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Introduction

The doctoral programme has supported my transformation from a printmaker and digital media artist to a painter. It has enabled me to reevaluate and re-embrace my practice as an artist, and has brought me to a point where I have focus in my practice in terms of concept, media, technique, methodology and professional practice.

My work uses paint and digital media to interrogate the complexity of romantic love and the emotional ‘between-ness’ of relationships. Paint is handled as an expressive, performative medium that aims to capture moments of the artist’s inner dialogue and emotional state. Digital media is used to create moving paintings that meld and conjoin figures to produce troubled, interrupted forms. Oversized watercolour portraits of flirtatious, angry, sad, confused, and unspecified individuals confront us as audience. Images of passionate kisses form psychodramatic landscapes of characters locked in moments of unbridled lust, caring embrace, or dramatic end. Each image is a moment that presages the possibility of tragedy and the loss of the innocent adolescent ideal of the endless embrace.

This report is divided into sections. ‘Autobiographical Context’ briefly outlines the 15 years of my practice prior to the programme. ‘Creative Practice and Theory’ forms the main body of my reflective, contextual and critical analysis of my practice throughout the 5 years of the programme. ‘Professional Practice’ provides and annotated resume of exhibitions, presentations and other professional engagements, followed by details of selected projects. The conclusion collates my overall final position. The appendices provide context by outlining an abridged version of Roland Barthes A Lovers Discourse; Fragments, and a list of films that I have watched and analysed, observing at the kiss scenes.
Autobiographical context

I made a decision to become an artist at 10 years old, after I looking at *A Picture History of Art* (1979) by Christopher Lloyd. His book introduced me to both art and the erotic by providing me, the prepubescent adolescent, with images of architecture, sculpture and the nude. There were no other books about art in my immediate environment, and the idea of being an artist was unthinkable in my family culture.

30 years later the residual experience of looking at this book continues to have influence both in terms of the material practice of visual research and collage methodology, my use of contextual reference, and my play with the psychological signifiers of implied autobiographical narrative frameworks.

*A Picture History of Art* functioned as library of images that, as a youth, I ‘surfed’ in a manner that is similar to my visual research methodologies using digital search engines on the worldwide web. The untutored reading of the book allowed me to initialise a joyful, non-hierarchical, un-interpreted experience of art history and provided a contextual framework for my practice and creative methodology. It also provided scenarios for autoerotic fascination and for the development of an internal psychosexual dialogue.

Throughout the 1990s and early 2000s, a postmodern attitude continued to inform my research context and practice methodology through digital imaging, collage, print, psychoanalysis, postmodern theory and cultural studies. Key to my studio research was Lacan’s work on the development of identity, separation anxiety and the construction of ‘libidinal dynamism’ (Lacan, J: 1936) and Winnicott’s theories on the ‘transitional object’ (Winnecott, D: 1953). Theoretically, the work functioned as a model of Lacanian psychoanalysis and as a discourse on the fractured nature of the postmodern identity and the futility inherent in libidinal desire.

Digital technology and the use of computers in visual research and the making of art remained consistent throughout my creative practice history from the late 1980s to the present time. In the late 1980s I
started to use computers to make my first digital works, taking the computer into the life drawing room. Printed output was then used to produce screenprints and paintings. In the mid 1990s at the Royal College of Art I digitally appropriated Agostino Carracci erotic engravings as part of a discourse on the hidden currency of erotica in the history of printmaking, using digital technology enable me to discretely transform and reframe their narratives. For example, the characters in *Susanna and the Elders* [figure 1] were transformed by copying and reflecting Susanna’s face and hair onto one of the Elder characters, re-rendering the scene as a scenario of mirrored identity.

![Figure 1: Hedley Roberts (1996), *Susannah and the Elders*
Screenprint on paper, 120 x 100 cm, UK Private Collection.](image)

Between the late 1990s and early 2000s I worked extensively with digital print, video and performance. I invented character I called *Horsehead* [Figure 2] and another called *Goatfucker* [Figure 3], that occupied liminal spaces at the edge of my psychosexual character, but also made contextual reference to art history.
Figure 2: Hedley Roberts (1998), *Horsehead Brixton*
Digital Print, 130 x 70 cm, UK Private Collection

*Horsehead* [Figure 2] wore a latex sculpture of a horse’s head that had no airvents, and would restrict the wearer’s actions. The *Goatfucker* character and scene was a post-modern play on the Pan and Nymph copulating images, ‘erotic’ artworks and engravings and ‘stag’ films. These dark works occupied a intense emotional space and were made as reflection on the masquerades of sexual identity in response to reading *Womanliness as a Masquerade* (Riviere, J: 1929)

In 2006, after three years of working on digital network projects and not producing images, I began painting as an antidote to working exclusively with digital technology. In 2007 I joined the Professional Doctorate in Fine Art.
A Country Alliance [Figure 4] represents the first significant work that I made whilst on the doctorate programme. Completed in early 2008, the work consists of a diptych of two 5ft x 4ft paintings. The work operates as a discourse on a relationship, and common with many of my works, arises out of a semi-autobiographical narrative via a complex of references.

I began A Country Alliance when I lived on a country estate in Hampshire. The land was owned by Lord Baring of Baring’s bank, and the house was one of several thatched cottages in a workers village. The farm workers cottages houses were being bought up by and influx of new residents who enjoyed pheasant beating and shooting, keeping their dogs and updating their houses in the country style.

The left figure is painted onto William Morris’ Willow printed textiles (reprinted by Sanderson: 2009), and is a composite character who is constructed in body and costume from the 1995 BBC movie production of Pride and Prejudice (Lee [Dir]; 1995). The head is Landseer’s ‘Monarch of
the Glen’ (Landseer: 1851), reputedly Queen Victoria’s favourite painting, which is housed in the Houses of Parliament. Accompanying this is a second panel on William Morris’ *Fruit* printed textile (reprinted by Sanderson: 2009). The figure is Merle Oberon, appropriated from the 1945 film production of *A Song to Remember* (Vidor [Dir.]; 1945), where Oberon plays George Sand, the female writer notorious for her wearing of men’s clothes, her mannish ways and unorthodox love life. Merle Oberon was born to a 15-year-old Anglo-Sinhalase mother, and an unknown father (Delofski; 2002) Throughout her life, Merle Oberon’s parentage and ethnicity was hidden, firstly when her Grandmother brought her up as her daughter, and then when Oberon sought to hide the visible qualities of her mixed race through chemical means. Later, after a car accident left her facially scarred, she sought to employ careful lighting to affect her appearance. Indirectly, Oberon’s anxiety about her appearance made a significant contribution to the development of light and filming techniques for cosmetic ‘enhancement’ for media. (Higham & Moseley; 1983)

In its postmodern construction, *Countryside Alliance* [Figure 4] creates an allegory of masquerade in its use of reference to actors, narratives and characters that have slippery identities in both reality and fiction. Its use of the William Morris textile generates a reference to ‘country’ lifestyle living that is also a slippery and inconsistent status signifier.

In 2008, I began to think about whether paintings could be ‘experientially sentimental’ in the same way as popular love songs. In this period, I returned to re-reading familiar structuralist / post-structuralist writers, and in particular, the ‘Mirror Phase’ work in Lacan (Lacan, 1977), ‘abjection’ in Kristeva (Kristeva; 1982, 1987), the ‘author’ Barthes (Barthes; 1972, 1975) and ‘gender & identity’ in Butler (Butler; 1990, 1993) in the context of phenomenological experience. This was in an attempt to understand of phenomenology and the work of Husserl (Bernet [ed.]; 1993), Heidegger (Heidegger; 1977, Wrathall; 2005), Merleau-Ponty (Merleau-Ponty; 1964) and Buber. In the midst of this reading I found Roland Barthes text *A Lovers Discourse; Fragments*, (Barthes; 1977) and began to see how a textual work could function as reference, but also as a kind of personal narrative projected into the audience space.
At the time, I began to see Barthes fragments as a one sided dialogue with a beloved, and that this had similarities to love songs.

"Throughout any love life, figures occur to the lover without any order, for on the occasion they depend on an (internal or external) accident. Confronting each of these incidents (what “befalls” him), the amorous subject draws on the reservoir (the thesaurus?) of figures, depending on the needs, the injunctions, or the pleasures of his image repertoire. Each figure explodes, vibrates in and out of itself like a sound severed in any tune – or is repeated to satiety, like the motif of a hovering music. No logic links the figures, determines their contiguity: the figures are non-syntagmatic, non-narrative; they are Erinyes; they stir, collide, subside, return, vanish with no more order than the flight of mosquitoes. Amorous dis-cursus is not dialectical; it turns like a perpetual calendar, an encyclopedia of affective culture."

Roland Barthes – A lover’s Discourse; Fragments (Barthes; 1977, p9)

In this collection of writings, Barthes attempts to detail, very precisely, an anatomy of love and desire from the perspective of the lover of the beloved. Unrelenting in its analysis of the language of love, Barthes examines such topics as jealousy, absence, embarrassment, ravishment, thoughts of suicide, fetishistic behaviour. He considers various love scenes and encounters, and relates the experience of the suffering of passion.

The book is constructed around the idea of ‘figures’. These are sessions of language as ‘fragments’ of discourse about the language of love. The text has the personal feel of a contemplative journal or diary. Each ‘chapter’ entry is headed by a “topic”, which Barthes states is “half coded, half projective”, as a turn of phrase or argument that operates as a title, in a manner similar to the titles of a contemporary work of art. For example, “Special Days”, “Blue Coat and Yellow Vest”, “I Am Odious”. Each topic is followed by a word that contextualises the topic. For example, “Blue Coat and Yellow Vest” is followed by “Habit”. This is underwritten by a “Matrix Sentence” that is not a completed message, but
a “mutilated sentence” that functions indicatively. In the case of “Blue Coat and Yellow Vest” the sentence reads

“Any affect provoked or sustained by the clothing which the subject has worn during the amorous encounter, or wears with the intention of seducing the loved object.” (Barthes; 1977)

Barthes has annotated each paragraph with the name of a writer, philosopher, philosophy or friend that has been quoted or referred to. Other than this structuring, each figure is written individually with no particular observation of pattern, length or style. Occasionally they appear to break off, as if the thought was discontinued. In other fragments, the subject text is ruthless in its pursuit of a reading. For example, “I Love You” covers nine pages whilst “Aubade” is a single page. The figures are not in any particular order or classification, and neither is there a narrative to the collective fragments. It does not read as a story of love that can be identified as accompanying a specific relationship or amorous encounter, although on reading it is apparent that these are not observations but experiences.

Barthes text operates laterally and interconnectedly, without specific time or narrative. Each figure or fragment ‘soliloquy’ exists as a discursive ‘site’ for his thoughts and stimulates those of the reader. Barthes texts emerge from the texts of others, equally valuing the expressions of friends and eminent writers and thinkers. His ‘fragments’ are each, in themselves, discussions with his experiences and are informed by the totality of his knowledge and understanding through a wide variety of sources that include the Tao, Sade, Freud, Lacan, Mann, Werther, Sappho, haiku, The Marriage of Figaro, Leibnitz and many others. Barthes aim is for the reader to make the text ‘live’ through the experience of reading these private soliloquies and affirmations via their own subjectivity and personal experience, thereby rendering meaning themselves.

As an alternative to the traditional notion of the ‘author’ as the genius creator of text from the powers of imagination, Barthes posits the “scriptor” who combines pre-existing texts in new ways, drawing on all pre-existing texts, norms and conventions to enable new understanding. Barthes terms this kind of writing ‘writerly text’ as enabling the reader to
'write’ or ‘produce’ meaning through the active act of reading, rather than passively consuming authored meaning. “Writerly text is ourselves writing, before the infinite play of the world is traversed, intersected, stopped, plasticized by some singular system (ideology, Genus, Criticism) which reduces the plurality of networks, the infinity of languages”.

Barthes notion of the “scriptor” as a writer who draws upon all preexisting texts and combining them, intertextually, to create new works has particular significance in relation to my creative practice history and my approach to collage as a method for generating visual practices that explore psychological frames and narratives. The practice of collage is also common to many artists who have influenced my practice over the years.

In “Androgyny, Spectatorship, and the Weimar Photomontages of Hannah Höch”, Maud Lauvin (Lauvin; 1990) analyses the collage methodology of Hoch’s work in relation to the artist’s sexual and psychological identity via Hoch’s “Marlene” of 1930. Lauvin’s writing gives evidence of how we can interpret meaning from the collaged image and connote a notion of the autobiography of the artist.
Lauvin writes that Hoch "generates an oscillation between a male heterosexual position and a female homosexual one. Although the fetishized legs are viewed by two men in the lower right corner, both the mouth and the word "Marlene" - by being presented frontally, out of the narrative space are offered directly as objects of desire to the viewer... the viewer can choose either to engage with the name and fragmented body parts as objects of desire, and/or to identify with the two men as surrogates, since the men are defined as spectators. For the female viewer, this choice represents a selection between a female homosexual gaze of desire (directly confronting the delicious lips and the admired name) and a male heterosexual gaze of desire...” Lauvin identifies that Hoch’s engagement with liminality in representational language is explored, in part, as an autobiographical discourse on her own sexual
desires and relationships as contextualized by contemporary psychoanalytic thinking dominated by Freud.

In my own work, images collected from media, film advertising and personal photographs are used as source material to build complex compositions that obliquely intimate an autobiography.

Figure 5: Left: *La Belle et La Bête*, (1946) film still, Jean Cocteau (Dir)

Figure 6: Right: Hedley Roberts (2008) *La Belle Bête*, Digital Sketch. UK Collection of the Artist.

*La Belle Bête* [Figure 8] is a digital montage sourced from a photograph of Loretta Young. In this image she clutches a rose as a symbol of love. In the photo manipulation, I have continued her hair over her head and face to render her as both the beauty and the beast from Jean Cocteau’s 1946 film adaptation. The *Loretta* work became the source material for *La Belle Bête* 2008, Oil on veneered chipboard panel.
Digital technology is the predominant medium used throughout my visual research and collage synthesis stage of image making. Digital Tools created for photographic imaging provide opportunities to re-approach an image formally, re-evaluating the structure of the composition in terms of the assets in the image, scale, placement, perspective, and aspect ratio. It also provides mechanisms for challenging the representational qualities of the image in terms of ‘painterly’ affectations by allowing the adjustment of focus, blurring, blending transparency, and overlay. Colour can be completely re-evaluated at any stage in the image, and with the combination of digital photography the painting itself can be re-evaluated, in progress by re-sampling, and digital adjustment. The large variety of digital filters and effects offered in software an in digital camera ‘APPs’ can allow any image to be affected by specific colour palettes. For a specific approach, the colour palette of any image can be applied to any other,
giving opportunities for the conceptual approach of applying the colour values of a historical painting over one's own work.

Despite the flexibility of the digital medium for planning and execution, the visual synthesis stages of creative process remain largely intuitive. I immerse myself in a landscape of images, texts, narratives, sound, music, and thoughts. These items are collected in a haphazard ‘magpie’ fashion, without attempt at an ordered ‘body’. Images are tried, tested, reimaged, sometimes once or twice, sometimes hundreds of times until they are unrecognisable from the original sources. Usually it is the introduction of an unexpected element into this landscape of images that figures and forms the opportunity for the first ideas. In this sense, the chaos of my digital files and semantic searches function like the floor of Francis Bacon’s studio where images are randomly juxtaposed to create opportunities for new combinations. (Peppiatt; 2012)

For example, the three images above were selected from a body of visual research into the pinafore dress that featured around 200 images. The image on the left arrived very early on in the process. I was particularly interested in the pose and the way that the crossed legs looked. However the work was not conceived until I found the image in the centre and on the right. These images are of the ‘Dolly’ sisters, stars of the vaudeville stages and early cinema, who were both the lover of the retail magnate Harry Gordon Selfridge (Chapman; 2006). These images were composited, with several others to make the work Suspended, Void [Figure 10] that was realised in 2009, some 8 months after beginning the work.
My ‘immersion’ in the creative process may be understood through the concept of psychodynamic ‘flow’ (Csikszentmihalyi; 1996). Psychodynamics is the study of the balance of energies in the psyche and is analogous to the concept of thermodynamics. Jung, building on the work of Freud, developed the theory of psychodynamics and identified Libido, Entropy, and Equivalence as core elements of the psychodynamic landscape. (Laplanche; 1974). According to Jung, the psyche takes energy from its environment and distributes it among the various psychic systems e.g. libido, progression, regression, and canalisation and entropy. (Laplanche; 1974) Entropy, generally speaking, is the visualisation of energy that cannot be converted to activity and refers to the measure of energy that is random, lost (misplaced), or unavailable to the action of the system. In this analogy, I consider my methodological process as psychodynamically entropic, where the ‘lost energy’ is what has not been compounded into the complex that is the artwork, but is essential to the process. This might be the ideas that are lost, the images that do not directly become integrated into the collage, the scraps of paint on the
palette, the learning of new software, the forgotten ‘inspirations’, the narrative stories that fill my head when I’m painting, or the music that I listen to. In the visual research process this unavailable energy is in the 1000s of images collected that inform the coalesces of ideas, in the digital processes it is within the photo montages and sketches that are obliterated by changes, alterations and deletions, and it is also in the process of abandonment, where the idea ceases to have momentum. In my watercolour on gesso works, this process has can be found in the technique of washing, ‘lifting’ and removal of pigment from the image to reveal the base support or staining. In my most recent oil paintings it can be found in the scrubbing out or obliteration of the previous layer of image, or in the drips that run away from the image, or in the painting that is abandoned unresolved. All these are essential to the system of creative production, but are dispelled during the process, and may not be evident in the finality of the outcome.

I conceive of my image making practice as a form of psychodynamic psychotherapy that allows me to work through psychodramatic scenarios and emotional landscapes as a method that enables to be to imagine and create scenes of a semi-autobiographical or biographical nature. This process forms structures that are drawn from my psychological landscape, but realised as fictions. Much of this work is contextualised by psychoanalytical theory, and in particular the ideas around twinning, conjoinment, mirroring, otherness, reflection are influenced by Lacan’s Mirror stage. In the ‘Mirror Stage’, the infant child is able to recognise a specular image of itself in the mirror, but as yet is not fully able to co-ordinate it’s movement and therefore perceives it’s self as a fragmented ‘other’, leading rivalry and tension between the subject and the other. When the misrecognition of the image as the self occurs this creates an ‘imaginary order’. The infant then turns towards the omnipresent maternal figure for assurance of it’s own precarious self mastery, thereby ‘calling upon’ the symbolic order.

In 2009 I began the conjoin:me art-fashion collaboration with Sian-Kate Mooney. [Figure 11]. We had secured a solo show for our collaboration at SuperDeluxe in Tokyo Japan. The collaborative works were based around the notion of ‘conjoined practice’ as a model for
collaboration, where two artists attempt to ‘fuse’ together different practices without working together, side by side on developing the same body of work. The themes of conjoinment, twinning and merging we present in both of our works, and these became key concepts.

In the project Sian-Kate Mooney's work used fashion pattern cutting methods to join together garments and furniture into sculptural forms that has parallels with my 'collage' methodology. Our working methodology was contextualized by those of Schiaparelli (Schiaparelli; date) Dali, and in particular, the ‘Tear Dress’ of 1938 (Dali; date). Within
the practice, Sian was largely responsible for the 3D forms, and I developed the 2D using printed textiles as a substrate for ‘trompe l’oeil’ paintings that negotiated the patterns and forms. Material sources for the collage continued to be films and photographs from 1940s Hollywood cinema, as a visual signifier of ‘romance’ that was utilized as a method for disarming the viewer gaze on the abhorrent quality of the conjoined forms.

Figure 11: Photo Mari, M (2008)


Installation SuperDeluxe Gallery, Tokyo.
In total we produced four large-scale works for an installed, site-specific show that used live models, animated backdrops and audio soundscapes.

Throughout the 2009-11 period, Roland Barthes *A Lovers Discourse* continued to be a predominant influence in the conceptual and emotional development stages of the creative activity. This “brazier of meaning” (Barthes; 1977) provided by Barthes ensures a wide range of narrative possibilities for reflection on one’s own ‘loving’ and ‘being loved’. Barthes ‘Figures’ become useful emotive or intellectual frameworks on which to hang a thread of semantic or visual discourse. For example, “To Love Love”; “annulation / annulment”, the “Explosion of language during which the subject manages to annul the loved object under the volume of love itself: by a specifically amorous perversion, it is love the subject loves, not the object.” This ‘figure’ becomes a way of thinking about one’s relationship with a relationship, a specific scene, or the way one fetishises a material object.
In *The Everafter Series* [Figure 13-15], I began working with notions of masculinity and anxiety. This work revisited my undergraduate engagements with Judith Butler’s ideas around the ‘performative nature of gender identity’ and in particular the idea that “Gender is an identity tenuously constituted in time, instituted in an exterior space through a stylised repetition of acts.” (Butler; 1993) This, coupled with the intertextual method negotiated via Barthes provided a playful site for emotive performance and contemplative subjectivity.

The source material for the compositions maps to the central theme of masculinity explored, e.g. John Wayne, Somerset Maugham, ‘gender-bending’ characters from the London club scene, and ‘gendered’ masks from Borneo. The work references specific film narratives, for example,
John Huston’s 1967 film *Reflections in a Golden Eye* starring Marlon Brando and Liz Taylor. (Huston [Dir.]; 1967) This film tells the story of a relationship between a repressed homosexual military man and his wife. Each of these narratives considers the tension created by ‘expected’ performances of traditional roles.

Figure 13: Hedley Roberts (2010) *The Everafter Series (reflections, golden eye)*

Watercolour on Paper, 152 x 124 cm. UK; Collection of the Artist
The EverAfter Series of the 2009-10 period featured significant concentration on materials and methodologies. Through the making of these works I became increasingly interested in the qualities of the brush marks themselves, and in a search for more ‘painterly’ expressive marks. I began to use the qualities of the ground, the under-painting, the glazes and the impasto to inform the image, varying the pace and energy of application to examine how this transforms the visual ‘flow’ in the image.

Throughout this process I reviewed the contemporary context of my practice as a ‘painter’, considering the works of a wide range of artists and artists who might be considered contemporary ‘figurative’ painters whose works maintain a psychodramatic narrative presence within the subtext of their work. A brief summary of these artists includes Liz Neal, Christoph Schmidberger, Michael Borremans, Karen Kilimnik, Elizabeth Peyton, Luc Tuymans, Martin Eder, Muntean / Rosenblum, Cecily Brown, Chantal Joffe,
Marlene Dumas, Paul P and Mamma Andersson In 2010-11, I further expanded this group of artists to include Gavin Nolan, Adrian Ghenie, Mercedes Helwin, Eric White, Ling Jian, Wilhelm Sasnal, Alexander Tinei, Simone Haack, Phillip Jones, Richard Wathen and Dan Coombes.

Common to the practice of these artists is a visceral, corporeal use of the painting medium as a language within the image making. Each of these artists uses the viscosity of paint and the medium on the substrate to evidence the painterly quality of their works. Throughout, each of these artists engages a dialogue with painting as discourse, generating tensions between the illusory, mimetic potential of the medium and the physical material qualities to elucidate the tension between the inner world of the artist and the outer reality that the work exists within.

The artist that has had the most influence throughout the doctorate, in terms of practice, has been the Belgian artist Michael Borreman. Borreman’s paintings create psychodramatic narrative discourses with a limited palette, traditional technique and use of photographic images and collages as a point of reference.
"I try to show figures—I don’t want to use the word “individuals”; they’re not individuals. I try to place them in a space that is familiar yet undefined. It’s very strange. I used to make images that were based on photographs from the 1930s or ‘40s, but that was too recognizable. I heard that the work was nostalgic, and that was absolutely not the idea. So I try to avoid that, and now I usually work with models who pose for me. I have a room in my studio where I photograph them. It’s a room that’s anonymous, with a certain light—I call it my “Earth Light Room,” like in the spaceship in 2001: A Space Odyssey, where they have an “Earth Light Room,” whatever that might be. So it’s an artificial environment.” (Borremans; 2008)

Borremans also makes films, and makes paintings from his films. The films themselves have no narrative plot, but are scenes observed from a static camera where characters are suspended or move very slowly. An essay by the Italian critic Massimiliano Gioni speaks of Borremans work as having a “sense of immobility” in the parallel world
that he creates. Ann Demeester, Director of De Appel, Amsterdam calls Borremans films ‘moving paintings’, referring to the scenes as “images that are content with remaining unrevealed, pleased with speaking in tongues without being fully understood.” (Demeester, Gioni, Michaud; 2008) Phillipe-Alain Michaud, Film Curator at the Musée national d’art moderne-Centre Georges-Pompidou speaks of Borremans films in relation to the act of painting and the material conjuring that occurs in the creation process, “If Borremans’ films are effectuated paintings, this picture [The Performance, 2002], may be the matrix of this transubstantiation, a painting of a painting: a representation of the white canvas of the screen, out of which rise impalpable effigies, like dead people emerging from their shrouds and transformed into pure appearance.” (Demeester, Gioni, Michaud; 2008, p15)

Figure 18: Michaël Borremans, (2006) Le Lievre - De Hass - The Hare.

Oil on Board, 22 x 13cm, Private Collection
Borremans practice has enabled me to consider my own use of film in to make ‘moving pictures’, narrative structures in painting composition, and the notion of the ‘painting’ as a ‘space’ that is between the inner and outer dialogue that the artist has with the world.

Borreman’s influence on my own work has been filtered through a lens of his contemporaries, the films identified in my appendices, and by
my original reference *A Picture History of Art* (Lloyd; 1979). The artists listed have been discussed in tutorials and seminars in relation to my practice. This has been especially helpful in facilitating analysis of the material approach to making, and in particular to the phenomenological experience of ‘painting’. It has also assisted in identifying the functional operation of the material qualities within the frame of the illusionistic narrative ‘genre’ painting which characterizes the majority of painters listed, verses the non-illusionistic, ‘abstract’, ‘expressive’ methodologies identified in the work of the same artists, but most explicit in the work of artists like Cecily Brown or Adrian Ghenie, and to a lesser extent in passages of Michael Borremans works. Analysis of the practice of these artists and their own references and influences have impacted on my own working methodologies, for instance, Borremans references to Velazquez’s use of long handled brushes caused me to research both Velazquez’s methods, and led to me making my own long handled brushes. I also began to look at ways of creating time constraints for the production of each work. Whilst working on *The EverAfter Series* I was influenced by the practice of Luc Tuymans (Birnbaum & Tuymans; 1998) and Wilhelm Sasnal, (Wilmes; 2012) both of whom aim to make a painting in a single day. I began to give myself working period of two separate five hour blocks to complete each work. The immediacy of this timed approach led to a synthesis of both planning and chance that presented a the vitality that I was seeking.

In a Flash Art interview with Magda Radu, Adrian Ghenie speaks of the role of the serendipitous accident in his work “When I provoke an accident and I let the oil or acrylic paint leak over a surface, I get interesting results and satisfying solutions that I haven’t thought about. Representational painting can be quite tedious when it comes to the painterly facture, when paint is applied with a brush in a conventional way. The mix of colors resulting from accidents endows the compositional elements with vibrancy and I use this type of execution when I paint the background. In my works, the space framing the figures has to be painted as loosely as possible.” (Magda; 2009). Ghenie continues “An antagonism is embedded in my paintings, which is not something I was fully aware of. On one hand, I work on an image in an
almost classical vein: composition, figuration, use of light. On the other hand, I do not refrain from resorting to all kinds of idioms, such as the surrealist principle of association or the abstract experiments which foreground texture and surface. If the distribution of elements is precisely premeditated, paint is nonetheless applied freely, with unbridled gestures. The oil paint medium triggers a range of technical possibilities, which I am committed to explore in various combinations. For example, I mix various colors on a trowel and I apply it directly onto the canvas. Then I wipe it off with something else. Quite often I paint with a house-painter’s brush. I’m interested to see the outcome of such exercises.” (Magda; 2009).

Figure 21: Adrian Ghenie, (2008) Pie Fight Study, location unknown.

Considering Ghenie’s work alongside that of Michael Borremans, it is apparent that both artists recognise the role of paint not as mimetic representational material for recording an image, but rather as a phenomenological experience. Understanding this was a particular turning point in my own practice. Both Borremans and Ghenie clearly indicate that they have the ‘craft skills’ necessary to render images in a highly illusionistic manner, and yet both use the visceral, corporeal, physical, qualities of the paint and the ‘incompleteness’ of abstraction to simultaneously explore both an ‘inner’ and ‘external’ embodiment of the
artist (and the viewer) being ‘in’ and ‘of’ the world. The physicality and psychology of this is familiar to Merleau-Ponty’s notion of ‘embodiment’. (Merleau-Ponty; 1964) This embodiment occurs in the interrelationship between artist, intention, the physical material, the psychology of the artist and ultimately the culture, psychology and experience of the viewer. “the painter can do no more than construct an image; he must wait for this image to come to life for other people. When it does, the work of art will have united these separate lives; it will no longer exist in one of them like a stubborn dream…it will dwell undivided in several minds’ (Merleau-Ponty; 1964, p70)

Brendan Prendeville explains this in ‘Merleau-Ponty, realism and painting: Psychophysical space and the space of exchange’. “His [Merleau-Ponty’s] method... ...was to stress the phenomenality of the ‘world’ on the one hand, and the embodiedness of perception on the other. There is no question of the world ‘out there’ to a consciousness ‘in here’. Prendeville’s article goes on to examine Merleau-Ponty’s “Eye and Mind” paper of 1964 to discuss what Merleau-Ponty calls the “frission of Being” and ‘recroisement’, which he Prendeville translates as ‘blending’, in this translation we read “There is a human body, when between the seeing and the seen... a blending takes place”. Prendeville goes on to say that what Merleau-Ponty is making is an ontological play in the French word for “cross-breeding to make a hybrid; not a coming together but a new opening, one achieved in a (chiasmic) crossing”. (Prendeville; 1999).
Prendeville interprets the complexes of Merleau-Ponty’s use of language to explain the concept of ‘between’, neither object, nor immaterial. This concept is particularly important to my understanding of my own practice and working methods. Like Borremans or Ghenie, my work operates in this space of ‘between’ – between the physical quality of the paint and the illusionistic reference, between the psyche and the external body. In a literal, material way this concept of ‘recroisement’ is explored in my own work in the blended, wiped watercolour on gesso paintings and also in the blending of the intermediate spaces in the animated works. These too, describe the ontology of ‘crossing’, blending and ‘between’. Interestingly, Prendeville also makes reference to the concept of mirroring in the filmmaking work of Antonioni, and a specific scene in “L’Eclisse” (Antonioni [Dir]; 1962), where the male and female protagonists confront each other through the glass of a bookcase and “they haunt each other... they reflect each other, so that their love arises spontaneously from the space between them”.

Figure 22: Hedley Roberts (2009) Self Portrait as a Dead Twin
Digital Video Loop, Dimensions Variable. UK; Collection of the Artist.
Prendeville explains that in Merleau-Ponty’s later works, “individuals are not defined as self-enclosed entities, but mediately or dividedly, as ‘seeing-seen’; there is a ‘fundamental narcissism in all vision’.” This thinking, this work, and this phrasing echo my other references to the Lacanian mirror-stage and the Oedipal complex.

In reading of Prendeville’s article, I was reminded of Magritte’s painting “The Lovers” of 1928 (Magritte; 1928) which features two lovers kissing, with both heads wrapped in hoods of fabric, thereby preventing them from physically touching each other. Terr (Terr; 1987) identifies the “The Lovers” narrative as a post-traumatic creative reification of the (potential fictional) scene of Magritte’s mother’s death by suicide drowning, and of the fourteen year old Magritte finding her with her face covered by her nightgown.
In Magritte’s subsequent painting of the unrequited lovers kiss, the shrouding of the faces of the lovers can be read metonymically, as a psychodrama of his own transitional subjectivity. Lacanian analysis might lead us to a post-oedipal psychoanalytical interpretation of this work, where Magritte identifies the desire for symbolic unification with the other in Romantic Love restrained by an external force.

Whilst Magritte’s representational style functions very differently to that of Borremans or Ghenie’s, in that it does not obviously engage with the material of the paint as a method for debating the ‘place of exchange’ that blends our Being between ‘inner’ and ‘outer’ experience, there is a similar thread of intentionality. Magritte’s painting offers the same opportunity to reflect on where the blending and ‘back-crossing’ (Prendeville; 1999) occurs between two consciousnesses or two bodies. Operating in a way that is similar to the scene in Antonio’s narcissistic mirror reflection, it asks us to be in the experience in the space between, and to find ourselves disappointed, annihilated, unable and without satisfaction.

In my 2009-10 visual research following I began to consider the ‘tondo’ composition in art, using Rudolf Arnheim’s “Power of the Centre” (Arnheim; 1982) as a reference and formalist dialogue to critique the round compositions of La Belle Bête [Figure 6]. Arnheim interprets
composition through psychology, particularly in the ‘centers as dividers’ chapter, where he discusses the ‘bipolar’ compositional device as a method for creating tension. Anheim’s method of analysis underpinned the compositional structures in the *Everafter Series* of paintings.

![Figure 25: The Razor’s Edge, (1946) Film Still, Edmund Goulding (Dir)](image)

Arnheim’s writings were then used to visually analyse the romantic narrative films that I was watching throughout the 2009-10 period. For example; the extended scene in “The Razor’s Edge” (Goulding [Dir]; 1946) [Figure 25] where a ‘bipolar’ composition frames the male and female lead in extended conversation leading to a kiss moment became a digital collage projection work that composites the two characters into a single face with tears. This single images attempts to capture the complete narrative of a complete scene into one blended moment.
In 2009, I reintroduced time-based media into my practice as a method for examining the moment of fusion, crossing, blending. This recourse evolved out of a desire to make “moving paintings” as a method for capturing a kind of internal transformation in process.
Irreconcilable Difference [Figure 27] makes oblique reference to Aristophanes Speech from Plato’s Symposium (Plato; 380BC). In this narrative, Aristophanes tells the story of how primeval beings were not separated into two sexes, but were one “being”. In the narrative Zeus lays retribution on the beings for an act of hubris towards the gods, and separates them into two parts, doomed to search for each other. Two separate figure forms (sisters) attempt to ‘conjoin’ through surreal ‘morphing’ with the aim of becoming a single unified figure, but ultimately fail, only to return to two figures and then to repeat the same pattern. The work is presented as a circular digital video projection in a ‘black box’ space. The image is projected as a continuous video loop that cycles through the transformation and then reverses.

The circular format reiterates the cyclical nature of the video loop and communicates the idea that the subject is continually searching for resolution. The idea of using the circle or ‘tondo’ format specifically references the practice of using the ‘tondo’ format for devotional scenes. (Olson; 1993)
In “Lost and Partially Found: The Tondo, a Significant Florentine Art Form” (Olson; 1993), Roberta Olson writes that there is a “visual convention for rendering visions and celestial beings in circles, which were synonymous with the idea of perfection, or mandorlas (also influential in the development of the tondi), signifying holiness.” Olson identifies that the tondo usually pictured a double portrait of Madonna and Child.
In making the work in the circular motif, I was conscious of how the characters should be ‘looking out’ of the framed composition. My intention was to imply that they although they might initially seem to be looking out to the viewer through a window, or mirror into the viewers dimension, they are clearly in another dimension. In using this thematic device, I am reiterating the mirror theme through the use of the tondo framing device often used for either painting or mirror. (Olson; 1993) and continuing with the theme of previous double portrait works that made reference to Lacan’s work on the mirror stage of psychological development. (Lacan; 1977),

*Irreconcilable Difference* is explicit in reference to Lacan’s imaginary and symbolic ‘other’. The two characters as separated are represented as either siblings, or the same self split into two subjectivities. Surup, in writing on Lacan explains the Mirror Stage scene; “The child wants to be
filled by the other, to be the other, which is why no determinate thing will
do. It demands a love that paradoxically entails it’s own annihilation, for it
demands a fullness of the other to stop up the lack that conditions it as a
subject.” (Surup; 1992). In this Lacanian reading, their ‘idealized’
unification of the two figures into a single mature ‘mother’ figure can be
read as an unsatisfactory attempt to resolve the trauma of existence.

My initial attention in the making of this work, was primarily
the psychodrama of the composition. However, in the process of
transformation through morphing, the forms have to go through stages of
figuration where the structure and form dissolves and dissipates before it
becomes the new figure. This process creates a tension between the
definition of the structured form (the identifiable figure) disintegrative
process that increasingly becomes chaotic and more abstract in it’s
journey before new structures start to emerge in the transformation to a
new form. A technological process in animation called ‘tweening’
generates this process. Put simply, in traditional animation, ‘tweening’ or
‘inbetweening’ is the digital generation of intermediate frames between
key frames that generate the impression of movement. In Irreconcilable
Difference and other animated works I have used this process in
combination with other digital tools that enable the pixel data to be
manipulated. The terminology for this process uses metaphor of “liquefied
paint”. Mimetically speaking, the viscous membrane (pixels) of the image
can be dragged, expanded, compressed, pulled, pinched, and twisted as
well as copied, repeated, manipulated and transformed. This process is
used to transform the images at key frames in the timeline of the work,
the ‘inbetweening’ process is then used to auto-generate the intermediate
frames. This generative process is used in a methodology that might be
analogous to the smearing, wiping back and dilution of a painted image
using turpentine or other solvent, or to the drawing process where an
image is made, and rubbed out and made again with the residue of the
history of the corrections.

From an initial state of conjoin-ment, the two figures in
Irreconcilable Difference begin to morph together mutating into a single
figure that appears more as an ‘imagined’ form when compared to the
more ‘photographic’ qualities of the initial conjoined figures. The figures
begin in a state of ‘trauma’ and seek ‘unification’ into a singular whole, and yet always having to return to repeat the futile exercise. In this sense the work is a discourse on the perpetual state of paradoxical ‘desiring’ that Lacan’s mirror stage refers to. The figures seek to complete the cycle in their search for ultimate loving by absorption into the maternal figure, but realize that annihilation is the outcome of that scenario, and so they therefore recoil.

In *Irreconcilable Difference*, the originating image is a digital collage that has been composited from the component parts of a family portrait photograph given to me when I made a call for ‘friend’s family photographs’ that expressed a ‘loving relationship’ that I would then ‘read’ and interpret. The ‘beginning’ image was composited from a photographic portrait of two sisters. In the still composition that begins the work, the two faces are conjoined in a manner that suggests what might be read as a portrait of the psychological condition of their relationship. However, this work is does not function as a biographical illustration of their relationship, as this is not known to me. Therefore, the transformation that I have performed on this image is, in fact an interpretive representation of my reading of their relationship from the image and my own psychological and cultural experiences, and therefore can more properly be understood as an semi-autobiographical work because it conveys as much about the artist as it does the sitter.

In “Unmasking Pablo’s Gertrude: Queer Desire and the Subject of Portraiture”, Robert S. Lubar (Lubar; 1997) examines the relationship between painter and sitter, considering the scenario in which Picasso completed his portrait of Gertude Stein by ‘erasing’ her image after the sittings were complete, stating “I cannot see you any longer when I look”. Lubar uses Lacanian analysis to interpret this complex scenario noting that the “relation between looking and seeing might be configured within the space of representation: the idea of painting as a trap for what Jacques Lacan calls le regard (the gaze), which, in the case of direct portraiture, insinuates itself in the form of a highly complex economy of psychic and social exchanges between the painter and the sitter. For what Stein points to on the underside of mimesis is the idea of representation as a mechanism of revelation and occlusion, a frame
for the gaze in the field of the Other.” (Lubar; 1997) This understanding of the relationship between ‘sitter’ and the gaze is important within the context of my own ‘portraits’. The narrative of the young Picasso’s tense relationship with his powerful subject and the resultant ‘portrait’ is a model for understanding the process by which my own figurative compositions depart from mimesis, even though they are often sourced from photographs.

Figure 30: Man Ray (1922) [Gertrude Stein with Picasso’s portrait of Getrude Stein]

Figure 31: Hedley Roberts (2010) *Applegraft*

Digital Video Loop, Dimensions Variable, UK; Collection of the Artist
AppleGraft [Figure 31] is a 7-minute film loop work that has been created using technological and methodological processes similar to Irreconcilable Difference, and the work continues to interrogate the similar themes using similar formal and referential devices. Again, the work features two siblings being consumed into one single figure across time inside a tondo composition. However, in this work, there is a central ‘apple’ that is consumed into the belly of the final figure. The symbolic significance of this image makes reference to the biblical narrative of the ‘Fall’ of human kind from god’s grace. In the work, the two siblings appear as child/women chimeras. They are clothed in pinafore dresses that intentionally reference a previous generational ‘Sunday best’ outfit that might have been worn but my parent’s generation. In using this period of historical reference to the typical ‘best’ dress of late 1940s or early 1950s, I am referring to the period that my mother may have grown up in. The figures themselves, are ‘digital paintings’. Although they have been sourced, in part, from Harpers Bazaar images of that period (Harpers; 1945-7), they have been composited, mutated and transformed beyond any recognizable source image. Autobiographically speaking, both of these characters psychologically refer to a fantasy ‘imago’ of the mother, that only exists in my psychic memory. In this ‘memory’, this maternal character is a woman child. In the work, this character is represented as two figures and can be interpreted through Lacanian analysis as a representation of the ‘subject’ and the ‘other’ in conflict in the mirror phase where “The child sees itself in the mirror, but the image is reversed. Identity is a mere outer skin that constantly distorts one’s relations with others. When the fragmented body gives way to the armour of the subject – and to it’s identity, already alienating by definition – the ‘ego’ is formed. (Sarup; 1992, p.65).

Using this reading in combination with a referral to mythological narrative, it is possible to interpret and ‘narrate’ the ‘consumption’ of the symbolic fruit into the belly of the single figure at the end of the cycle as an biographical portrait of the journey that my mother made in her attempt to leave her own social background through marriage, and her subsequent attempts to project into an idealized
identity. The whole composition itself is a discourse on the psychological conditions within an enterprise of socio-economic love. The mutations that the figures undergo during the transformation towards the aspiration for stylized ‘beautiful’ romantic form are hideously ugly. They occur very slowly, subtly and continuously across the image. In watching them, it is impossible to track them all at once, and yet collectively they gravitate towards a smooth flowing romantic figuration. In this figuration I am making subtle reference to the society portraits of Thomas Gainsborough or John Singer-Sergeant to refer to the social mobility ambitions of my own parent-figure. In the final instance the single figure has annihilated the multifaceted personalities of the complex youths and absorbed the symbolic apple that represents the fall from naive grace, and is once again, unresolved in the final instance of the cycle because a compositional red line continues to separate the two halves of the figure leaving it to remain fractured and in danger of unravelling at any given moment.

Shortly after the *EverAfter Series* and the circular formatted time based works, I began to work more extensively in watercolour on paper and on gessoed panel. The 2009 *EverAfter Series* represented a turning point with a change of medium to watercolour on paper. Understanding the material and physical properties of the watercolour is imperative to success in using the medium. I began by examining the properties of different manufacturers products and the history and recipes for making watercolour via writings and research by the Art Historian, Nicola Moorby, a specialist on watercolour and, in particular, Turner. In her role as Tate Britain Curator of the ‘Watercolour’ exhibition, Moorby writes that the “water component of watercolour means that it is much trickier to use without some knowledge and anticipation of it’s physical characteristics...It is difficult to correct or hide mistakes, and virtually impossible to replicate effects in the same manner.” (Smith [ed]; 2011, p23)

The circumstances that led to my experimentation were not planned, but serendipitous. Whilst working on a series of watercolour sketches, I ran out of paper and instead used a gesso panel that had been prepared for oil painting. The smooth gesso surface allowed the paint to flow freely, but the highly absorbent structure of the gesso also allows the
materials to soak in. In trials, I found that the highly polished surface could initially resist watercolour pigment when suspended with high water content. The painting material could then be made fluid on the surface, allowing for a temporary period of working of the puddles of liquid. These properties are very different to those of paper, which will absorb almost instantly, even when heavily sized. When worked flat on the floor, these qualities enabled me to use the viscous drag of the material to move or ‘pool’ watercolour material of high or low pigment content on the polished surface. The material would suspend for a few moments and then absorb into the substrate. Subsequent layers would operate as glazes, but could also be manipulated more boldly to work the gesso chalk / glue into the material of the watercolour, rendering it more opaque into a material that has properties similar to gouache.

In working this, I found I could paint the image, and then wipe back, obliterating the figuration into a chaotic mass of marks and residue that had mimetic similarities to the digital processes that I was using. Interrupting the integrity of the representational figuration with loose, abstracted forms from the wiping, washing out and from allowing the material to pool spread and collect enabled the works to have a
psychological dimension that operated in a similar way to the time based works. “Supernova 1006; I remember you” [Figure 33] was the first of these works, executed on the largest commercially available single sheet paper, arches 60 x 48 inches. The scale itself worked to enable the image to emerge, as I was working in a very physical way with the work. It was made on the floor, and I was using large brushes, mops and homemade tools to obliterate the image after I’d painted the figurative sections.

Figure 33: Hedley Roberts (2010) Supernova 1006; I Remember You (detail)
Watercolour on Gesso Panel, 110 x 90 cm. UK; Collection of the Artist

“Supernova 1006; I remember you” continues the theme of the kissing moment, but is identifiably a ‘marriage scene’. The figures are in a chaotic morphic interchange but remain identifiably separate. The male form looks into the female in what might be a loving gaze, but could equally be hesitant. The female appears to be in a moment of ecstatic rapture at the embrace and the marriage. The figurative lighting follows filmic conventions of the kiss embrace as identified by Linda Williams in “Screening Sex”. (Williams; 2008)
“Sirius; The Teary Eyed Breaking Heart” [Figure 34] deploys a similar technical process and compositional structure. The work features two female figures embracing in what might be either a passionate or consoling kiss. The composition structure is built around both a spiral and a bifurcated structure to create the tension between the dynamic merging and the separateness of the two figures in the form.
Arguments; Pulling You Away From Me [Figure 35] also uses the morphing technique to blend the two figures that might be twins, siblings or a narcissistic mirrored reflection. In this work the faces have been painted and the wiped out, their defining features obliterated to create a sense of blended lost identity.

“Alpha Centauri; so close you burn” [Figure 36] also uses the same compositional and material methodology, but does not explicitly use the morphing device as the main narrative feature. Instead, the work focuses on the intersection of the two figures through the kiss and the mouth, with a secondary device of the joining eyes. In making this image, I was considering the passion of the embrace and the kind of desperate desire that overcomes in a passionate moment. In this sense, this work is more close to being metonymically representative of the sexual act than any other.
“Alpha Centauri; so close you burn” represented a departure from the morphing process that had dominated my work for almost two years, and at the same time I was executing the small watercolour studies of kisses. I was beginning to consider that the kiss itself, without the morphing might be analysed for meaning. Looking at the kiss in my paintings as well as those in cinema and family photographs, I began to be interested in the nuances of the framing of the kiss. Informed by the work of Williams, I began to think about how the kiss itself can denote subtle structures that can reveal an implied narrative that extends beyond the image being merely a kiss. Key to this analysis is the subtle difference in the formal pose of the two figures. For instance, the narrative that is implied by whose mouth is on top or below in the kiss, whose hand reaches up to form the heart shaped composition, whether one or both of the characters have their eyes open or shut, the subtleties of their expression in revealing the atmosphere of the situation, the style and period of the clothing and hair. All of these factors work together to tell a story of the image.
Sometimes I think you’ll never leave [Figure 37] is a 12-minute film loop work of two lovers conjoined in a kiss. The image is rendered in a painting style of a watercolour and was produced around the same time as the formal kiss studies and Alpha Centauri; so close you burn. Throughout the 12 minutes of the film loop the material of their kiss is in flux, constantly blending into abstraction. Metaphorically speaking, it seems as if the faces are in a process of melting into one another, the colours, lines and textures becoming ‘muddled’ in the kiss exchange. Throughout the work a tension occurs between the figurative order of the image and the chaotic entropic movement of material inside the boundary forms of the faces. Sometimes I think you’ll never leave is constructed on the basis of one of a series of small (10cm x 10cm) observational kiss watercolour paintings executed in 2011. The animated techniques used are similar to those in AppleGraft and Irreconcilable Difference, however, in this work I have not used the digital compositions directly into the work, instead I
have made the small watercolour paintings directly observed from the screen of digitally manipulated images. In these kiss paintings I used watercolour in a very traditional way, observing the conventions of controlled watercolour studies. The language of this method refers to many of the tropes and tautologies used in ‘appreciating’ watercolour painting as referred to by Alison Smith in “Watercolour”, the 2011 catalogue accompanying the Tate Britain show of the same name. (Smith; 2011). In her introductory text, Smith refers to “the way we tend to view watercolour through Romantic naturalism, which forms the conventional history of the subject in Britain, as represented by the abstract and expressive art of painters such as Francis Towne, Thomas Girtin, John Sell Cotman and Turner…” “…as a fundamentally Modernist understanding in asserting that the essence of the medium lends it a specific identity.” In *Sometimes I think you’ll never leave* I am countering what Smith refers to as the romantic, Modernist “truth to materials” by my own use of watercolour as a media reference in a work that is a digital simulacrum of the fluidity of watercolour. *Sometimes I think you’ll never leave* is an animated, time based piece that uses the ‘liquefied paint’ process metonymical methodology of “Irreconcilable Difference” to simulate the viscous qualities of the flow, flooding and saturation of watercolour pigment transparency and transference, glaze and liquidity. In functioning as an indexical sign for the time process that is lost within the physical painting process, the work metonymically speaks of the in-authenticity of the digital medium, and also of the inevitable failure of the kiss to solicit both oneness whilst still maintaining separate identity.

Throughout 2010-11, I put out requests for images of kissing scenes via my social media network, and also researched images of the kiss in culture through art and film. Using cinematic analysis, I investigated the compositional devices and structures used in film-making in key kissing scenes as a methodological approach to the analysis of personal kissing pictures that have been given to me by friends, acquaintances and ex-lovers. This visual research and thematic investigation into ‘the kiss’ was also underpinned by research into the visual language and psychological conditions of kissing. The majority of this work was contextualised by reading in psychoanalytical studies into
oral eroticism. This involved the work of Freud and his contemporaries on
the development of sexuality, and kissing as the relatively late
development phase in sexuality. This research led me to Adam Phillips’
chapter “Plotting for Kisses”, Phillips tells a story of an eight year old girl
telling him in a session “how much she loves being in the countryside on
holiday. I ask what she likes doing there and she replies, with a kind of
blithe indifference, ‘Oh, sometimes I just go out looking ... for cows, birds,
kisses, things like that.’ ‘Kisses?’ I ask. ‘You know, lovers ... I hate it when
people kiss, their mouths get muddled up.’” This ‘muddling’ enables
Phillips to identify that the kiss has a ‘mutuality that blurs the distinction
between giving and receiving” in reference to the possibility of the kissing
act as a non-gender specific, offering possibilities of penetrative
interaction and exchange that is not bound by the obvious physiological
properties of opposite sex couplings.

Figure 38: Hedley Roberts (2011) AVA Gallery Installation

In “On Kissing” by the psychotherapist, Adam Phillips, The narrative
of the child’s ‘kissing’ story is used as an introduction to Ferenczi’s theories
around ‘kissing’ as an act that tries to undo the trauma of the splitting
personality of the child when faced with the withdrawal of the maternal bosom. (Ferenczi; 1933) Phillips goes on to note that children retain an intense curiosity about kissing, and write that the "commonest infantile sexual theories that babies are conceived by kissing is anatomically inaccurate but suggestive and metonymically correct". He goes on to identify that, from a psychoanalytical point of view, "the kiss is a revealing sequence containing a personal history. The way a person kisses and like to be kissed shows in condensed form something about a persons character." The 'muddling up' of the kiss, as observed by the eight year old child in Phillips' narrative precisely captures the Freudian theory of the kiss as a 'normal perversion' of the sexual act. "Even a kiss an be described as a perverse act, since it consists in the bringing together of two oral erotogenic zones instead of the genitals. Yet no one rejects it as perverse; on the contrary it is permitted in theatrical performances as a softened hint at the sexual act." Phillips goes on in his analysis of Freud’s work on kissing to hypothesize that for Freud, kissing confirmed "his sense of the narcissistic intent, the grudge at the root of sexuality: a grudge that is to say, contingent upon the cumulative trauma that is human development. Desire, he wants us to know, is always in excess of the objects capacity to satisfy it."

My own visual research into the language of the kiss has been framed through the iconographic lens of cinematic kisses and cinematic theories that analyse the gender of spectatorship and the gaze. This research has been informed by continued reading of Williams (Williams; 2008) and Mulvey (Mulvey; 1975) in their various examinations of gender, sexuality, identification and spectatorship in pleasurable cinema-going. Williams, in particular, takes a chapter of “Screening Sex” to consider the tautologies of on-screen kissing in “Of Kisses and Ellipses”. Williams work makes reference to psychoanalytical theory, but also analyses the specific scenarios of iconic kiss scenes, examining the framing, the lighting conventions and the role of the camera lens in the scene. Williams pays specific attention to the stylistic devices of the kiss scene in relation to the ‘Motion Picture Production Code’ morale censorship guidelines for Hollywood films between 1930 and 1968 (Shurlock; 1947), until it’s abandonment and replacement by the Motion
The Picture Association of America film rating system. The production code had two sections, the first outlined a set of "general principles" which concerned morality. The second featured a set of "particular applications", which included an exacting list of items that could not be depicted. In section of the ‘Hays’ code on sex (2.2.b), it states that “Excessive and lustful kissing, lustful embraces, suggestive postures and gestures, are not to be shown.” Williams refers specifically to the practice of ‘interruptum’ to comply with the code. In response directors used symbolism to comply, but still maintain the erotic narrative. Strategies and devices employed including cutting the tryst partway through, but implying continuation ‘offscene’. Common signifiers in the following scenes would include typical tropes of; entwined clothes on the floor, two abandoned half champagne glasses on a table, a half finished cigarette smoking in the ashtray.

The visual language of the cinematic kiss inspired me to ask for friend’s colleagues and acquaintances to send me images of themselves kissing. The results, unsurprisingly, were full of iconic signifiers that could be mapped to common visual signifiers of the cinematic experience. Each image sent to me appeared to have been designed for spectatorship by a third-party ‘audience’ through the lens of the camera. Mulvey observes that “The camera becomes the mechanism for producing an illusion of Renaissance space, flowing movements compatible with the human eye, an ideology of representation that revolves around the perception of the subject; the camera’s look is disavowed in order to create a convincing world in which the spectator’s surrogate can perform with verisimilitude.” (Mulvey; 1975) This verisimilitude is essential to the language of cinema, and in turn, essential to the construction of the kiss image as viewed by the the third party lens. In “Hollywood Planet; Global Media and the Competitive Advantage of Narrative Transparency”, Olson uses Barthes work in “Mythologies” to outline the apparatus of verisimilitude in the cinema experience: “myth turns history into nature”. Olson observes that films, in their use of iconic signs in a mimetic visual language, seem to have the appearance of ‘naturalness’, ‘immediacy’ and ‘literalness’ that gives an appearance of verisimilitude.
The pervasiveness of this tendency to imagine the spectacle of one's own kissing experience within the verisimilitude of the Hollywood kiss can be seen in the social media culture of self-publishing, for example; [http://fuckyeahkissing.tumblr.com/](http://fuckyeahkissing.tumblr.com/). (fuckyeahkissing; 2009) The owners of this tumblr blog only post submissions sent by readers of the blog. This blog is typical of the current generation of bloggers who actively submit images of themselves to amateur community blogsites requests. Many of these sites feature ‘self shooters’ who pose provocatively in the mirror for their mobile phone camera, or the self shooting technique of extending the arm to gain a focal length sufficient enough to frame oneself kissing a partner within the gaze of the camera. Oliver Mannion analyses Facebook via Lacan, providing a useful interpretation of this social media phenomenon of ‘self shooting’. “For Zizek, cinema is the art of appearance that shows us how reality constitutes itself. Facebook is the art of the ego, which shows us how we construe our identities and relate to others.” (Mannion; 2011)

My visual investigation of the archetypal kiss required research into the philosophical, psychological, sociological and physiological framework in order to analyse the kiss scene. Prevalent within this research was by Joanne Brown’s, “A Psychosocial Exploration of Love and Intimacy” (Brown; 2006). Brown contributed to the pioneering research into establishing the genre of ‘psychosocial’ research practice at the University of East London in the 1980s and 1990’s, and this work provides an analysis of the origins, traditions and criticisms of the “romantic narrative” the examination of religious ideals, enlightenment thinking, romanticism and socio-political changes. Browns work includes the development of the idea of ‘courtly love’ as a unrequited state that can result in the passionate transformation of the lover to a devotional state that has parallels with religious devotion, and can therefore be analyzed within the context of the ‘romantic sublime’. She goes on to identify discourses around the similarities and differences in the development of socio-cultural ideas about of ‘love’, considering, for example, the destructive narcissism of ‘amour passion’, the socio-economic changes of the eighteenth century that led to the narratives that prioritized individual sovereignty, equality and the notion of the ‘self’ in western ideals of
‘romantic love’. Through this analysis, Brown considers Sartre’s existentialist criticism of ‘romantic love’ as an act of ‘bad faith’ and ultimately inauthentic. (Satre; 1958) She links Sartre to a view shared, in part by Lacan in his critical analysis of the human condition as one of alienation and misrecognitions, and ‘need minus demand’ (Lacan; 1977)

In examining the kiss image and iconography, I also considered the formal compositional values of the framed shot at the kiss moment in cinema. Through visual analysis of film stills, I noted that these scenes would often use a formal heart shaped compositional motif to frame the kiss scene. The ‘heart’ is composed through both the gaze of the lens and through the juxtaposition of the faces and limbs in the kiss itself. The ‘in profile’ framing of the two heads that form the upper hemispheres of the heart shape more usually forms the ‘heart’ of this kiss, and the hands of one or both of the kiss participants reaching up to the others face will usually form the lower ‘V’ shape of the composition. The symbolism of this ‘heart shaped’ compositional device seems to be obvious in the majority of images, and yet I have not found a theoretical discourse that analyses the persistence of the formal aspects of composition within this visual language.

The heart shaped kiss compositional device was explored, initially, in the small watercolour kiss paintings of early 2011. In the summer of 2011, I was selected for an international “Artslab” residency at Artoll near Dusseldorf in Germany. During this residency I undertook a programme of producing one large (60 x 48 inch) watercolour painting per day, preparing the following day’s image in each preceding evening. My method was to work on the floor with projected collaged images produced via photoshop compositions. I would start early in the morning, when the light had not yet reached the studio and continue to work with the projected image until the sunlight bleached out the image in the midday. When the projected image disappeared, I allowed the painted image to evolve and form through dialogue with my own emerging narrative of the kiss scene that I was creating.
These ‘narratives’ would develop as ‘love stories’ about the couples in the image through a sense of the formal interaction of the composition, the characters in the scene, their identity and image, and an emerging understanding of the psychological complexities that the scene portrayed. I did not manage to produce a painting every day as planned. Several paintings failed to emerge as convincing narratives. This was more usually due to a loss of the thread of the psychological pursuit, which usually resulted in over-painting in an embattled pursuit of the image, rather than synergism. When this occurred, I would start afresh the next day, and approach the painting again, starting with fresh paper and materials, re-examining the image for the narrative energy of the scene. The more successful work resulted from a painting scenario where the painting
action and my own psychodynamic flow was firmly embodied within the active transmission and reception of the painting process and my inner dialogue and personal storytelling had synergies with the image portrayed.

In 2012 whilst at the Directional Forces artist’s residency at Artoll Germany, I undertook to make six pre-prepared, four foot square, gessoed panelled kiss paintings. For these works I returned to using oil paint. This was in direct response to advice from my supervisor Lee Maezler. Lee and other painters in my peer group had given feedback that the techniques I was using could also be explored in oil paint, given the right surface and medium. This would lend the works more stability over the long term, and consequently afford more archival qualities. My aim was to create a similar transparency and fluidity as in the watercolours so that I could use the gesso surface as a colour within the compositions. To achieve this aim, I researched a variety of mediums including aklyds,
damar varnish, different oils and various solvents, and settled on a combination of liquin, damar varnish, linseed oil, zest-it solvent and turpentine. (Mayer; 1991, Zest-it; 2012)

**Figure 41:** Hedley Roberts (2012) *I’m Just Not Here Anymore*

Oil on Gesso Panel, 48 x 48 inches, UK; Collection of the Artist.

*I’m Just Not Here Anymore* [Figure 41] was stimulated, in part, by the very public breakup of the celebrity couple Russell Brand and Katy Perry. My aim in the work was to capture the fleeting impermanence of the moment when the two lovers connect into a moment of oneness, whilst still retaining the form of their own identity. The work was made on the wall instead of the floor, which offered me the opportunity to exploit the fluidity of the medium in the drips and splashes, which become part of the final image.
The End, reflected in a Golden Eye [Figure 41] continues with the same methodology of I’m Just Not Here Anymore, and continues with the morphing device of earlier works. However this work has an emotional narrative that differs from most of the more self-consciously ‘romantic’ works made throughout the previous year, instead reflecting a darker more troubled emotional landscape. In this work, I used a the same reference to John Huston’s 1967 film, “Reflections in a Golden Eye” starring Liz Taylor and Marlon Brando (Huston [Dir]; 1967) that I had used in the EverAfter Series works. This work uses the formal compositions of the square format to hold a spiral melting form of the two faces into the possibility of one single face with bifurcated features. In considering the separate figures, the character on the left, we can interpret her as a figure leaning in, committed to the kiss. The eye of the
figure on the right, however, is looking out, disconnected from the scene of the kiss. In viewing this figure we are aware of some unknown internal dialogue taking place within this character. The work makes oblique references to Picasso’s 1969 kiss paintings [Figure 51] and his 1937 painting *Weeping Woman* [Figure 52] In *Weeping Woman*, the younger Picasso is the artist observing the woman weeping, in the Kiss paintings Picasso is in the scene as the artist engaged in a slightly detached kiss with a much younger model. *The End, Reflected in a Golden Eye* refers to Huston’s film, but also to Picasso’s paintings. The weeping of the dripping painted material in *The End, Reflected in a Golden* are the tears, and the eye looking out from the merged form is that of the subject considering his own mortality in the moment.

Figure 43: Hedley Roberts (2012) *The Dream of De Beauvior Square*

Oil on Gesso Panel, 48 x 48 inches. Collection of the Artist.
The Dream of De Beauvior Square [Figure 43] also portrays an emotional scene of two characters in embrace, possibly in bed. Rendered in both dark and light, heavy and thin, the figures are deliberately different and in opposition. The composition of the two figures uses a device that enables them to share the same shoulder form, enabling the figures to be compacted into a tighter frame and closer connection. The large dark section to the bottom right of the image frames the faces, pushing them up into the top third, which allows the characters to face in different directions without forcing them apart. The aim of this work was to create a scene in which the two characters were separate, in their own internal worlds, but inside these personal spaces there might be the possibility that would connect functioning as a yin and yang within the composition, both necessary to complete the other.

Figure 44: Hedley Roberts (2012) The Blue Collar
Oil on Gesso Panel, 48 x 48 inches, UK; Collection of the Artist
The Blue Collar [Figure 44], in contrast to I’m Just Not Here Anymore, is an attempt to explore the emotional intensity of a desire imagined in the darkness. The paint is brushed into the image in a gestural manner that reveals the figures out of the darkness. The blue collar functions as a compositional anchor that locates the solid form of the male figure into the form of the square canvas, enabling the female figure to be a suspended from in space fixed only by the kiss of the male. This work informed by several private autobiographical narrative threads can be captured in Barthes figure “Sobria Ebrietas: vouloir-saisir: the “will-to-possess”. “Realizing that the difficulties of the amorous relationship originate in his ceaseless desire to appropriate the loved being in one way or another, the subject decides to abandon henceforth all "will-to-possess" in his regard.” (Barthes; 1977, p232) In this, the figure of the beloved, potentially weightless, only connected by the fixidity of the kiss and the application of the painted material that attempts to weigh down without suppression.

The work undertaken at Artoll, Germany in March 2012 represents the most recent work at the time of writing. Works like The End, Reflected in a Golden Eye, I’m Just Not Here Anymore, The Blue Collar and The Dream of De Beauvoir Square are ‘gateway’ works that indicate the potential future route for my practice into a darker, more challenging space where the painfulness of emotional relationships can be considered.
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**Critical Reflection On Professional Practice**

Throughout the doctoral programme I have engaged in a variety of professional practice activities ranging from exhibiting my own work in group shows, curating exhibitions, organising projects and presenting my creative work in the context of my pedagogic practice as an academic. In the section below I have documented a selection of these projects.

**Conjoin:Me**

![Conjoin:Me](http://example.com/conjoinme.jpg)

*Figure 45: Roberts, H & Mooney M (2008) Conjoin:me

*Installation* SuperDeluxe Gallery, Tokyo, Japan.

Mari, M (2008) [Photo]*
The Conjoin:me collaboration with Sian-Kate Mooney was presented at SuperDeluxe Gallery, Tokyo, Japan in 2008. The project was funded through UEL Research and Knowledge Exchange funding and was sponsored by Klein-Dytham Architects and Fabpad Printing Bureau. The projects was undertaken as a collaboration between the two artists, with further collaborations with sound artist Dominic Montague and Animator Maurice Stubbs. The aim was to produce a body of work that reflected the conjoined practices of the two artists, but could be easily transported and installed. In principle, the project was divided into two main responsibilities, the 3 dimensional sculptural form (Sian-Kate Mooney) and the 2 dimensional images, textiles and media (Hedley Roberts). I was project manager and responsible for securing the funding, managing marketing, communications and operational arrangements.

My creative involvement in the project has been covered elsewhere in this document. However, to provide context for the exhibition, it is important that I detail aspects of the work in relation to the professional practice of production.

The sculptural form of Conjoin:me was built around Sian-Kate Mooney’s practice of the time, which had as it’s basis a structural relationship between fashion clothing and furniture forms. In order to
make this a practical within the confines of the project, it was decided that the furniture form should be an IKEA Klippan (IKEA; 2012) sofa. This sofa is the most ubiquitous sofa form in the world today, and can be purchased in every major city. Our arrangement was that we would, on arrival, purchase the sofas that would function as part of the sculpture. The installation required that live models wear the sculptures, and with local support we hired professional dancers to wear the sculptures for the evening event. The event was well attended by the Tokyo art and design scene and we were invited to do an additional lecture as part of the Pecha Kucha series at SuperDeluxe.

Figure 47; left: Mari, M [photo] Conjoin:me SuperDeluxe Opening Event

Figure 48: right: Roberts, H & Mooney, S; Conjoin:me flyer & Business Card Design

**Directional Forces 2012**

In 2010 I was invited to take part in *Wunderkammer*, an international artists residency at Artoll in Germany. Whilst on this residency in 2011 I was asked if I would curate my own residency at the venue in the following year. In March 2012, I took fifteen artists to Artoll to take part in an intensive two week artists residency programme.

*Directional Forces 2012*” takes its title from one Joseph Beuys most significant works. Made between 1974 and 1977, Richtkräfte
(Directional forces, 1974–77) is an installation of 100 chalked blackboards featuring the wide range of subjects that Beuys covered in his lecture presentations. The work was begun during Art and Society at the Institute of Contemporary Arts, London (Nov. 1974). It was subsequently shown at the René Block Gallery, New York (April 1975) and the Venice Biennale (July 1976) before Beuys installed it in Berlin in its final form.

Beuys developed the role of the artist as pedagogue throughout the 1970s, including discussion and teaching in his expanded definition of art, delivering lectures in galleries and art colleges using complex annotated chalk drawings on blackboards. Beuys thinking was highly influenced by the work of the educationalist thinker, Rudolf Steiner. (Holland; 2008) Beuys theories of ‘Social Sculpture’ and the ‘Social organism as work of art’ emerge from Steiner’s theories of the ‘Social Three-folding” of ‘economy, politics and culture’. Beuys believed that art and creativity had the power to transform, and key to this was the belief that ongoing, active debate is necessary to stimulate this. (Holland; 2008)

The aim of the “Directional Forces 2012” was for the artists to interrogate the pedagogy of their practice within a social situation within a series of interconnected studios, leading towards a new body of work by each artist. None of the studio spaces have separating doors, and artists are free to observe and comment on the practices of each other, without privacy. The artists live, eat and work together, sharing knowledge, ideas and creative experiences through social interaction and engagement. This is an unfamiliar situation for the majority of artists, who typically work in isolated studio spaces in cities.

The works contributed to an exhibition on the 17/3/12 at Artoll and are in the process of being extended into a catalogue publication featuring images and text by the artists and associated writers. The project is documented in an online blog http://directionalforces2012.tumblr.com, which aims to capture the ‘social organism’ that transformed the practices of these artists during this period of intense working activity.

I conceived and curated the Directional Forces project, was project manager, undertook all publicity, marketing and communication and sourced all the funding to enable the artists to take part. The project featured artists from UEL’s Professional Doctorate in Fine Art, and invited
internationally recognised artists Cedric Christie (UK) and Ivan Lam (Malaysia). Directional Forces 2012 received approximately £8000 funding through the support of Artoll and the University of East London’s Teaching Fellowship Programme and the Going Global Bursary. The project received positive reviews, coverage in four German newspapers and associated online arts press, including one national newspaper. My aim will be to establish Directional Forces as an annual residency project event in various global locations.

**East is East**

In 2012, I was asked by the University of East London to curate a travelling exhibition of staff and students work that would be presented at the Annexe Gallery, Kuala Lumpur, and at Nanyang Academy of Fine Art. The Annexe Gallery venue is a recognised independent 3500 square foot arts space in the Central Market area of downtown Kuala Lumpur, and the Nanyang Academy space is in one of Singapore’s oldest Arts Education Institutions.

The event was designed to promote a wide range of practices in the School of Arts and Digital Industries at UEL, but would have focus on Arts, Design and Media.

Owing to restrictions on budget and timing for shipping, the show had to be planned around limited weight restrictions. Using the skills and knowledge gained for the Conjoin:me show, I conceived, planned and
executed an exhibition of over 30 artists and designers work that could be transported in less than 50kg and for a budget of under £10,000 including all transportation and accommodation costs for UEL staff involved. The exhibition hang was co-curated by Garry Doherty and Sian-Kate Mooney with support from Hariza Zambri, Amelia Johnstone and students from the One Academy Malaysia, TAR College Malaysia, the Academy of Architecture and Visual Arts Malaysia, and Nanyang Academy of Fine Arts Singapore.

Figure 50; Hedley Roberts [Photo]; *East is East* Installation images, Kuala Lumpur & Singapore 2012
My role as Head of Digital Arts and Visual Communication at the 
University of East London has put specific professional demands on the 
time available to me as a practicing artist. In order to manage the 
professional practice of my educational and pedagogic roles, I have 
undertaken pedagogic projects that have research focus into the 
expanded nature of creative practice, and in particular the role that digital 
and social media plays in underpinning new ways for artists, designers 
and educators to work, connect and engage professionally and 
pedagogically. This research promoted my interests and led to my 
receiving a UEL Teaching Fellowship in recognition of ‘excellence’ in my 
learning and teaching practice in these areas. In turn, the fellowship 
enabled me to develop projects like Directional Forces, which focussed 
more specifically on the various ways that Artists learn and engage with 
each other.

Conclusion

The works produced during this doctorate period are, like Barthes A 
Lover’s Discourse, a discourse on love, with each work as a figure, a fragment of that discourse.

In Barthes on Love, Stephen Heath writes that Barthes takes up the 
‘imaginary’ of love as ‘value’. “Not the love of property and possession, of 
jealous intrigue, constant suspicion, but the love-passion, the effusion of 
the subject in the image of the loved object as desire for total fulfilment, 
paradisical unity.” He goes on to say that ‘the discourse of the lover 
permits a distanciation of sexuality or, rather, reappropriates the latter 
from its reduction to genitality, the poverty of the current and commercial 
economy of sex, the market of the phallus, into a diffuseness of desire, a 
kind of generalised sensuality, another economy.” (Heath; 1982)

Heaths notion of Barthes’ ‘distanciation of sexuality’ from the phallic 
to the sensual in A Lover’s Discourse is a useful premise to use in 
reflecting on my work of the doctorate period 2007-12. Pre/early doctoral 
works like Goatfucker, Horsehead and The Countryside Alliance all clearly 
use explicit symbolic language to access the imaginary and produce
resultant psychodramatic narrative constructions. Following this we can see a gradual transition from works that interrogated sexuality, sensuality and the psychosexual identity through symbolic phallic genitality to mid period works that explore sensuality of the desire for ‘total fulfilment’ and ‘paradisical unity’ through conjoinment, blending and morphing of forms and features.

The large watercolour works in the *Everafter Series*, are mark the transitional phase from the symbolic phallo-centric investigations in my approach to the subject. These works form into a discourse on the subjectivity of masculine feminine roleplay. The subjective content of these works was born out of abandonment into creative ‘flow’, releasing imaes and ideas where the meaning and interpretations of the narrative work could remain unfixed.

*Supernova 1008*, and *Sirius; The Teary Eyed Breaking Heart* and *Irreconcilable Difference* represent a more substantial paradigm shift in both subject and approach. These works use the ‘conjoined’ ‘mirrored’ device as a symbolic referent to structure a tableau that creates a discourse around what Hendrick and Hendrick propose as the ‘merging verses wedding’ metaphor for the analysis of the lovers union experience. (Hendrick & Hendrick; 1992). In providing images that represent visions of individual identifies that are both separate and sacrificed into the unified whole, the work refers to the sublimation of self into other for the relationship.

The watercolour works *The Scent of the Moment Never Lingers Long Enough to Forget* and *The Last Kiss You Never Gave* are about the romantic belief in the transformative power of love to expand the self. These works function in what Dorothy Tennov calls “limerence”; which is “characterized by physiological arousal, idealization of the other, intrusive thinking, mood swings, fear of rejection, and so on” (Hendrick & Hendrick; 1983, Tennov; 1999). The kisses of these works operate in the same way that lovers approach a kiss to disclose something of themselves to the other, yet still retain the potential of some future moment of satiation, an important concept for the adolescent moment that aspires to passionate, romantic love.
Clearly, what is important to my working practice is the relationship between the theoretical context and the periods of creative ‘flow’ that build the visual research that contributes to the collaged creation of images leading to the phenomenological experience of the painting itself.

The later works *Blue Collar* and *The Dream of De Beauvoir Square*, and *The End, Reflected in a Golden Eye* attempt to position across a wider variety of what Hendricks & Hendricks term ‘love styles’, searching for a more intense, mature visualisation of love. These love styles can be paraphrased as; Eros, passionate love; Ludus, the love game; Storge, companionship love; Pragma, partnership love; Mania, obsessive love; and Agape, selfless love. (Hendrick & Hendrick; 1983) in The paintings build on the pictorial romanticism and the visual devices of the earlier cojoined and merged works, but then layer the emotional interruption into the paintwork and composition to simultaneously hold the tension of both togetherness and separation in mark, image and interpretation.
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Appendix 1: Roland Barthes: A Lover’s Discourse; Figures

I have provided an abridged version of Roland Barthes A Lover’s Discourse; Fragments that I have used in the studio since 2008. Trans. Richard Howard. New York: Hill and Wang, 1978

"I am engulfed, I succumb …”
s'abîmer / to be engulphed
Outburst of annihilation which affects the amorous subject in despair or fulfillment.

The Absent One
absence / absence
Any episode of language which stages the absence of the loved object -- whatever its cause and its duration -- and which tends to transform this absence into an ordeal of abandonment.

"Adorable"
adorable / adorable
Not managing to name the specialty of his desire for the loved being, the amorous subject falls back on this rather stupid word: adorable!

The Intractable
affirmation / affirmation
Against and in spite of everything, the subject affirms love as value.

The Tip of the Nose
altération / alteration
Abrupt production, within the amorous field, of a counter-image of the loved object. According to minor incidents or tenuous features, the subject suddenly sees the good Image alter and capsize.

Agony
angoisse / anxiety
The amorous subject, according to one contingency or another, feels swept away by the fear of a danger, an injury, an abandonment, a revulsion -- a sentiment he expresses under the name of anxiety.

**To Love Love**

_annulation / annulment_

Explosion of language during which the subject manages to annul the loved object under the volume of love itself: by a specifically amorous perversion, it is love the subject loves, not the object.

**To Be Ascetic**

_askesis_

Whether he feels guilty with regard to the loved being, or whether he seeks to impress that being by representing his unhappiness, the amorous subject outlines an ascetic behavior of self-punishment (in life style, dress, etc.).

**Atopos**

_atopos / atopos_

The loved being is recognized by the amorous subject as "atopos" (a qualification given to Socrates by his interlocutors), i.e., unclassifiable, of a ceaselessly unforseen originality.

**Waiting**

_attente / waiting_

Tumult of anxiety provoked by waiting for the loved being, subject to trivial delays (rendezvous, letters, telephone calls, returns).

**Dark Glasses**

cacher / to hide

A deliberative figure: the amorous subject wonders, not whether he should declare his love to the loved being (this is not a figure of avowal), but to what degree he should conceal the turbulences of his passion: his
desires, his distresses; in short, his excesses (in Racinian languages: his fureur).

**Tutti Sistemati**
casés / pigeonholed
The amorous subject sees everyone around him as "pigeonholed," each appearing to be granted a little practical and affective system of contractual liaisons from which he feels himself to be excluded; this inspires him with an ambiguous sentiment of envy and mockery.

**Catastrophe**
catastrophe / catastrophe
Violent crisis during which the subject, experiencing the amorous situation as a definitive impasse, a trap from which he can never escape, sees himself doomed to total destruction.

**Laetitia**
circonscrire / to circumscribe
To reduce his wretchedness, the subject pins his hope on a method of control which permits him to circumscribe the pleasures afforded by the amorous relation: on the one hand, to keep these pleasures, to take full advantage of them, and on the other hand, to place within a parenthesis of the unthinkable those broad depressive zones which separate such pleasures: "to forget" the loved being outside of the pleasures that being bestows.

**The Heart**
coeur / heart
This word refers to all kinds of movements and desires, but what is constant is that the heart is constituted into a gift-object -- whether ignored or rejected.
"All the delights of the earth"
comblement / fulfillment
The subject insistently posits the desire and the possibility of a complete satisfaction of the desire implicated in the amorous relation and of a perfect and virtually eternal success of this relation: paradisiac image of the Sovereign Good, to be given and to be received.

"I have an Other-ache"
compassion / compassion
The subject experiences a sentiment of violent compassion with regard to the loved object each time he sees, feels, or knows the loved object is unhappy or in danger, for whatever reason external to the amorous relation itself.

"I want to understand"
comprendre / to understand
Suddenly perceiving the amorous episode as a knot of inexplicable reasons and impaired solutions, the subject exclaims: "I want to understand (waht is happening to me)!

"What is to be done?"
conduite / behavior
A deliberative figure: the amorous subject raises (generally) futile problems of behavior: faced with this or that alternative, waht is to be done? How is he to act?

Connivance
connivence / connivance
The subject imagines himself speaking about the loved being with a rival person, and this image generates and strangely develops in him a pleasure of complicity.
"When my finger accidentally ..."
contacts / contacts
The figure refers to any interior discourse provoked by a furtive contact with the body (and more precisely the skin) of the desired being.

Events, Setbacks, Annoyances
contingences / contingencies
Trivialities, incidents, setbacks, pettiness’s, irritations, the vexations of amorous existence; any factual nucleus whose consequences intersect the amorous subject's will to happiness, as if chance conspired against him.

The Other's Body
corps / body
Any thought, any feeling, any interest aroused in the amorous subject by the loved body.

Talking
déclaration / declaration
The amorous subject's propensity to talk copiously, with repressed feeling, to the loved being, about his love for that being, for himself, for them: the declaration does not bear upon the avowal of love, but upon the endlessly glossed form of the amorous relation.

The Dedication
dédicace / dedication
An episode of language which accompanies any amorous gift, whether real or projected; and, more generally, every gesture, whether actual or interior, by which the subject dedicates something to the loved being.

"We are our own demons"
démons / demons
It occasionally seems to the amorous subject that he is possessed by a
demon of language which impels him to injure himself and to expel
himself -- according to Goethe's expression -- from the paradise which at
other moments the amorous relation constitutes for him.

**Domnei**
dépendance / dependency
A figure in which common opinion seesthe very condition of the amorous
subject, subjugated to the loved object.

**Exuberance**
dépense / expenditure
A figure by which the amorous subject both seeks and hesitates to place
love in an economy of pure expenditure, of "total loss."

**The World Thunderstruck**
déréalité / disreality
Sentiment of absence and withdrawal of reality experienced by the
amorous subject, confronting the world.

**Novel / Drama**
drame / drama
The amorous subject cannot write his love story himself. Only a very
archaic form can accommodate the event which he declaims without being
able to recount.

**Flayed**
écorché / flayed
The particular sensibility of the amorous subject, which renders him
vulnerable, defenseless to the slightest injuries.

**Inexpressible Love**
écrire / to write
Enticements, arguments, and impasses generated by the desire to "express" amorous feeling in a "creation" (particularly of writing).

**The Ghost Ship**
errance / errantry
Though each love is experienced as unique and though the subject rejects the notion of repeating it elsewhere later on, he sometimes discovers in himself a kind of diffusion of amorous desire; he then realizes he is doomed to wander until he dies, from love to love.

"**In the loving calm of your arms**"
etrëinte / embrace
The gesture of the amorous embrace seems to fulfill, for a time, the subject's dream of total union with the loved being.

**Exiled from the Image-repertoire**
exil / exile
Deciding to give up the amorous condition, the subject sadly discovers himself exiled from his Image-repertoire.

**The Orange**
fâcheux / irksome
Sentiment of slight jealousy which overcomes the amorous subject when he sees the loved being's interest attracted or distracted by persons, objects, or occupations which in his eyes function as so many secondary rivals.

**Fade-out**
fading / fade-out
Painful ordeal in which the loved being appears to withdraw from all contact, without such enigmatic indifference even being directed against the amorous subject or pronounced to the advantage of anyone else, world or rival.

**At Fault**
fautes / faults
In various contingencies of everyday life, the subject imagines he has failed the loved being and thereby experiences a sentiment of guilt.

"Special Days"
fête / festivity
The amorous subject experiences every meeting with the loved being as a festival.

"I am crazy"
fou / mad
It frequently occurs to the amorous subject that he is or is going mad.

"Looking embarrassed"
gêne / embarrassment
A group scene in which the implicit nature of the amorous relation functions as a constraint and provokes a collective embarrassment which is not spoken.

Gradiva
Gradiva / Gradiva
This name, borrowed from Jensen’s book analyzed by Freud, designates the image of the loved being insofar as that being agrees to enter to some degree into the amorous subject's delirium in order to help him escape from it.

Blue Coat and Yellow Vest
habit / habiliment
Any effect provoked or sustained by the clothing which the subject has worn during the amorous encounter, or wears with the intention of seducing the loved object.

Identifications
identification / identification
The subject painfully identifies himself with some person (or character) who occupies the same position as himself in the amorous structure.

Images
image / image
In the amorous realm, the most painful wounds are inflicted more often by what one sees than by what one knows.

The Unknowable
inconnaissable / unknowable
Effort of the amorous subject to understand and define the loved being "in itself," by some standard of character type, psychological or neurotic personality, independent of the particular data of the amorous relation.

"Show me whom to desire"
induction / induction
The loved being is desired because another or others have shown the subject that such a being is desirable: however particular, amorous desire is discovered by induction.

The Informer
informateur / informer
A friendly figure whose constant role, however, seems to be wound the amorous subject by "innocently" furnishing commonplace information about the loved being, though the effect of this information is to disturb the subject's image of that being.

This Can't Go On
insupportable / unbearable
The sentiment of an accumulation of amorous sufferings explodes in this cry: "This can't go on ..."
Ideas of Solution
issues / outcomes
Enticement of solutions, whatever they may be, which afford the amorous subject, despite their frequently catastrophic character, a temporary peace; hallucinatory manipulation of the possible outcomes of the amorous crisis.

Jealousy
jalousie / jealousy
"A sentiment which is born in love and which is produced by the fear that the loved person prefers someone else" (Littré).

I Love You
je-t'-aime / I-love-you
The figure refers not to the declaration of love, to the avowal, but to the repeated utterance of the love-cry.

Love's Languor
langeur / languor
Subtle state of amorous desire, experienced in its dearth, outside of any will-to-possess.

The Love Letter
lettre / letter
This figure refers to the special dialectic of the love letter, both blank (encoded) and expressive (charged with longing to signify desire).

The Loquela
loquela
This word, borrowed from Ignatius of Loyola, designates the flux of language through which the subject tirelessly rehashes the effects of a wound or the consequences of an action: an emphatic form of the lover's discourse.

The Last Leaf
magie / magic
Magic consultations, secret rites, and votive actions are not absent from the amorous subject's life, whatever culture he belongs to.

"I am odious"
monstreux / monstrous
The subject suddenly realizes that he is imprisoning the loved object in a net of tyrannies: he has been pitiable, now he becomes monstrous.

No Answer
mutisme / silence
The amorous subject suffers anxiety because the loved object replies scantily or not at all to his language (discourse or letters).

Clouds
nuages / clouds
Meaning and employment of that darkening of mood which overtakes the subject under various circumstances.

"And the night illuminated the night"
nuit / night
Any state which provokes in the subject the metaphor of the darkness, whether affective, intellective, or existential, in which he struggles or subsides.

The Ribbon
objets / objects
Every object touched by the loved being's body becomes part of that body, and the subject eagerly attaches himself to it.

Love's Obscenity
obsèène / obscene
Discredited by modern opinion, love's sentimentality must be assumed by the amorous subject as a powerful transgression which leaves him alone and exposed; by a reversal of values, then, it is this sentimentality which
today constitutes love’s obscenity.

**In Praise of Tears**

pleurer / crying

The amorous subject has a particular propensity to cry: the functioning and appearance of tears in this subject.

**Gossip**

potin / gossip

Pain suffered by the amorous subject when he finds that the loved being is the subject of "gossip" and hears that being discussed promiscuously.

**Why**

pourquoi / why

Even as he obsessively asks himself why he is not loved, the amorous subject lives in the belief that the loved object does love him but does not tell him so.

**Ravishment**

ravissement / ravishment

The supposedly initial episode (though it may be reconstructed after the fact) during which the amorous subject is "ravished" (captured and enchanted) by the image of the loved object (popular name: love at first sight; scholarly name: enamoration.

**Regretted?**

regretté / regretted

Imagining himself dead, the amorous subject sees the loved being’s life continue as if nothing had happened.

"**How blue the sky was**"

rencontre / encounter
The figure refers to the happy interval immediately following the first ravishment, before the difficulties of the amorous relationship begin.

**Reverberation**
retentissement / reverberation
Fundamental mode of amorous subjectivity: a word, an image reverberates painfully in the subject's affective consciousness.

**Aubade**
réveil / waking
Various modes by which the amorous subject finds upon waking that he is once again besieged by the anxieties of his passion.

**Making Scenes**
scène / scene
The figure comprehends every "scene" (in the household sense of the term) as an exchange of reciprocal contestations.

"No clergyman attended"
seul / alone
The figure refers, not to what the human solitude of the amorous subject may be, but to his "philosophical" solitude, love-as-passion being accounted for today by no major system of thought (of discourse).

**The Uncertainty of Signs**
signes / signs
Whether he seeks to prove his love, or to discover if the other loves him, the amorous subject has no system of sure signs at his disposal.

**Elucevan le stelle**
souvenir / remembrance
Happy and/or tormenting remembrance of an object, a gesture, a scene, linked to the loved being and marked by the intrusion of the imperfect tense into the grammar of the lover's discourse.
Ideas of Suicide

suicide / suicide
In the amorous realm, the desire for suicide is frequent: a trifle provokes it.

Thus
tel / thus
Endlessly required to define the loved object, and suffering from the uncertainties of this definition, the amorous subject dreams of a knowledge which would let him take the other as he is, thus and no other, exonerated from any adjective.

Tenderness
tendresse / tenderness
Bliss, but also a disturbing evaluation of the loved object's tender gestures, insofar as the subject realizes that he is not their privileged recipient.

Union
union / union
Dream of total union with the loved being.

Truth
vérité / truth
Every episode of language refers to the "sensation of truth" the amorous subject experiences in thinking of his love, either because he believes he is the only one to see the loved object "in its truth," or because he defines the specialty of his own requirement as a truth concerning which he cannot yield.

Sobria Ebrietast
vouloir-saisir / will-to-possess
Realizing that the difficulties of the amorous relationship originate in his ceaseless desire to appropriate the loved being in one way or another, the subject decides to abandon henceforth all "will-to-possess" in his regard.
Appendix 2: Films featuring Kiss Scenes

The following list identifies selected films that I have watched and studied to examine the visual language of kiss scenes within the narrative structure. This is a representative list only.

1896 Dir. Edison “The Kiss” Irwin-Rice kiss, the first-ever cinematic screen kiss
1926 Dir. Brown “Flesh and the Devil” Garbo-Gilbert femme-fatal kiss
1930 Dir. Leonard “Divorcee” Morris-Shearer pre-code kiss
1932 Dir. Sagan “Mädchen in Uniform” Thiele-Wieck lesbian kiss
1942 Dir. Curtiz “Casablanca” Bogart-Bergman kiss
1944 Dir. Dmytryk “Murder My Sweet” Powell-Shirley blindfold kiss
1952 Dir. Kelly & Donen “Singing in the Rain” Kelly-Reynolds end-of-movie kiss,
1953 Dir. Zinneman “From Here to Eternity” Lancaster-Kerr waves metaphor kiss
1955 Dir. Hitchcock “To Catch a Thief” Grant-Kelly fireworks metaphor kiss
1961 Dir. Edwards “Breakfast at Tiffany’s” Peppard-Hepburn kissing in the ‘abandonment’ rain kiss
1963 Dir. Warhol “Kiss” avant-garde film kisses
1970 Dir. Antonioni “Zabriskie Point” Frechet-Halprin hallucinatory orgy fantasy kiss
1971 Dir. Lucas “THX” Duvall-McOmie illicit futuristic kiss
1975 Dir. Cronenberg “Shivers” Petrie-Steele, Steele-Hampton erotic horror zombie kisses
1982 Dir. Lisberger “Tron” Bridges-Morgan computer kiss
1987 Dir. Ardolino “Dirty Dancing” Swayze-Grey kiss
1988 Dir. Tornatore “Cinema Paradiso” collected screen kisses
1992 Dir. Leonard “Lawnmower Man” CGI Kiss
1994 Dir. Newell “Four Weddings and a Funeral” Grant-McDowell ‘I do’ kiss
1996 Dir. Stopkewich “Kissed” Parker-Corpse Necrophilia kiss
1997 Dir. Lurhmann “Romeo & Juliet” Dane-Caprio kiss of death kiss
1997 Dir. Lyne “Lolita” remake Irons-Swaine underage kiss
1997 Dir. Cameron “Titanic” Caprio-Winslet steamy kiss, flying metaphor kiss
1999 Dir. Kumble “Cruel Intentions” Geller-Blair kiss
2003 Dir. Bertolucci “The Dreamers” Green-Pitt-Garrel kiss
2005 Dir. “Kids in America” compilation kiss renactment
2005 Dir. Lee “Brokeback Mountain” Gyllenhaal-Hedger homosexual awakening kiss
2006 Dir. Aronofsky “The Fountain” Jackman-Wiesz remembered kiss lament
2008 Dir. Daldry “The Reader” Winslet-Kross underage kiss
2008 Dir. Mendes “Revolutionary Road” Winslet-Caprio husband directing wife intertextual reference kiss
2010 Dir. Yates “Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows”, Radcliff-Watson coming of age onscreen kiss
2010 Dir. Aronofsky “Black Swan” Portman-Kunis repressed fantasy kiss
2010 Dir. Conn “Elena Undone” Zadegan-Dinwiddle longest on-screen kiss
APPENDIX 3: Artists as referenced

Charlie Smith Gallery (2010), Gavin Nolan

Haunch of Venison (2010), Adrian Ghenie
(Accessed: 1 April 2011)

Mercedes Helwin (2011), Mercedes Helwin

Eric White (2011) Eric White

Ling Jian (2011) Ling Jian
http://www.lingjian.org/ (Accessed: 1 April 2011)


Alexander Tinei (2011) Alexander Tinei

Alan Christea (2010) Alexander Tinei

Simone Haack (2011) Simone Haack
http://www.simone-haack.de/ (Accessed: 1 April 2011)

Tate Modern (2010) Luc Tuymans

David Zwirner (2010) Mamma Andersson

David Zwirner (2010) Michael Borremans

Greer, G. (2011) Marlene Dumas’s paintings of nudes and kids are always unsettling. Go, girl!


Fred (2010) Phillip Jones
New Museum (2009) Live Forever: Elizabeth Peyton
http://www.newmuseum.org/exhibitions/400 (Accessed: 1 April 2011)
Max Wigram (2009) Richard Wathen
(Accessed: 1 April 2011)
APPENDIX 4: Additional Illustrations

Figure 51: Pablo Picasso (1969), Le baiser (The kiss)
Oil on canvas, 97 × 130 cm, Réunion des Musées Nationaux

Figure 52: Pablo Picasso (1937), Weeping Woman
Oil on canvas, 60 x 50 cm, Tate Gallery London
Figure 53: Hedley Roberts (2010) *The Ribbon,*
Watercolour & Tempera on Silk Panel 27 x 21cm

Figure 54: Hedley Roberts (2011) *The Gulf Between Us*
Watercolour on Paper 21 x 21cm
Figure 55: Hedley Roberts (2011) *The Fulfilment that Never Comes*

Watercolour on Paper 21 x 21cm

Figure 56: Hedley Roberts (2011) *The Final Embrace*

Watercolour on Paper 21 x 21cm
Figure 57: Hedley Roberts (2011) *The Lack of Tenderness*

Watercolour on Paper 21 x 21cm