth century conceptions of drawing than with the graphic outpourings of 1970s conceptual art.
The immediacy of the gesture indicates the drawing process to be fundamentally temporal. Cornelia Butler’s text, *Afterimage: Drawing Through Process* (1999), reviews drawing through conceptions of process art of the sixties and seventies. She argues the “conventions of line, tool, and hand – the historical foundations of draftsmanship” and the formal legibility of drawing’s techniques (like contour modelling, chiaroscuro), all work against the model of process, which emphasises materiality over “temporal duree” (Butler 1999:27). The thread that I want to pick up from Butler’s text is the notion of the “acute inscription of temporality” (Butler 1999:27) of the drawing process. The action of drawing – and the resultant inscription – takes time and occupies a space.

Emphasis on process in drawing necessarily implicates the importance of the concepts of gesture and temporality. To say that “drawing is process” is almost a tautology, for nothing seems more apparent than the way in which drawing records the artist’s process (Butler 1999:26; Hoptman 2002:11). Each stroke of the artist’s hand is “kinesis graphically embodied” (Butler 1999:27).

According to Hoptman (2002:11) ‘process’ broadly refers to art making that bears the traces of its making in time. From this perspective drawing is viewed as the “most direct and unmediated method” to catch the creative process as it happens (Hoptman 2002:11). This preoccupation with a state of perpetual becoming, synonymous with process, leads artist Michael Newman to conclude that drawing is a recording of “lived temporality” (cited in Dexter 2005:10). In this light drawing, as process, becomes a means of transcribing action in time – a means of inscription. The work in turn, bears the traces of its making and binds together the residue of moments and acts.

Drawings are often composed only of a few small gestures on a sheet of paper. All that’s left on the page is black powder, which can evoke a special language for the viewer, a language that can touch things that are important in life - all this in a relaxed and free manner. I would like to see my drawings as a spectator does. As a spectator, I think it’s interesting to try to retrace the mental process of the person who made the drawing. A drawing is a transparent skin suspended between the artist and the spectator for comparison (Manders 2002:6).

I draw on Henry Roque’s reading of Georgio Vasari as well as Laura Hoptman and Emma Dexter’s views with regards to the notion of the proximity of drawing and thought. The Renaissance conception of drawing as disegno supplies perspective on the view of drawing that identifies with the finished work, the object of contemplation. Giorgio Vasari remarks that disegno “is nothing but a visual expression and clarification of that concept which one has in
the intellect and that which one imagines in the mind and builds up in the idea” (cited in Roque 1994:50-51).

The term, *disegno*, has a double significance here: it designates the kinetic process of drawing (the action) and the object of the act of “designing”. Art historian Karen-Edis Barzman echoes Vasari’s ideas in her explanation that *disegno* signifies the practice of drawing and the artist’s manual dexterity as well as the cognitive process that moves from “sensible particulars to universal knowledge” (cited in Butler 1999:33). It follows that drawing, in the sense of *disegno*, compounds imaginative ability and imaginative content into one action and one object simultaneously.

The Renaissance conception of drawing as conduit of one kind of knowledge to another prevails (Butler 1999:33) emphasis on the importance of the close relationship between gesture and idea as it is embodied by the line. Dexter (2005:8) conceives of *disegno* as “the act of bodying forth the creative idea using line”. Dexter’s metaphor of ‘bodying forth’ is compelling because of the implication that drawing is an embodiment, the physical exponent of the drawer’s thought and imagination that attains physicality through the line. The line is in this sense the conduit of the drawer’s mental processes. The line, in a manner of speaking, follows a train of thought.

Hoptman (2002:12) observes a tendency in contemporary drawing which “refers as much to the language of life around us as it does to fine art – that can communicate information, narrate a story, create a scenario, or conjure a world or a system of belief”. Dexter (2005:9) similarly argues that drawing has become a “sanctuary” for artists who want to explore questions associated with drawing, such as narrative, subjectivity, authenticity, the unruly and the irrational. She (2005:9) remarks, “there has been an explosion of drawing based on an aesthetics of an apparent return to the expression of emotion, experience, and feeling”.

---

4 Conceptual art has also attempted to radicalize this conception of drawing as idea. Here Sol Lewitt’s drawings come to mind. Lawrence Alloway writes about this emphasis in Sol Lewitt’s drawings: “There is the notion of drawing as graphological discourse, the most direct marks that an artist can make and hence, because of their intimacy, authentic evidence of the artist’s presence. Personal touch is highly valued on this basis. There is another notion, which is that drawing represents not genetic freedom but the artist at his most rigorously intellectual. In this sense drawing is a projection of the artist’s intelligence in its least discursive form: the line is the gist, the core of art” (cited in Godfrey 1990:12-13)
Dexter (2005:9), interestingly, links the current resurgence of drawing with a revival of Romanticism in contemporary art practice: “As a precursor to Surrealism, Romanticism should be viewed as a valuable repository of powerful and still-relevant cultural and political ideas, such as liberty, the sublime, and the unshackling of emotion and intuition”. Hoptman (2002:167) summarises

Amidst all this work a form of drawing has arisen that has not been at the centre of art discourse since arguably the mid-nineteenth century, although it never has fully disappeared: the kind of autonomous drawing that is attached less to process than to the finished product, that describes a specific object or state of mind, that maps a specific experience, that tells a particular story.
A place where words make contact with what they cannot say

As we seek clear cut definitions for drawing, paradoxes await like mantraps in the jungle (Godfrey 1990:17).

(The city must never be confused with the words that describe it (Calvino 1972:61).

Drawings are connected to ideas by way of the gesture, the bodily action that brings about a drawing. The eye guides the tracing and in so doing coordinates the possibilities of seeing, touching, and moving (Derrida 1993:3-4). The concordance of the eye and the hand which culminates in the gesture, helps explain the frequency with which drawing is compared with writing. In this section I develop a more in-depth theoretical exploration of the tensions between drawn and written mark to suggest the tension between legibility and illegibility in drawing as a strategy which makes drawings richer, exactly because this tension makes drawings more difficult to "read”.

Georges Roque (1994:46) suggests the relationship between the mind and the hand and between the hand and its tracings reinforces the correlation between drawing and writing, as if there were some kind of correspondence between the hand and the mind. Serge Bourjea concurs: “all the gifts of the mind are used [in a drawing, which enables] a form to be read and pronounced before writing it” (1994:138). However, as Otto Pöggeler (1992:261) suggests, “to refer to the proximity of word and image, which makes possible the inscribed trace, is not equivalent to reducing language to this proximity. Accordingly drawing and writing are not equivalent mediums – they are expressive of thoughts, but not in the same way.

Umberto Eco (1989:91) writes in The open work: “Contemporary art draws its main value from the rupture with the laws of probability that govern common language”. The notion that drawing functions partially inside and partially outside the codes of language, indicates that drawings are more complex than they might appear to be at first sight.
Martine Reid’s *Boundaries: writing and drawing* (1994) also addresses the notions of the legible, illegible in the field of the visible. According to Reid there is no question that marks, lines and traces are graphically similar to written marks. Yet, writing is a legible “reproduction of an established set of signs” whereas drawn marks tend to be visible, rather than legible (Reid 1994:6). Reid’s (1994:3) extrapolation on textual genetics and the appearance of text in 20th century art are interesting examples of the border area where the boundaries between writing and drawing become vague.

Textual genetics is the study of textual production. It traces the initial impulses of a text by studying preliminary documents such as jottings, notes, sketches and early drafts that supplement rough copies of handwritten manuscripts. The relevance of textual genetics to my research lies in the fact that it acknowledges the “figurative qualities of writing” (Reid 1994:3) which exemplifies the fragility of the legible and its easy disintegration into the field of the visible.

Reid (1994:6) observes that words appear in pictures not to provide explanations by naming them, but to complicate vision by mixing categories. Reid surmises that illegible writing “shows things as they are not”. It seems to hide or disguise and is “‘read’ as a gesture of refusal”. According to Reid “illegible writing indicates that the sign has been remorsefully eaten away by its own figurative nature” and therefore “the figure resorts back to its status as a mere drawing” (1994:6).

Instead, for Deleuze, the unconscious is a process of “displacement and production”, desire and affirmation. This conception has the advantage of replacing the traditional (allegedly neutral) writer/reader coupling in philosophy with writes and readers in an ‘intensive mode’ and who acts as “transformers” and “processors” of intellectual energies and extratextual experiences (Boundas and Olkowski 1994:11).

In my drawings visible marks jostle legible words in an unassuming interplay. I jot down thoughts, or I write down what I would like to draw. In this way drawn and written marks become suspended figures that reveal patterns and relationships and possibly even a rewarding coherence.

Writing, legible and illegible, is to a degree a way of documenting and contextualising moments and gestures. It is simultaneously a strategy that draws the viewer closer with the promise of meaning: Written fragments create the expectation that there are words which can be read in sequence and thus provide an explanation of the drawing. The written elements are however always retreating in the direction of incomprehensibility. The illegible scribbles
mock writing by dissolving it into figures and accordingly frustrates the viewer's expectation of “reading” meaning into the drawings.

The written marks that are indeed legible as words do not congeal into a linear narrative. They allow a glimpse into someone’s private notes but ultimately they withhold explicit answers. The familiarity of writing, thus the familiarity of language, and therefore what is predictable as far a discourse goes, becomes disruptive element. In this sense my drawings diffuse the rigid “truth” of words in a play of uncertainty and illusion.

The drawings consist of a series of concealments through which the viewer has to pass. Every viewer is faced with a choice when looking at drawings. One can either read the inscriptions (in search of concrete explanations) or, one can immerse oneself in what is offered.

The tension between the legible and the illegible marks holds open a mystery: there is something making its presence known whilst it is, simultaneously, being withheld. The viewer's encounter with the drawings become like the act of noticing things from the corner of one’s eye: one is never entirely sure what one is looking at. There are other codes at work besides the linguistic and the textual. One might begin to suspect that there are other ways of experiencing the drawing that make its presence known by resisting explicit signification.

The combination of figures and the written word produces, what Foucault calls a “calligram”, a composite text/image that brings together a text and a shape as close together as possible (Mitchell 1994:70). The calligram aims at a utopia of representation in which things are trapped in a “double-cipher”, an alliance between the meanings of words and images. Foucault compares this relationship between word and image to two hunters “pursuing its quarry by two paths...By its double function, it guarantees capture, as neither discourse alone nor a pure drawing could do” (Mitchell 1994:70).

Because of this “double-cipher”, drawing seems to be better adapted to the figuration of the ‘secret’ mentioned above in relation to my drawings. Serge Bourjea’s explication of this notion of secret in Rhombos – Eye, Dance, Trace: The writing process in Valéry’s rough drafts (1994) resonates with my concerns with the play between the visible and the legible in my drawings. Bourjea’s text investigates the “non-categories of the vague and the uncertain” in the handwriting process in Paul Valéry's Cahiers, a compilation of the poet’s rough drafts and unpublished manuscripts.
Serge Bourjea (1994:138-9) cites from Valéry notes

You must be aware that words and commonly used languages are, so to speak, incommensurable among themselves, and cannot communicate the idea of a given curve… My secret lies in an image that would be easier to draw than to describe – but I can hardly draw it either, because it is not just lines and colour nor a well known object. It does not resemble anything – that is why it is so powerful… I bring it everything that life or reflection offers me. I can measure it out – and I dare to do it.

Thus Valéry confirms that any linguistic expression is bound to be incomplete. For the poet writing is a matter of sketching. The graphic gesture seems independent from sight. Set down on paper, as an extension of the hand or the whole body, it is capable of inventing. Valéry speaks of the “hand of the eye” (cited in Bourjea 1994:137). This phrase denotes a distracted, or withheld, gaze that characterizes the act of inscription. The eye and the hand are reciprocally preoccupied with the activity of the other. This paradoxical seeing discloses something that is hidden from sight; something that cannot really be seen nor constitute a scene (Bourjea 1994:137).

Valéry writes, “On the magic mirror of its white expanse, the soul sees in front of it a miraculous space which could be brought to life with signs and lines” (Valéry cited in Bourjea 1994:144). When brought in relation with the page as a kind of “magic mirror” the imagination casts the drawing as a place where the imagination is free to conjure relationships between lines and marks and in doing so to create different ways of being conscious of our being-in-the-world.

The drawing maintains the figure of the “secret”, specifically because it remains beyond the rules of language, whilst confirming the event of the gesture, despite the impossibility of putting it into words. In the drawing, the mysterious becomes visible, despite the fact that it is made up of lines, smears, traces and colours. The drawing is, in this sense, an ambiguous vision that remains balanced between, inside, intellectual reflection, and outside, what life offers. In this the drawing is just as real as it is imaginary.
Looking at drawings is like listening to other people’s conversations, one is never sure what is being said (Ian McKeever cited in Godfrey 1990:17). The important thing is that when we read, we are probably doing it so that we don’t have to look anymore (Kabakov 1996:129).

The concordance of the hand and the eye that produces the incommensurable effect of the line reveals an irreducible gap between what is created on the surface of the paper and its capacity to invent by way of the real and the imagined. Here two philosophically dense perspectives emerge: firstly, there is the concept of the figure, as developed by Jean-Francois Lyotard, and, secondly, there is the notion of the between. I will subsequently examine these concepts in further detail by discussing Lyotard’s notion of the figure.

Lyotard’s aesthetics informs this research’s concern with extrapolating on the suggestion that artworks convey more that can be spoken about.

The position of art is a denial of the position of discourse. The position of art indicates a function of the figure, which is not signified, and this indicates this function both at the edge of and within discourse. It indicates that the transcendence of the symbol is the figure, that is to say a spatial manifestation which linguistic space cannot incorporate without being overthrown, an exteriority which cannot be interiorized as signification. Art is posed otherwise as plasticity and desire, curved extension, in the face of invariance and reason (Lyotard cited in Readings 1991:25).

Lyotard associates written text (and the experience of reading) with discourse, and images (and the experience of seeing) with figures. He asserts that there is always a figural coexistence of the plastic and the textual. The figural is a “cramping together” of plastic and graphic spaces that mark the entry of the heterogeneous into representation (Readings 1991:20).

Lyotard goes on to develop the figural as a disruptive force, which works to interrupt established structures in the realms of both reading and seeing5 (IDP Sv “Lyotard, Jean-Francois”). He argues that the clash between difference and opposition is the effect of the

---

5 Lyotard associates the visual arts with the figural and the process of seeing (IDP Sv “Lyotard, Jean-Francois”). Thus the figural exists as the trace in the discursive, or conversely, textual is a trace present in the image.
figural co-presence of the immeasurable orders of the visible and the textual in language (Readings 1991:6). Consequently, the figural refers to an unspeakable other at work within and against discourse, which disrupts representation.

The work of art, in Lyotard’s view, functions by virtue of its physical resonance rather than through codes. The area of aesthetic invention exists in the displacement and transformation of representation, rather than in innovative discovery of new modes of representation (Readings 1991: xxiii). Accordingly, the incommensurability of language and the gesture, which reveals the figure, a perceptible reality, exists in the space between these modes. By drawing it, a fleeting moment in the incommensurability of the object is exposed.

For Lyotard the work of art is a space where sense perception and meaning coexist6. They occupy the same space whilst remaining distinct. The coexistence of visible and textual, figural and discursive, sensible and signification cannot be reduced to a matter of meaning7 (Readings 1991:51). According to Lyotard the task of interpretation of artworks is to testify to difference, to put the text to work; not to claim to articulate hidden meanings. The density of objects that inhabits what Lyotard calls “figural space” is apparent to the extent that their difference cannot be reduced to a simple set of oppositions (Readings 1997:1).

Heidegger formulates this notion of difference as a tear in The origin of the work of art (1994:188). In Heidegger the tear “der Riss” - is a polyvalent term that carries contrasting meanings8. In German, the noun Riss is a tear, a cleft or a rift9. The verb ‘cleave’ means not only cut, intersect, fissure and separate, but also stick, adhere and cling. Cleaving therefore simultaneously divides and adheres. The term therefore indicates the intimacy with which opponents belong to each other.

6 Sense as the fleshly resonance of things in the sensible world and meaning as the abstract signified by the operation of language.
7 Lyotard’s thought marks a shift from opposition (as conceived of in Saussure’s structural linguistics) to heterogeneity (difference) in representational systems. Lyotard echoes Barthes in claiming that the object always remains other to any discourse about it, because it has heterogeneity in excess of the meanings that are attached to it. The figural appears as the coexistence of incommensurable spaces, of the figurative in the textual or the textual in the figurative (Readings 1991:4). The figural indicates this resistance in that one cannot say everything about an object, or a work of art.
8 David Krell (1994:188) favours the translation of der Riss as “rift”, whereas Mark Taylor (1987:42) prefers “cleft”. I will use Krell’s translation, although I acknowledge that “cleave” perhaps illustrates the multiple directions marked by Heidegger’s Riss more poignantly in English. Both translations are however implicated in Heidegger’s term.
9 Heidegger’s notion of Being is compounded in the term Dasein. The term literally means “being there” Heidegger’s use of the term plays on two senses of the German word: the traditional philosophical use of the word which refers to any mode of being or existence, and the colloquial German in which the word simply means to be present and is usually applied to people rather than inanimate objects. Heidegger’s use of Dasein refers to the mode of being of human beings as opposed to the “being-at-hand” of things (DCT 2000 Sv “Dasein”).
The rift is an “outline sketch” that brings the opponents into the origin of their unity by virtue of their common ground that “draws the basic features of the clearing of beings”. The rift is the “drawing together” of breach and outline, of sketch and basic design into a unity (Heidegger 1994:188). The conflict of the rift alternates in the duplicity of cleaving. Hence the origin of the work of art simultaneously joins and separates, by holding open this alternating difference (Heidegger 1994:197). In the space and time of this opening disclosure and withdrawal intersect repeatedly in a play of differences. This play of differences is what constitutes the “essential strife” of “world” as “self-disclosing openness” and “earth” as “the essentially self-secluding”. It follows that the artwork functions by setting up the world as the region within which Being and beings emerge (Taylor 1987:50).

Heidegger (1994:183) develops the notion of the creative process as “a bringing forth” through τεχνή, which in ancient Greece signified both art and craft. Heidegger argues that τεχνή means neither craft nor art in the present day sense. He suggests that the word rather denotes a mode of knowing. In Heidegger (1994:184) this kind of knowing is “to apprehend what is present, as such”. “Τechnē, as knowledge experienced in the Greek manner, is a bringing forth of beings in that it brings forth what is present as such out of concealment and specifically into the unconcealment, the truth, of its appearance” (Heidegger 1994:184).

Heidegger’s notion of τεχνή, in my view, also connects drawing with knowing via a different route: the Afrikaans word for drawing, teken. Teken “a sign” and it is also “to draw” whilst teken means “to know”. Herein, again, emerges the notion of drawing as simultaneously working and the work. This view, in my opinion, links drawing to processes of signification and to modes of knowing via the double entendre of concealment and disclosure in Heidegger’s formulation.

The significance of Heidegger’s text, The origin of the work of art (1994), lies in the originating cleavage. The play of differences in the between, opened by the tear, reveals the constant alternation between concealment and disclosure. This echoes the movement of drawing: it’s alternation between legible and illegible, between withdrawing and drawing outward. In the context of Heidegger, drawing as inscription alternates between disclosing something of the drawer’s presence as a being-in-the-world and of the drawer as a present being in the world.
According to Mark Taylor (1987:43), Heidegger conceives of difference as “the between”. Difference as the between is, in Heidegger, the condition of the possibility of all subjectivity and objectivity: we can say “the same” only if we “think” difference (Taylor 1987:44). This condition of difference makes possible a view of drawing that combines intellectual and conceptual as well as intuitive and subjective. In the experience of the artwork these modes invariably interpenetrate and alternate.

Heidegger’s notion of *alētheia* comes into play here. According to Heidegger (1994:185) “the work’s becoming a work is a way in which truth becomes and happens”. In truth, as unconcealment, there is a “double restraint”, a refusal. Truth essentially occurs in the rift between the clearing and the concealing. This notion of the origin of the work of art as a truth, points toward the process through which the work comes into being.

In my view the work of art works by transforming what is commonplace into something that is other than usual. This is the gift of the artwork to the viewer: It discloses the possibility of seeing the commonplace, from another perspective, with “new” eyes. Heidegger (1994:199) writes “a work of art is in actual effect as a work only when we remove ourselves from our commonplace routine and move into what is disclosed by the work, so as to bring our own essence itself to take a stand in the truth of beings”.

The work, through the alternation of difference, transports us into the openness of beings, and therefore out of the realm of the ordinary. Heidegger (1994:191), suggests “to submit to this displacement means to transform our accustomed ties to the world and earth and henceforth to restrain all usual doing and prizing, knowing and looking”. In this sense knowing, as having seen, is “a being resolved” (1994:193). It is the human being standing within the strife difference, acknowledging the irreconcilable nature of difference, and thus claiming the rift as a productive space.

Heidegger often cites the Taoist parable of an empty vessel to articulate the utility of this space between. The utility of the artwork as vessel lies in the emptiness at its centre (Pöggeler 1997:29)

Mould clay into a vessel; it is the emptiness within that creates the usefulness of the vessel…Thus, what we have may be something substantial, but its usefulness lies in the unoccupied, empty space. The substance of your body is enlivened by maintaining the part of you that is unoccupied (Hua-Ching Ni 2003:12).
The collapse of opposition into difference and the notion of alternation between what can be represented (or written) and that which can not be represented (or is left unspoken) are discussed in discourses by Lyotard and Heidegger to reveal an important theme: The artwork does not only testify to difference, but opens it into a region, a productive space. In this sense the space opened by the rift, that emptiness at the centre of the vessel, can be conceived of as a site for moments of insight.

Roland Barthes (1998:166) writes about this transformative power

So we must take a painting (let us keep this convenient name, even if it is an old one) as a kind of stage: the curtain rises, we look, we receive, we understand; and once the scene is finished and the painting removed, we remember: we are no longer what we were.

Barthes’ “stage” is the place and the space within which Kristeva’s ‘I’ is confronted by the experience of the act (gestures) that has been played out on the page. The ‘architecture’ of the space (the stage, or the page) frames a symbolic constellation that is a space of continuous transformation: It is where the ‘I’ moves between movement and stasis, between separation and union, between what is real and what is possible, between the visible and the sayable, in a movement towards an improbable synthesis of waking life and the imagination. In this perspective drawing is the site, a place and an imaginary space, where paradoxes can, and do, co-exist. Despite, and perhaps because of, drawing’s proximity with writing and the ambiguity that ensues, the play of differences in the constant alternation of withdrawing and revealing, locates drawing as a complex space in which knowing and feeling evolve.
Naming the unnamable

Reality is right before you, yet you are apt to translate it into a world of names and forms (Fa-yen Wen-I cited in Loy 1988:58).

So narrow is his [the drawer’s] stroke, so surrounded by great empty shores! And so easy then for him to feel intuitively that that white page is the unknowing which surpasses his ability to know… After which he will surely be able to sense that drawing is less defining contours, finding their truth, than venturing into that whiteness and discovering there the precarity of all that has been acquired, the vanity of wants, and thus drawing near to that reality unity that language robs us of (Bonnefoy 1994:14-15).

At this point a brief return to the initial question raised by Kristeva: “how do we retrace the speaking thread back into the place, the drawing, from which words have withdrawn?” Walter Benjamin (1917:86) anticipates the question: “…in the pictures of the modern artists the judging word might enter the mark. To understand the connection between the word and the picture, the composition – that is the act of naming – is decisive”.

Heidegger’s response to such a question is: “poetry” (1994:198). He roots art in poiesis, the originating act of making. In this intricate connection with poetry, art is bounded to openness through concealment and mystery (Pöggler 1997:209). In Heidegger’s view language brings beings into the open, by naming them for the first time, and thus bringing beings to word and to appearance. Such a naming is a “saying”, a creative act, a “projection of the clearing” that calls beings into Being10. Heidegger connects this “projective saying”11 with poetry. Poetry is the saying of the unconcealment of beings, and as such brings the unsayable into the world. Poetry discloses both presence and absence and thereby saying also brings forth unsayable (Heidegger 1994:198).

10 The privilege that speech enjoys over writing also appears in Derrida’s Of Grammatology (1991:31-58). Roque (1994:56) draws a parallel between this privileging of speech over writing and the privilege afforded to drawing as an apt expression of a truth of an idea.

11 Taylor (1987:53) translates “projective saying” as “saying sketchily” to emphasize the way in which saying implies that with withdraws and conceals itself. “Sketchily” also recalls associations with the various forms of Riss.
In Heidegger, the poetry that allows opening to take place designates art itself\(^\text{12}\), rather than a specific art form. According to Heidegger (1994:199) plastic creation, by extension, also belongs to the between. Plastic creation is viewed as a “special” form of poeticizing within the clearing of beings which happen “unnoticed” in language (1994:199). Consequently the act of “saying” is the expression that renders existence articulate (Heidegger 1994:198). Thus the displacement of meanings across things and words is the displacement of naming. Language, as naming, articulates the opening, the between, that makes communication possible.

Derrida’s (1993:2) discussion of drawing in Memoirs of the blind addresses the interplay between drawing and speech in the form of a dialogue

- Shall I just listen? Or observe? Silently watch you show me some drawings?  
- Both, once again, or rather between the two. I’ll have you observe that reading proceeds in no other way. It listens in watching.

Thus the ambiguous rhythms of the rift continually return: The double bind of language holds together the opposites it holds apart. In this way language always returns to difference – the difference that is The origin of the work of art. This constant oscillation of difference at the threshold of art and language indicates a horizon where saying and silence, movement and rest, coincide.

Here again, Yves Bonnefoy (1994:14) resonates with Heidegger’s thought

> Reality nonetheless survives, on that horizon in things that words can never reach, or in the space between them…. And poetry is what speech becomes when one has learned not to forget that there is a place, in many words, where, despite what has just been said about them, they make contact with what they cannot say.

Bonnefoy’s horizon unfolds in an undulating line that unites (and separates) doing and speaking. In Foucault the space between the text and the drawing, the calligram, serves as a common frontier, “the calm sand of the page”, where all the relations of designation, nomination and description are established (Mitchell 1994:69). This dubious region between text and figure is always in transit. One moment it is abstract and the next it is a landscape and in the next an absence or a space. In this double bind of discourse and representation, the sayable and the visible cross an invisible frontier, and make it possible to assign names to things - to describe them.

\(^{12}\) Despite this very broad interpretation of poetry, Heidegger also gives special precedence to poetry in the narrow sense in the domain of the arts (Heidegger 1994:198).
Derrida’s deconstruction seeks to reveal an understanding of writing and speaking as inscriptions of the trace. In this conception speaking and writing become ways of “writing down”, through which life inscribes its trace. In this way Derrida “places life as trace before being as presence” and the trace becomes the common ground between writing and speaking (Pöggeler 1992:230-231). As far as the trace inscribes itself externally, it moves from the temporal to the spatial dimension. Thus the trace can be preserved and conferred on another time. In this way the trace indicates that which is absent.

According to Brunette (1994:12) Derrida dooms the visual object to the muteness of the thing itself and it is just this muteness which, in silence, restores an order of presence: “Obviously the spatial work of art presents itself as silent, but its mutism, which produces an effect of full presence, can as always be interpreted in a contradictory fashion”. The “mutism” Derrida refers to here is the silence of something that cannot speak. Derrida (Brunette 1994:13) takes this silence as evidence that there exists “on the side of such a mute work of art, a place, a real place from the perspective of which, words find their limit”. I view this silence as a resistance against discursive hegemony.

I recall the image of Jing-Mei Woo’s mother unravelling an old sweater in Amy Tan’s novel Joy Luck Club:

It was the story she would always tell me when she was bored, when there was nothing to do, when every bowl had been washed and the Formica table had been wiped down twice, when my father sat reading the newspaper smoking one Pall Mall cigarette after another, a warning not to disturb him. This was when my mother would take out an old box of ski sweaters sent to us by unseen relatives from Vancouver. She would snip the bottom of a sweater and pull out a kinky thread of yarn, anchoring it to a piece of cardboard. And as she began to roll with one sweeping rhythm, she would start her story. Over the years, she told me the same story, except for the ending, which grew darker, casting long shadows into her life, and eventually into mine (Tan 1998:20-21).

The converse of the same experience is the experience that we as speaking beings have of these silent works. We can always receive, read and interpret drawings as potential discourse. From this vantage point the silent work becomes “the place of a word that is all the more powerful because it is silent” (Derrida cited in Brunette 1994:13). These alternating interpretations are always present, and we are always moving between them.

---

13 In Heidegger’s thought the space of the play of time, is not only movement, but “something underway toward a place” (Pöggeler 1992:216). The notion of absence, here, as constituted by nothingness, is a therefore conceived of as a site for moments of insight (Pöggeler 1992:215).
In *Memoirs of the blind* Jacques Derrida writes of the “eternal duel” between sight and speech that lies at the heart of drawing. Derrida (1993:57) emphasizes that drawing never goes without being articulated with words, or without narrative. The connections he forges between drawing, speech and narrative implicates memory in the act of drawing.

Herman Rapaport asserts that Heidegger picks up the aesthetic as something other, “as that which names something else than our names name” (Rapaport 1994:156). Rapaport (1994:156) stresses Heidegger’s suggestion that saying is not essentially tied to the production of new and unfamiliar representations; it is in fact at its most radical when it does not take the path of producing the unfamiliar, but instead re-appropriates something familiar that has temporarily been put aside.
CHAPTER 2

SPATIAL PRACTICE

What constitutes a line drawing…a pencil line on a piece of paper / bits of wire / strips of fabric / a row of marshmallows in a room? Questioning the very nature of drawing prompts another question: What constitutes Reality? Is it the word, the image, the idea, the object? Or it is the interplay between these fragments?

I imagine a blank page as a limitless horizon bounded within four edges: a flat object and a limitless space simultaneously. Lines on a page have the conceptual flexibility to become inscriptions that occupy space as well as places. This expanded view of drawing facilitates a perpetual ‘crossing over’ between realms of figure/ground, absence/presence, space/place, here/there. In this chapter the implied space in drawings on paper are shown equivalent to everyday lived spaces.
Drawing spatially

Drawing is...defined as a mark-making process used to produce a line-based composition...today's drawing ranges from monumental to micro, from conceptual to three-dimensional, from black-and-white to full-colour (Dexter 2005:5).

The rift must set itself back into the gravity of stone, the mute hardness of wood, the dark glow of colours. As the earth takes back the rift into itself, the rift is first set forth into the open region and is thus placed (Heidegger 1994:188).

The classical allegory of the origins of drawing holds that it was invented by the daughter of a Corinthian potter, Butades, who faced with a long separation from her lover, traces the outline of her lover's shadow on the wall (Fischer 2003:219). Butades's desire to retain something of her lover's presence encapsulates the thread that runs between present and absent, the act of drawing and its trace.

The myth of Butades points to further implications of the connection between the trace and absence/presence in drawing. Firstly, it indicates that drawing is an intrinsically human activity. The desire to mark one's presence in the world seems almost inevitable. The traces of our presence in the world are visible everywhere in the lived spaces where people perform their lives. We all draw, whether it is the traces of a skateboard on a freshly painted wall, the skid marks of a car that breaks suddenly or scribbling while on the phone, or drawing a map of directions (Godfrey 1990:9). Secondly, the myth establishes a bridge between the act of drawing and situated tactile forms. I appropriate this myth as a reconciliation of drawing and plastic production. Thus the notions of three-dimensional production such as sculpture and installations are re-engineered in the tautology ‘spatial drawing’.
There are three hypotheses about the inhabitants of Baucis: that they hate the earth; that they respect it so much they avoid all contact; that they love it as it was before they existed and with spyglasses and telescopes aimed downward they never tire of examining it, leaf by leaf…. Contemplating with fascination their own absence (Calvino 1972:77).

Drawing delineates. Philip Rawson (1987:84) defines the drawn line as a “trace left behind by a moving point”. Thus the trace has at once directional value in relation to the coordinates of the field whilst functioning as a separator (Rawson 1987:95). The word ‘drawing’ signifies an additional function, that of bringing something closer: ‘The imparting of motion in the direction of an actuating force’, ‘pulling’, ‘traction’, ‘attraction’ (OED 1989 Sv “drawing”). This connotation of ‘drawing near’ implicates the utility of the trace as bringing what is distant or even absent into proximity. These accretions indicate the traces left in the wake of the
concordance of the hand and the eye - the drawing - is fundamentally bound to themes of absence (metaphor), separation (boundary), and passage (journey).

In *Walter Benjamin: critical constellations* Graham Gilloch (2002:183) remarks, “The trace is the appearance of nearness, however far removed the thing that left it behind may be... As a residue of what is now absent the ‘trace’ paradoxically offers proximity, tactility and decipherment”. Otto Pöggeler (1992:233) summarises Heidegger’s conceptions of the trace as that which is “left behind by what has gone before”, whilst Derrida (1991:47) surmises “The trace is nothing”.

These quotations indicate a shared view of the function of the trace as that which brings what is materially absent - an object, a thought, a memory, a gesture or a story - into the field of the present. The paradoxical play of visible/invisible, absence/presence, distance/proximity in the trace connects it with metaphor and with the imagination.
These concepts of the trace resonate with Heidegger’s (1994:188) paradox of the rift: “The rift is the drawing together, into a unity, of sketch and basic design, breach and outline”. According to Herman Rapaport (1992:231) Derrida extends Heidegger’s notion of the trace as rift by articulating it as that which holds open the difference which is maintained in the original unity of being and thought. Derrida (1993:45) consistently uses the figures of absence and path to speak about the trace

In its originary pathbreaking [frayage] moment, in the tracing potency of the trait, at the instant when the point at the point of the hand (of the body proper in general) moves forward upon making contact with the surface, the inscription of the inscribable is not seen (Derrida 1993:45).

Derrida (1993:41) hesitates between two paradoxes about drawing. He names them, “for memory’s sake”: The first paradox is the invisible condition of the possibility of drawing, “the drawing of drawing” (Derrida 1993:41). The second is the event, that which “meets the eyes”. The latter represents the unrepresentable condition of the first. Between these two “blindnesses”, that which meets the eyes can give rise to the speech of narrative, or to myth, or to the scene of everyday life (Derrida 1993:41).

The rift remains between the thing drawn, the drawing, and the drawing trait. The trace is the tear that separates and binds. It connects one point to another, thereby dividing and joining the ground upon which it is inscribed. In this analysis the trace is simultaneously a point taken for a walk, a separating line, region, border area, and horizon.

The above mentioned views on the trace substantiate my view of drawing as a practise which draws together thoughts, memories, and places into an imaginative space. The insistent return of the theme of absence/presence and proximity/distance that is simultaneous to the disclosure of difference substantiates the function of the drawn trace as a means through which one can mark one’s presence in the present. As Kearney (1994:235) writes, this play between present and absent is what “pulls our present into shape and endows it with meaning”.
Horizon / Border area

A border is a dividing line, a narrow strip along a steep edge. A borderland is a vague and undetermined place created by the emotional residue of an unnatural boundary. It is in a constant state of transition...those who cross over, pass over, or go through the confines of the “normal” (Gloria Anzaldúa cited in Henderson 1995:1).

Still it is too much to claim that there is a blank or a lacuna; instead, it is an absence of space, an effacement of the ‘common place’ between the signs of writing and the lines of the image (Mitchell 1994:69-70).

It seems almost instinctual to draw boundaries to indicate our territories, to lay claim to a space, physical or psychological. Serge Tisseron (1994:32), in a study of the spatial development of handwritten manuscripts, develops the notion of the trace as separator via a different path. Tisseron references ancient Chinese scripts in which the sign that designates the gesture of marking illustrates a hand marking out the corners of a square. He posits this ideogram harks back to the gesture which initially partitioned the boundless earth,
establishing boundaries between properties. This account situates the gesture of marking (and its trace) into “a double process of appropriating space: that of the physical, as well as psychic” (Tisseron 1994:32).

The simultaneity of these paradoxes can be visualized as a fluctuating horizon. Germano Celant (1996:xiii) writes “The horizon line on which the elements rest or from which they project is by definition a point of transition between two worlds”. In this sense horizon is not a fixed line. It is rather a between-space that depends on movement and change and continuation. The horizon refers to a conceptual separation between substantial (earth) and insubstantial (sky). It is synonymous with deferred, unattainable and ever-shifting.

The horizon then becomes a clearing (Heidegger’s term) that simultaneously separates and binds. The essence here is the collapse of binary opposition through action. The notion of horizon encapsulates co-presence in that it functions as both a line (a separator) and a space simultaneously. It follows that what we can experience co-presently is what we separate in thought, conceptually and linguistically. This paradox reconciles the separating gap of the rift and transforms it into a bridging space across a two-dimensional page and by extension a three-dimensional space. Each contains the other and thus reveals them as simultaneous complimentary forces in short, co-presence.

The figure of horizon encapsulates this co-presence of literal and figural spaces – the simultaneity of figure/ground, and by extension, substantial/insubstantial, known/unknown, here/there. It follows that what one experiences as co-presence in the realms of drawing is that which is separated conceptually and linguistically in the processes of thought.
Derrida (1993:4) writes that the trace crosses all the borders separating the senses. Physical movement over the landscape thus runs parallel with and is a catalyst for spiritual or psychological change in the protagonist. This foregrounds an attitude to being-in-the-world that prefers knowing the world through experience as it is reflected in the Taoist canon.

Lao Tsu (cited in Collinson 1994:136) elaborates on this connection in the Tao Teh Ching

[The Tao] advocates a wandering discovery of the Way, much as a stream of water will find a course between the irregularities of the land through which it flows. What results is a kind of lived understanding; a knowing-how rather than a knowing-that.
Being and doing is thus absorbed in the metaphor of journey. As the wanderer cannot be separated from the road s/he travels, so the ‘inner life’ of the protagonist cannot be isolated from the active participation of his/her body in life as it is lived in every moment. In this sense physical journey which involves action on the part of the body cannot separated from the psychical (Kazashi 2004:4).

Drawing, walking, moving and thinking become metaphor for one another. Jordan Crandall (2005:60) writes of a “corporeal thinking” – the body’s sense of the aliveness of a situation. This modality of perception does not resolve into a statement. Instead it brings forth an expression: “It is not about movement, but rather the quality of a lived interior state, which marks a pure coincidence between subject and object” (Crandall 2005:60).

**Drawing / Walking**

An active line on a walk, moving freely, without a goal. A walk for a walk’s sake (Klee 1925:16).

The man who went ‘Walkabout’ was making a ritual journey. He trod in the footprints of his Ancestor. He sang the Ancestor’s stanzas without changing a word or note – and so recreated the Creation (Chatwin 1998:14).

Artist, Paul Klee, and travel writer, Bruce Chatwin’s meditations indicate something of the complex relationships between line, space and place that is encompassed in the metaphor of journey. The correspondence of figure/ground relationships furthermore bind drawing to the notion of journey as far as travelling requires movement and direction, as well as a ground. Within art history drawing is associated with walking14. The figure of walking links the space of drawing with physical places and ultimately connects with the visual poetics of drawing. In this metaphor the wandering trail of the line becomes synonymous with the individual’s passage through the world. The gesture and the trace thereby expand drawing outward into the lived spaces of everyday life.

---

14 The reassessment of the materiality of the art object in the development of Conceptual art, took drawing beyond the limits of the page. The act of drawing was extended into the landscape (Land Art), site-specific installations and performance (Hoptman 2002:11). Richard Long’s “A line made by walking” comes to mind here. This work extends Paul Klee’s line by taking it for a walk, literally.
Our bodies are constantly in motion. As they move they trace a path from one location to another. These paths intersect with other paths, those of people and of things, animals, machines, trees and places. Nigel Thrift (1996:8) calls these paths “trajectories in time-space”. In this manner the trace equates the drawing process with a wandering activity of inscription. As we move around places we draw trajectories of your existence – our being-in-the-world. We inscribe our presence on the places we move through.

Serge Bourjea (1994:148) observes the trace is “the ‘trace’ of a step”. Bourjea (194:148) imagines the trace as footsteps in the sand – a mark on an uncertain surface: “The wandering and the groping at least will have left a sign that they have occurred, an obvious mark albeit fragile of an otherwise complex movement which it could sum up and reduce”. Here the trace is quite literally a wandering halfway between the gesture and the legible.

Figure 2
Accordingly walking and drawing are associated with passage: the passage of time, movement over a surface, and the visible traces that mark this passage across time and space. The journey of the line opens up into other realms of thought and of meaning. Sibyl Moholy-Nagy notes this passage is not simply a material one: “The dot, extended into a graphic curve, cannot come to rest on the last page of the [Paul Klee’s Pedagogical] Sketchbook. It urges on to further explorations, both in space and in spirit” (Dexter 2005:10).

In lieu of this drawing can be understood as journeying though lived and imagined places in the infinite expanse of a white page or a space. The notion of accretion combined with the presence/absence features of the trace indicates the transformative potential of drawing as a way of thinking. In drawing, between insubstantial and substance, the drawer becomes a nomad that migrates between the formal and material languages with which s/he affirms her presence in the world.

Space / Place

…a picture represents a possible situation in logical space (Wittgenstein 1991:10).

A Sufi manual, the Kashf-al-Mahjub, says that, towards the end of his journey the dervish becomes the Way, not the wayfarer; i.e. a place over which something is passing, not a traveller following his own free will (Chatwin 1998:179).

Drawn lines are configurations on a surface. Graphic marks are bound to the ground upon which they are inscribed. A trace must be left on something. It is always situated - temporal and spatial. It marks the passage of time whilst occupying a physical space. The trace takes place and it takes up space, in place.

According to Walter Benjamin (1917:83) the line (the presence of traces) depends on its being “conjoined” with a ground: “The graphic line marks out the area and so defines it by attaching itself to it as its background. Conversely the graphic line can exist only against this background”. Thus a line is a figure on a ground rather than a random mark (Readings 1991:18). In Heidegger (1994:188) the line is not merely a rift ripped open; “rather, it is the intimacy with which the opponents belong to each other. This rift carries the opponents into
the origin of their unity by virtue of their common ground”. Derrida (1991:42) summarizes: “this trace is the opening of the first exteriority in general, the enigmatic relationship of the living to its other and of an inside to an outside: spacing”.

Hillis-Miller (1995:12) notes that these figures, the dividing tear and the conjoining bridge, delineate a rudimentary map. The rift inscribes the surface and in so doing transforms surface to sign (Hillis-Miller 1995:13): The rift as line is simultaneously a path that joins one place to another and a furrow that divides this side from that. At the same time it is also the “trait”, an inscription on the surface.

Heidegger (1994:188) writes: “The rift-design is the drawing together, into a unity, of sketch and basic design, breach and outline”. Hillis-Miller (1995:13) emphasises the connection between Riss and reissen, and, Zug (“feature, trait, something drawn”) and ziehen (“draw closer, attract”). The crossing of these families of words in Heidegger’s thought marks a play between active and passive: to draw is to be drawn, to inscribe the rift is to be drawn along it (Hillis-Miller 1995:13). Reading Heidegger, Hillis-Miller (1995:14) writes

Paths give the world edges and measures. They also join this place to that place. They establish a place where the opposition between earth in its self-enclosure and world in its openness can be brought out, in an intimacy of proximity and distance. The paths are also clefts.

Derrida (1993:53) writes, the trace “tends to wear itself out so as to mark the single edge of the contour: between the inside and the outside of the figure”. This indicates the experience of drawing must “always consists of journeying beyond limits” (Derrida 1993:54). Thus the “pathbreaking course” (Derrida 1993:53) of the trace is seen as the line itself: It joins and adjoins by delimiting and separating.

James Elkins (1998:89) expands the concept of the trace as a figure on a ground in geographical terms. He cites Merleau-Ponty’s phenomenology of figure/ground relationships in order to open ‘the field’ of drawn figures and grounds to metaphorical exploration” (Elkins 1998:91). A figure and its ground, or even a mark and its surface may easily come to mean subject and world. The question of the relation between self (or “body-subject”) and world is both spatial and temporal.

15 What remains in question when one reads Heidegger is whether the inscription of the tear, the rift design, is imposed superficially on the earth by man or whether it reveals a hidden design. All Heidegger’s political orientations hang in the balance here… Heidegger is beguiled by a dream of a harmonious and unified culture, one rooted in place (Hillis-Miller 1995:55).
Cultural geographer Yi-Fu Tuan likens space to movement and place to pauses – stops along the way: each pause in movement makes it possible for a location to be transformed into a place (cited in Cresswell 2004:8). Dissident poststructuralist Gilles Deleuze rethinks the nature of space and place as a “thinking space” – a region within the play of the world (Doel & Clarke 1994:106). Deleuze's ability to enliven the most depleated space, an exhausted text, a corner of a room or a stretch of pavement, signals that space itself is alive (Doel & Clarke 1994:106). This enlivenment of everyday spaces is the core of Deleuze’s nomadic thought (Doel & Clarke 1994:106). Deleuze’s nomad thought is always looking for creative encounters with texts, paintings, novels, situations and events. Thus thought is always encountered, situated and contingent. (Doel & Clarke 1994:104).

---

**Naming / Mapping**

Between each idea and each point of the itinerary, an affinity or a contrast can be established, serving as an immediate aid to memory (Calvino 1972:15).

…to scribble is to take possession of space (Butor 1994:20).

---

Drawings trace out the movement of figures one point to the next, from one time to another, thus creating an imaginary space. In this sense drawings are a kind of figural mapping of visual, metaphorical and imaginative passage through real and imagined spaces. The elements set up a dynamic field of relations between them and so maps landscapes of experience linked to specific places. These maps, based on the real landscape, charged now with the subjective meanings of the narratives enacted on it. Dispersed fragments gather topographical features into a design. This transformation re-names, rearranges, dismantles and scatters the features of the actual landscape. Changes in the real topography bring things separated in reality closer together.
The landscape in this case is not a pre-existing thing in itself. It is made into a landscape, a humanly meaningful space by the activity that takes place within it (Hillis-Miller 1995:21). In this way the landscape is transformed both materially and imaginatively through the act of drawing. Thus the drawing becomes a place. It is a ground where shapes and objects and figures gather and intersect – pauses along a narrative line. The configuration is open to interpretation laterally in relation to the layers piled on top of one another.

All of the drawings together may be thought of as transparencies superimposed in palimpsest on a map. Each transparency charts a different feature of the landscape underneath. Yet, the landscape is never a given, only the ways in which it has been drawn. There is no linear sequence. The drawings exist as a spatial array in which elements may be arranged in different orders and through various possible lines of exploration. Each can be connected to the other by a multitude of conceptual or figurative links.

Figure 3
In *Memoirs of the blind* Derrida draws interconnections between drawing, memory, speech, and place by formulating the trace as trait. The word *trait* in French preserves a range of meanings of the trace, from trait to a line, stroke or mark (Derrida 1993:2 trans.). According to Elkins (1998:19) this - the “arche-trace” - is the condition under which marks may emerge, become visible and have form. Elkins anticipates a gap, a between-space, as yet unarticulated but productive never the less, opened by these concepts of the trait.

According to Otto Pöggeler (1992:215) the theme of distance/proximity in the trace appears in Heidegger as a country path. The path opens up onto what Heidegger calls a ‘region’ - the clearing of things where one approaches “what names something other than what our names name” (Rapaport 1994:156). From Heidegger’s perspective the tracks, discloses that there has been walking, that someone has passed along the way (Rapaport 1994:61).

The metaphor of ‘path’ configures the idea of the trace as a silent confirmation that something has passed. Accordingly the trace construed as the mark of absence is fundamentally bound to memory. The trace here requires imaginary projection in which the absent returns to tell of its crossing (Rapaport 1994:163). It is through memory, that naming and tracing have a common ground. There is a transposition of real places into a “country of the mind” (Hillis-Miller 1995:19).
Wandering metaphors

Whereas travel creates fragmentation, the idea of journey is concerned with exploring the in-between, remaining open for adventure, the dialogue between here and there (Zyman & Cram 2006:163).

(The) nomad is not necessarily someone who moves around: some journeys take place in the same place, they’re journeys in intensity, and even historically speaking, nomads don’t move around like migrants. On the contrary, nomads are motionless, and the nomadic adventure begins when they seek to stay in the same place by escaping the codes (Deleuze 2004:259-260).

Nigel Thrift (1996:16) in his overview of theories on practice, Spatial formations, observes cultural geographer Michel de Certeau’s notion that practices can be discovered by spatial-symbolic metaphors like walking, pathways and the city. He writes, “Through the movements of the body and the powers of speech the subject (now a walker) can jointly produce the possibility of converting one spatial signifier into another” (Thrift 1996:16). New places and meanings, acts and footsteps, are produced and generate liberated spaces that can be occupied (Thrift 1996:16). The city is now a landscape, now a room.
The spatial-temporal nature of the trace, the associated paradox of absence / presence, and the implication of memory and wandering connects drawing with flânerie. The protagonist of this wandering practice of the trace is the 19th century stroller embodied by the flâneur. This metaphoric figure, first brought into being by Baudelaire in *The painter of modern life*, is a spectator and representative of modern life, specifically in relation to art and the sights of the city (Jenks 1995:146).

The image of flâneur assists Walter Benjamin in discovering and exploring the experiences and memories of the contemporary metropolitan environment. The flâneur transforms the decaying city into a place of reading and remembering. He exemplifies the contradictions of the city: the ruination of experience and the fragmentation of memory and conversely, the “deciphering of meaning” and the “recollection of lost moments” (Gilloch 2002:214).
I wander through China. Without ever having boarded a plane. My travels take place here in the Tokyo subways, in the backseat of a taxi. My adventures take me to the waiting room of a nearby dentist, to the bank teller’s window. I can go everywhere and don’t go anywhere (Murakami 2003:239).

The flâneur’s focus is directed at the tenuous traces - the marginalia and minutiae of the contemporary urban metropolis. He/she affords more importance to the inconspicuous, incidental details of everyday life (Muñoz 2005:3). Thus the flâneur’s concern is with the scattered indications in the external aspect of the space. This is the feature of the flâneur that I associate with most. This is where my work takes place, as illustrated by Room travel: recommended for those who fear high cliffs, robberies and tropical diseases (what if the world, Cape Town, 2006).

Figure 6

The drawings explore the physical and psychological aspects of journey. Everyday objects are collected and changed - cut into narrative threads (literally and metaphorically), and rejoined them in new narrative constellations - that is, narrative without story telling. The narratives are immediate and personal – they are travels without leaving the room: journeys of the imagination through contemporary myths.

Travel reactivates us to that which we are so accustomed to at home: Returning from elsewhere, our normal boring surroundings are suddenly interesting again, that is, until we become used to it again. The drawings (on paper or as objects) document real and imagined journeys across landscapes of physical places and metaphorical spaces. They create imaginary spaces where the viewer may rediscover the ordinary in day-to-day life.
Every voyage can be said to involve a re-siting of boundaries. The travelling self is here both the self that moves physically from one place to another, following “public routes and beaten tracks” within a mapped movement, and the self that embarks on an undetermined journeying practice, having constantly to negotiate between home and abroad, native culture and adopted culture, or more creatively speaking, between a here, a there, and an elsewhere (Trinh T. Minh-ha cited in Burton 2001:225).

I borrow cultural critic Chris Jenks’ (1995:156) view of postmodern flânerie as “a creative attitude”, an approach to knowledge, knowing and its social context, to re-appropriate figure of the flâneur in order to posit drawing as a kind of flânerie (and the drawer as flâneur). He argues the flâneur “must shake off the ‘blasé attitude’ and proceed to a critical appreciation of falsehood, fabrication and replication at the heart of postmodernity’s volatile network of meaning – so often symbolised as the ‘city’” (Jenks 1995:153). Accordingly, through the methodology of the flâneur drawing can be understood as an approach and a tool for observing, processing, and assimilating experiences of urban spaces. In this manner I posit drawing as a journeying practice that integrates drawn spaces with the inscription of lived spaces.

Figure 7
The notion of *flânerie* develops an understanding of drawing as a way of accumulating information through a process of accretion\(^{16}\). Drawing gathers fragments of visual stimulus, memories, and traces into the proximity of the page where they emerge cut from other contexts and original features but with new added accretions (Gilloch 2002:4). During the process of accretion deceptive surfaces of the objects are eroded and undetected meanings are unfolded. Objects are culled from their usual contexts, subjected to transformations and interventions that re-cognize/re-collect its significance and actualize its potential. In this way objects, texts and images are expelled from their usual contexts and recomposed in a palimpsest of contemporary constellations.

---

16 The term "accretion" is appropriated from Walter Benjamin’s formulation of the “afterlife of the object” (Gilloch 2002:4-5).
Collecting impressions

No, they are not Mythologies, but rather the collecting of certain incidents which week by week star my sensibility as it receives certain stimuli or discouragements from the world (Barthes 1985:116).

Every story is a travel story – a spatial practice. For this reason spatial practices concern everyday tactics....They are not satisfied with displacing the latter and transposing them into the field of language. In reality, they organise walks. They make the journey before or during the time the feet perform it (de Certeau cited in Thrift 1996:16-17).

Ganeri & Vassilopoulou (2005:8) writes journey becomes liveable “when the craving to ‘be there’ fades away to be replaced by a willingness to ‘become here’. To allow the fleeting moments of the journey itself to supply enough of stability for one to be at home”. This fragmentation of remembrance through traces and the possibility of reconstituting these fragments in new constellations indicate that drawing, like flânerie, is a way of moving through social space and place. Thus at the heart of this fluctuation, transience and instability lies the reassurance for the flâneur: the fleeting is transformed into the familiar and with this comes the relative stability that comes with the transitory itself. Integrated experience gives way to a residue of a plethora of discontinuous fragments of experience17.

But there is another important change: the space which is penetrated by the gatherer of impressions is organised according to aesthetic criteria: the space of passages is replaced by the social aesthetic space, in which the other (individual) also becomes an object of impressions, a surface able to awake our sensations (Frydryczak 2003:185).

Walter Benjamin’s figures of the collector and the flâneur act as metaphors for the postmodern way of participating in culture. Fragmentation, excess of impulses, impressions and selective approaches to reality are symptomatic of the postmodern city dweller. Beate Frydryczak (2003:182) proposes that Benjamin’s reflection on the figures of the flâneur and the collector suggest firstly that collecting can be understood as an activity in “material and social-cultural space”, and secondly, it can be understood as a way to make one’s own space, and in consequence to assert one’s identity in the urban environment.

17 Benjamin’s notion of mémoire involontaire - the experience of the flâneur and the condition of modern metropolitan memory - refers to memories that come unbidden in the surprise of momentary recognition (Gilloch 2002:219). The shock experience that is characteristic of the flâneur results both from the sensory overload and of jolts of memory.
The collector transforms objects into fragments. “In order to realise the significance of the
fragment it must be wrested from its usual context and assembled in a new constellation
alongside other fragments” (Frydryczak 2003:184). The process of disintegration and
ruination in which the object emerges from earlier contexts cut from some of its original
features but with new accretions added to it.

The collector’s gesture attains meaning through the destruction of the original context of the
object, followed by a construction, setting the object in a new order of things (Frydryczak
active to the extent that the negative is transmuted and converted into affirmative power: the
eternal joy of becoming”. 
This indicates an artistic practice which consists of recycling, re-positioning or re-using elements from previous contexts and a re-assembly of the fragments forged into a new work or image thereby creating an altogether new meaning. Through this critical strategy the postmodern flâneur can claim distance from the necessity to see objects as commodities. The collector strips the commodity quality of objects. For the collector, the everyday object loses its primary meaning and usefulness and becomes a souvenir full of different traces, as illustrated by Long words on a hot afternoon, a spatial drawing at blank projects, Cape Town, 2006.¹⁸

¹⁸ This installation is doodles with objects in space and time. The work is an experiment which plays with drawing’s potential as a direct act and the notion of drawing spatially through materials.
The figures of the collector and the flâneur anticipate the post-modern experience. From this perspective the collection abounding in gathering and walking leads to the shaping of ‘something’ by assembling attained objects and collected experiences into a synthesis, which comprises the postmodern collector/flâneur’s place in the world. This process of transferring things and impressions into the private sphere can be understood as an attempt to settle oneself in the world. In the process the collector/flâneur becomes a nomad through the formal and material languages of the city. From the perspective of the collector/flâneur the world becomes a space that is surprising, accidental and unexpected.
Thus, small things, marginal stories, and seemingly irrelevant events unfold into alternative paths through the past and present, opening gaps in monolithic memories, reversing our perspectives represented by hegemonic narratives, valorising a return to the personal and lyrical encounter with the everyday over discursive and critical investigations of an apparently obsolete postmodernism (Zyman & Cram 2006:169).

The notion of *flânerie* develops an understanding of drawing as a way of accumulating information through a process of accretion\(^{19}\). Drawing gathers fragments of visual stimulus, memories, and traces into the proximity of the page where they emerge cut from other contexts and original features but with new added accretions (Gilloch 2002:4). During the process of accretion deceptive surfaces of the objects are eroded and undetected meanings are unfolded. Objects are culled from their usual contexts, subjected to transformations and interventions that re-recognize/re-collect its significance and actualize its potential. In this way objects, texts and images are expelled from their usual contexts and recomposed in a palimpsest of contemporary constellations.

Guy Debord - leading figure of the Situationist International – offers a relevant perspective to the wandering methodology of the post-modern *flâneur* in the form of the concept of *dérive* (Jenks 1995:153). The *dérive* - literally a "drifting" - is a playful constructive practice through which psycho-geographies are realized. A psycho-geography depends on the walker being drawn into events, situations and images by abandonment to unexpected attraction (Jenks 1995:154). Thus a psycho-geography derives from a "mapping of an unrouted route which reveals both randomness and spatial intentionality (Jenks 1995:154).

Debord (cited in Ford 2005:34) writes

> In a *dérive* one or more persons during a certain period drop their usual motives and action…and let themselves be drawn by the attractions of the terrain and the encounters they find there.

Jenks (1995:155) argues the notion of *dérive* provides the *flâneur* with the tools for spatial irony: "The walker in *dérive*…can playfully and artfully ‘see’ the juxtaposition of elements that make up the city in new and revealing relationships”.

\(^{19}\) The term "accretion" is appropriated from Walter Benjamin’s formulation of the "afterlife of the object" (Gilloch 2002:4-5).
Emma Dexter (2005:6) elaborates,

(D)rawing exists at another level within the human psyche – it is a locus for signs by which we map the physical world, but it is itself the pre-eminent thing of being. Therefore, drawing is not a window on the world, but a device for understanding our place within the universe.

Thus the psyche of the post-structuralist subject is anchored in different ways: by narrative, by the recording of prediscursive experiences of the object, by language, and most importantly by the "unconscious imaginary, defined as ‘the key psychical mechanism through which human beings establish an imaginary relation with the self, others, received social meanings, and society” (Thrift 1996:21).

The psychical and the social run through each other. This implies that individuals and subjects blend with and connect to neighbourhood, local, regional, culture and aesthetic relations (Grosz cited in Thrift 1996:28). Drawing thus becomes a way through which particular lines of thought and personal relationships are explored.
**CONCLUSION**

**COMMON GROUND**

…art suggests a way for us to see the world in which we live, and, by seeing it, to accept it and to integrate it into our sensibility (Eco 1989:90).

More than a mere depository of treasured or controversial works of art, a nation’s culture is also an activity, a creative engagement with a rapidly changing present. It actively seeks to negotiate changing value and attributes toward a changing world (Adelson, L. A. 2003:244).

This research was conceptualised, from inception, as a project generated through process. It would be a research that would test the value of journey as lived along the way – a purposeful wandering through the realms of critical theory and creative practice – the conclusion, just another stop along the way.

My research has taken on the structure of a field that expands and contracts between very intimate drawings on paper and large-scale routes through physical urban spaces. Along the way drawing has become the common thread which guides my reworking of cultural content through object based work, collaboration, teaching and site specific projects. These diverse aspects are drawn together by the central concern with drawing and its potential as a medium though which one inscribes one’s presence in the world and in relation to people. It is at once an affirmation of one’s presence in the world and a way of defining one’s space / place.

The text has attempted to write in the area where language and theory intersects with that which takes place simultaneously, silently graphically. It has defined drawing as the sum of its parts: mark making, inscription, trace, process and product. Drawing has been shown to encompass all these aspects simultaneously. I have used discourses on the immediacy of the gesture and the trace to extend the use of drawing in my work as a vehicle to move from the private, immediate, intuitive space of the page to everyday urban places. Drawing, in the context of my work has become a way – a journey through materials and places.

The text positions drawing as silent dialogue and as situated spatial practice. Accordingly, the first part of the text traces conceptions of drawing as process and product in relation to
the proximity of drawing and handwritten texts. These themes are embodied by the notion of drawing as a silent dialogue. I investigate the possibilities of drawing as a way of communicating in ways other than through writing and speech, concluding that drawing happens between the legible and the illegible, between speaking and silence. This notion of a silent dialogue stages drawing as a place where words make contact with what they cannot say. Here, it is possible to move between movement and stasis, the real and what is possible, and the improbable synthesis of waking life and the imagination. Thus drawing’s ability to alternate between its being a site, a place, and an imaginary space, locates it as a complex space within which knowing and feeling evolve.

These thoughts set the stage for expanding traditional notions of drawing beyond the limits of the page by confirming drawing as a spatial practice. All relevant associations of the trace are explored in substantiation: The trace as a diving line, a link between memory and the present moment, the trace as inscription. The trace is the vehicle through which the graphic line is extended materially and metaphorically into three-dimensional spaces. In short, it allows the viewer to cross the borders between the senses, pulling the present into shape and endowing it with meaning. It is through these notions of the trace that drawing is cast as a journeying through lived and imagined spaces within the edges of a page as well as the infinite expanse of the world. The gesture and the trace form a symbolic constellation in which drawing is shown as a space of transformation. The intuitive visual responses of the drawing process are transformed into a way of participating in and responding to lived experience in contemporary urban spaces. In this manner drawing makes possible a transposition of real places into the region of the imagination and vice versa.

During this wandering through theories on drawing, the drawer/author is likened to a nomad who wanders between formal and material landscapes with which she affirms and explores her presence in the world. The figure and its ground come to mean subject and world. I identify this wandering attitude of the drawer with that of a postmodern flânerie: a creative approach to observing, processing, and assimilating the experience of urban life. Drawing as a journeying practice integrates drawn worlds with the inscription of lived spaces - ultimately it presents a way of being-in-the-world, here, now, in this moment. This conceptual, material and visual pliability of drawing makes it possible to imagine and explore potential spaces and by extension enlivening depleted (urban) spaces.
Nicolas Bourreaud (2002:23) writes that to produce form is to invent possible encounters; to receive a form is to create the conditions of exchange. The poetic function of drawing subjective constellations would have little meaning if it did not assist us in bridging the rifts between experience and expression and transforming individual experiences into cultural common ground. The line continues beyond the edge of this page as a place of departure for endless future journeys.
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Figure 14

Afrikan Tähti: Digging for Gold\(^{20}\) is the culmination of a series of collaborations with artist Liza Grobler. During the last 5 years we have collaborated on site-specific urban interventions which focus our preoccupation of drawing in the landscape with concerns regarding exploitation of natural resources and urban development. Afrikan Tähti: Digging for Gold brings together our collaborations in Cape Town, on Finnish territory. The project links urban development in South-Africa to art incentives in Finland. The project was commissioned by the Lönnstrom Art Museum in Rauma for Common Ground: Raumars 10 years.

Figure 15

The project is based on the Finnish board game “Afrikan Tähti” (translated: “Star of Africa”). The aim of this popular Scandinavian game (non-existent in Africa), is to find precious stones in different countries on the African continent. Whoever finds the “African Star” first\(^{21}\), wins the game. On the quest for riches a player will accumulate lesser gems as well as bandits (who confiscate your assets) and horse shoes (for good luck). The game also includes a half-way stop at Cape Town.

Our work consists of a public “explorer” route through the town of Rauma which mimics this game. An aerial perspective of the route would reveal it to be in the shape of the African continent. The participants trace the outline of the African continent over the landscape of Rauma by walking along the indicated route.

---

\(^{20}\) A brief outline of the project is presented here. Extensive documentation is available online at www.afrikantahti.blogspot.com.

\(^{21}\) The African Star is a 516 ½ karat diamond found in the then Transvaal province of South Africa a century ago. Ironically, this gem is in the British crown jewels.
The blank arrows are markers that trace the route through the town and connect the walker to the physical features of the city and to implied psycho-geographies.
Yellow-and-black Cape 07 arrows (re-cycled and re-produced) from Cape Town’s first grand-scale art event\textsuperscript{22}, points toward interesting details of the city en route. The signs are employed here in a different context to link two distant physical spaces: Cape Town / Rauma.

\textsuperscript{22} Cape ‘07 was a brave attempt to develop a large-scale visual arts event for Africa that would be “not another biennale”. Due to lack of resources and sponsors not delivering to their promises, the event turned out to be more of a grand-scale Capetonian affair, with only those in the know able to recognise and “find” the exhibitions and projects scattered throughout the city. Nonetheless, over 300 artists participated, providing a hub of activity and proving that Southern Africa’s boisterous creative energy will flourish even though we are still “digging for gold” to fund the ideas.
In our version of the game there were two stops along the route: CAIRO and TANGIERS. At CAIRO participants were served grilled sausages by two South African-style burglars, complete with balaclavas. Here we link with a cultural similarity – grilling food on open fires – and a contrast – South Africa’s endemic crime problem and the safety of life in Finland.
At TANGIERS, the blacksmith’s monument which commemorates the C15th forge, two women with flower headdresses explain the rules of horse shoe throwing to the participants. The headdresses link with the lace-making traditions of the Rauma region and the Voortrekker kappie.
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The following pages documents Strange things travel with you presented as parallel visual research and contextualization of this text.
ADDENDUM C

PRESS FILE

Die Burger, 13 February 2007
Michael Taylor at the US Gallery and Jeanne Hoffman at blank projects
by Adrienne van Eeden

Two recent exhibitions offered not only a challenge to conventional illustrative narrative, but also an alternative to our often compartmentalised understanding of artworks.

Although Michael Taylor's MA(FA) degree show, 'Title Sequence', appears to fit very well into those time-honoured categories of painting and drawing, the viewer is presented with a situation where he/she cannot simply use prior knowledge of pictorial codes to 'interpret' the work. Taylor's electronic flipbook series, *Immediate Nonsense*, offers a very direct confrontation of the viewer/reader's understanding of the much-debated relationship between image and text. The titles mostly evoke something far removed from what the pictures represent - a partnering of seemingly incongruous things that often characterises 'nonsense art'.

Despite the obvious skill, wit and idiosyncratic sense of humour demonstrated by these illustrations, the presentation thereof does (unfortunately?) provide one with a somewhat immediate sense of gratification. The juxtaposition, however, of the large-scale charcoal drawings (*Staged Disasters*) and set of miniature paintings (*The Gift*) creates a subtle and much more successful site for the imagination. The drawings in *Staged Disasters* bear witness to a self-reflective (and self-conscious) realisation of the contrived nature of narrative structure. Furthermore: the method of display, which forces the viewer to navigate the long hall in order to 'discover' the titles of each of the paintings suspended from the ceiling in *The Gift*, allows for a delayed spatial experience of an otherwise two-dimensional medium.

Jeanne Hoffman, who prefers to identify the (mostly three-dimensional) work in the installation 'Long Words on a Hot Afternoon' with drawing, creates a poetic environment in which the process (rather than simply the product) of drawing is challenged. Although the viewer is given very few specific interpretative guidelines, this 'drawing out' or unravelling of memories and narratives is echoed by the use of materials such as newspaper, cut-up clothing and embroidery thread. Akin to Taylor's work, the 'drawings' are deceptively nonchalant. They are, however, the result of a highly personal and deliberate re-working of materials and make allusions to both Spanish Magic Realism and so-called ' Outsider Art'. Hoffman's intentional subversion of 'acceptable' methods of gallery display and spatial orientation, as well as her refusal to create a clear differentiation between the two- and three-dimensional translations of her thought processes, make for a slightly awkward, yet imaginative and thought-provoking exhibition.

*Michael Taylor's 'Title Sequence' showed at the University of Stellenbosch Art Gallery from January 23 - 28, while Jeanne Hoffman's 'Long Words on a Hot Afternoon' showed at blank projects from January 18 - 27. Both have recently completed their Master's in Illustration at the University of Stellenbosch.*

Review and photographs by Adrienne van Eeden

January 2006, [www.artthrobco.za](http://www.artthrobco.za)
Afrikan Tähteä kotimaisemissa

Etä-afrikkalaiset taitelijat Joanna Hoffman ja Lisa Großer ovat kehittäneet yli 50 vuotta vanan Afrikan Tähti -taustapeliä ympäristölle kaupunkilaistemessä.

Pelin aikana ilmestyy kilpikonna, joka varrella on kahden tilastollisiin päätyyn tulen mielenkiintoisia kysymyksiä. Keskustelun kuljettajat ovat ohjaavat kulttuurin, ja taitelijat tavoittavat, että myös ilmestys pukutässä olisi pelin aikana keskustelua.

Ravamalla Afrikan Tähti-löytää lapsit käyrää ja pelaavia ja ammattilaisia paljastaa 0.30 alkaen. Samaa vikennuksen loppuna järjestettävänä myös miinitilaisuuden Rauman tanssinäytöksen kunniaa.

Synttärit kaupunkilaisten kanssa

Gestaalit Rauman taidelöytäjät kutsuvat kaupunkilaisia vietämään taidevikonloppua.

Länsi-Suomi, 26 October 2007
Päivän väri: keltainen

Raauman kaupungin ja seurue on uusiin
järjestelyihin rakennuttamassa hobby-
ja harrastusliikkeeseen. Kaupungin
kin yhteistyöä Albinen Tähten
Hämeenkyllän kesä-elokuvayksikkö
seurailee myös kelloja.

Kangasissa tapahtunut mi-
keitelényö kiloi heti asuimilla
tavanomaisen partion. Kangas-
kaupunki Päiväteko on käynyt
hobbielämän liittymänä.

Päivän väri: keltainen. Kuningas
ja hänen tän-
näköisiä iätä-Maala ottavat kauneimman
asiat. Kaksi upeaan korina-
teelle varustettu ajastusista. Päivä
jutellaan erilaiset perhe-
metsäiset ja suurta merkity-
ä, Kangasissa tapahtuva

Länsi-Suomi, 11 November 2007
Sini sai vihdon tatuoinnin

Tapahtumat

Petra ja Pavla Valentova aikeroivat kunnolla hennapisteja raumalaiskäsin.

Afrikan Tahti -kaupunkitaidepeli sai Fannin ja Maisan katsomaan tuttuja maisemia uusin silmin.
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