

# *Artist-Author in Action and Reflection*

## [Part 3]

Michael Croft, Collaborative researcher, Porto University, Portugal  
Email: [mcroft.contact@gmail.com](mailto:mcroft.contact@gmail.com)

### Introduction

This text synthesizes sections of voice-recording transcripts from edited video recordings of the process of making two separate drawings, the two-fold content presenting the reflexive identification of the author with his drawing more fully than any one of them from the perspective of embodied experience. While some transcript sections from the video titled RAUM (SPACE) Drawing/Video First State are self-apparent in the text due to reference to *Raum*, sections from the video titled DRAWING QUA MONOLOGUE are implicitly referenced. The video recordings can be accessed here - <https://www.researchcatalogue.net/view/1671103/1671104>)

The text presents and is formatted as several *voices*, indicated as abbreviations:

**AN**: Author's narration

**APV** + italics: Author's personal voice

**AS-AA**: Author's statement, of combined author-artist

**AAT** as transcribed and grammatically enunciated speech: Author-artist's transcript

**ARR**: Author's response to reviewers' suggested amendments

**AN**: While the last of the voices is due to a contingency, the result of editorial involvement in prospective published texts, by including this other implicit voice the author acknowledges that much further, that the text has a *life*, as it were, both implicit with and different from its content. The visual artistic practice as phenomenological practice, which it is the aim of the article to present, therefore leans towards the medium of language-based practice, and in doing so the formatting of the text is additional material of its message. In such terms the text's formatting as an article has a rationale that is *other* to the visual, auditory and textual elements that it references.

The author both draws and speaks his drawings while video recording. While drawings have resulted from each of two recordings, which can be viewed in the Appendix as Figures 1 and 2, their differences are due to Figure 1's response to an illusorily optical motif and Figure 2's to a sound.

**APV**: *Artist as conjoined author, the article's title suggests. The ratio could as ill be reversed (to use a health-related reference, among other forthcoming turns-of-phrase) – author-artist – where the following commentary would take a different course. The potential of this will at least be suggested by the author component word of the pair also being suffixed with a hyphen.*

**AN:** An action camera is a prerequisite device, a small black box attached to clear plastic industrial goggles worn over orange-tinted reading glasses that records all the artist-author's drawing activity as seen through eyes moved by dint of one's head movements. In this respect the process can easily go wrong – the sensorimotor ability to move one's eyes without the head – to compensate for which, the artist's monologue will also have accessed the drawing.

**ARR:** The drawing of which the video clip terms DRAWING QUA MONOLOGUE, concerns what can be seen of the action camera by the artist-, a device that, for reasons explained below, partly obscures the artist-'s vision. The drawing surface, typical of both referenced drawings, is specifically white satin-effect laminated cardboard, the drawing tools of which are Dermatograph pencils and black ink applied with a brush. Such pencils, favourable to highly smooth surfaces, boldly iterate the artist-'s contact with the lamination, while their marks can be erased without trace, and the ink defers to the surface's limited porousness. The tools' combined strengths enable the artist- to delay in the process without resulting in either an over-accumulation of the medium or conveying anaemic sense of hesitancy. The drawing of which the video clip terms RAUM (SPACE) Drawing/Video First State, concerns pronunciation of the German word for space, *Raum*, of which the drawing is in response. Heidegger (2001) refers to *Raum* in the context of human dwelling as a "boundary' [...] from which something begins its presencing" (p. 152). While Heidegger's understanding of space might be performed human scale by one's outstretched embracing arms, the rolling sound of the 'R' of the pronounced *Raum* suggests space's point of origin actually inside one's body, as it is much more palpably felt during its emergence from the larynx than the English word *space*. Such a sound presences its own 'boundary' through a roundness of movement of one's hands – with drawing materials in both hands – empathically with the scale of the drawing surface.

**AN:** The text integrates both artist- and author- into their practice, the pronoun *they* – used from now on – which is really a plural *one*, even while the author- is inclined to detach from the artist- when referenced for *their* reflective contribution after the drawing event. Importantly for the structure of the article, the author-'s comment on the artist-'s drawings is also ambiguously connected with the author of the present text, the latter of whom can convey ideas of either the artist- or author-, or their complete artist-author constitution, or his own reflective-critical comment on any permutation. This is within the nature of a situation that exists as conjoined drawing, speech, video and subsequent reflection, where the text inevitably veers towards the latter.

## **Action and Reflection**

**AN:** 'Between the two *one*', says the artist- – the *one* should perhaps *be* the gap, rather than 'creates a gap' – where the *one* is equal to *the* (thee), when in the transcripts the artist habitually stresses the definite article 'the'. The question of gap that they pose is not so much a product of the artistry as its internal directing basis, as though a homunculus in the work's midst needs anonymity in order to operate.

**APV:** *The homunculus is in this case me, the present text's author, who does really dissociate from the pair, the plural one, in order to format the otherwise untidiness of the reflexive practice in different terms to that of the author-, when such untidiness*

may be considered the work's poetic potentiality. And then another level of untidiness is the interference of me in my effort to coherently format the conjoined artist-author character's creative insistence, where I'm the one to which the artist- refers, stepping out of, only to interfere in, the creative process – as authority is inclined is to do with most anything.

**AN:** The artist-'s monologues reflect issues of their drawing *while* drawing. Transcripts convey as much as possible of the artist-'s enunciation of their speech.

**ARR:** The reason for this, which can be sensed in the text, is that it better orientates and to an extent *delays* the artist- in the experiential process, where, arguably, more emphasis is given to the present moment of drawing.

**AN:** Disfluency as irregularities of grammar and long pauses, indicating the interruption of the drawing event into speech added to its innate characteristics, are as nearly as possible preserved in the speech's transcription as text. The artist-'s reflexivity of their speech can therefore in effect be *seen* in the article's transcription examples. The author-'s reflection on the artist-'s speech in transcript is somewhat different to any reader of the transcripts. Insofar as both the author- and the reader are each an interlocutor, the author- is – as suggested – infinitely more interfering, while any reader of the transcripts would be in a position to be more of a judge. The author-component as interlocutor might wonder what is the artist-'s need of them, and on that uncertain basis also interferes.

**AS-AA:** I'd been wondering of your need of me, but I realise that what I can do, if only this, is to point out that you've mispronounced – in order to say it with psychic incision – affectionate as *infectionate!* Affectionately infected with what if not the 'thee', the abstraction that leads you, cussedly on its own terms as if independently of you, considered for your own good — at this moment through this *ill*-formed space, if I might similarly play on a word to convey an opinion. It's not that I don't speak, but you permit *me* only natural means too, that oscillate with and as the drawing when reduced to a few basic elements – means that tap and index what you utter as nearly as possible as enunciation only. I bite while you roar, as faculties of the one creature in the forest.

You're granting me what you consider the greater power of the listener. It's nonetheless an active role, with the potential of interlocution, and in these interspersed paragraphs I come into my own.

It's testimony to our present depth of involvement that you and I are one, through and as the artifice of the artistic means: drawing, audio-visual, transcripts, reflective comment. If we ask who calls the shots, you or me, you prefer to think of it as me as the interlocutor after the reflexive experiential event of drawing and speaking, but there's reciprocity, after all, that's inevitable.

An *illness* metaphor prevails. You've mentioned illness recently in the context of having to intermittently clear your throat. Interesting, though, that your pronunciation of *Raum* is clear and sustained. Yet there are associations suggested by the sounds of the drawing, such as an old door squeaking on its rusty hinges, as though your work seeks its sustainability through concerns of the worried well or unsuspectingly sick. This is the question at the core of the gameplay, which can

oscillate between physical and cerebral. Look at the darkness built up, like a corroded lung, the microphone a doctor's listening.

**AN:** The artist- of the pair may unwittingly speak the author-'s involvement as interlocutor. This is an important point: the author-'s voice *is* implicit in the speech of the artist-:

**AAT:** The wandering of the camera . . . 'the wandering glance' of the subject . . . coordinated with . . . the movement of the camera . . . and the movement of my *eyes* . . . separately from the movement of my camera, and you the viewer will not see. *I will not see*, after the event of the drawing, in this recording . . . .

**AN:** The author-, on the other hand, might consider that the artist- views them as the *other*; that somehow the artifice of this near reciprocal interplay between two halves does indicate something other than them; interests in phenomena, in materiality.

**ARR:** It should be explained that the artist- cannot say that they start their drawing with next-to-nothing, as nice as a blank slate would be, for the reason that in order to observe the evolution of the drawing as its own subject it suits the artist- to video-record such a process. The means of recording is a small black-box action-camera attached to the front of clear-plastic goggles worn over reading glasses that the artist-needs for close work, over the eyes. While the visual effect is profound – one's looking around the black box and its optical imploding as a thin black rectangle that scales up considerably from its object's actual size – only the artist- can see this during the drawing process, the camera picks up nothing of itself, and neither can it be seen by artist- or any viewer of the resulting video. Since the camera also records audio, the artist-'s speech has crept into the mix. This is also important: these two contingent facts, the camera's obfuscation of the artist-'s vision and the ease with which it records sound, have enabled the artist-'s elucidation of the content of their work such that an author- component of the practice has emerged.

**AN:** The artist- sometimes physically taps the author-'s presence on and in the drawing, sounding for them – if not sounding *me* as the presence of something else in their midst – and at the same time the author- is indexed as the pencils' resistance to the pressure exerted on them. Inasmuch as the author- is the ratio that's holding the microphone rather than doing the drawing – the right hand dedicated to the artist- via the pencil and the author- via the microphone taped to the finger – they are at that point vocally mute.

Speech is mostly a reflexive sensorimotor activity that is driven by a general level of sense, where one nonetheless hopes that one speaks well and clearly. However, both the *psyche* and the *soma* exist in speech; one cannot do much about the former, while the latter bears one's physical troubles. When the artist- pronounces the word *Raum* it's not just the projection outwards: there's the initial intake of breath in order to roll the 'R' sound, which is the part of the sound that comes not from deep down in the throat but from the back of the upper mouth – at least how an English language speaker does it, since the rolled 'R' is not a phoneme of English. The RAUM (SPACE) video has prompted a revelation that wavers as truth between their mildly troublesome laryngeal condition and its invention in and as the drawing's narrative. The artist- states:

**AAT:** And I have no idea . . . of the accuracy . . . of the pronunciation, RAUM, and within the pronunciation, my, intonation . . . and the com— combination of pronunciation and, intonation, subject to *the* enunciation of my speech. I mean, I love this; the pronunciation, combined with the intonation, the pronunciation of the word, the intoned, character of the word, and this, enunciated, within my speech. RAUM. And there are pauses. The disfluency of my language. To an extent it's natural. I tend to stop and start, stutter, stammer, lost for words and so on. (*Raum* time-length three seconds and six seconds respectively, and some audible evidence of throat irritation)

*Then again:*

**AAT:** I need to-um, record . . . record the drawing process in vish— in video because it's about the drawing process rather than the drawing finish, to *my* mind. Phenomenological research through drawing, is, through the drawing process, and— um, speak my thoughts about this while drawing, because, after the event of the drawing it's, in a sense too late. (Sound of throat irritation)

**AN:** The artist- not only alludes to the author-'s expressed idea, but also suggests that to explore the experiential process of drawing is automatically phenomenological. The artist- is using the drawing as an example in practice of how to explore the *process* of drawing, both mechanically and experientially. Process itself as a methodology of working *is* important, if one is to turn a medium that ends as a form of artefact back in on itself to explore its nature; but not only that, its embodiment of its progenitor's experience. The artist-'s ability to reflect on the circumstances even while drawing is due to the fact that they have done this before, a main interest being to notice and draw perceivable differences between central and peripheral vision. The artist- may stare fixedly at the point of a pencil and its act of indexing on the page, while attentive to whatever is on the periphery, or pencil/s may be drawing the peripheral content while some detail of the drawing may hold the artist-'s central focus.

Authority, the artist- suggests through the preponderance of the stressed intonation of the *definite article* as 'thee', holds them back – as a dog that cooperates with a jerk to its halter – as evidenced by the article mostly being followed by a comma. We hear this, see it, in the video in the gentle and sometimes not so gentle tapping of the pencil on the page, or the pausing or slight backward movement of the pencil.

**APV:** *In the above instance I can suggest that I am coming through, in the process conferring more with the author- than with the artist-.*

**AN:** The microphone taped to the finger of the artist- picks up the drawing sounds on the laminated cardboard support. The microphone can be seen moving in sync with the mark-making and gestures that provoke occasional sudden, sharp, fast, alternate tapping that can of course also be heard, and records the resistant dragging and repetitive resonant low-tone pulling and squeaking, smudging, dragging and their intermittent repeats. The artist- also refers to having to cross boundaries – 'territory' – of the drawing to pick up the respective sounds of left and right drawing actions.

The artist- frequently coughs, which the author- links to a form of acid reflux that affects the larynx and oesophagus, but also suggests is useful evidence of the artist-'s persistent corporeality conveyed in and through their voice. The *Raum* basis

of the drawing in a sense monopolizes on the condition. The pronunciation and intonation projects outwards from the initial intake of breath in order to roll the ‘R’ sound, which comes from the back of the upper mouth. So here the artist- has the translation of a malady into the audible basis of the activity, coupled with visual comparisons that abound in the drawing – the sheer black and redness, apart from anything. The action, reaction, and considerable resistance is going on biologically inside the artist-’s throat, visualized as drawing that simultaneously finds auditory equivalents. The artist- is in a sense not comfortable with authority that gurgles deep inside them, and tries to expel it *through* their voice, but whatever it is stays stubbornly in place.

The pauses afforded by the up-and-down and pushing-gestures’ repetition afford the artist- the chance of their reflexive thinking to gather just enough conscious awareness for them to shift gear. The changing of direction at which the artist- pushes, pulls and rocks the pencil in order to ‘curtail’ the blended movement is a drawing-based metaphor for their subtle shift in thinking about the nature of their involvement. This is important, because the artist-’s speech as enunciation embodies the biological and instinctual bedrock of them as living within and alive *through* their language. The artist- has therefore chosen a word that they can debate through speech and drawing while staying natural – somewhat animal – in their approach to both. The artist- is suggesting a comparison between drawing and speaking through their mutual reflexivity. Where the two show their enunciated basis, inasmuch as this indicates reflexive experience, is through the idiosyncrasies of the artist-’s spoken language’s punctuation and the signatory style of their drawing. While the artist-’s speech disfluency may inhibit their flow of thought, in another way they are exposing the pattern of their speech to try to evidence it also in and as drawing; what’s natural to both, in the artist-’s own experiential terms. The artist-’s language is of speech, and their speech is of drawing. Any reflective text written by the author- after the artist-’s drawing event is of the artist-’s speech *and* drawing.

*APV: This again, suggests that the author- and myself are more compatible at this time than the artist- and I, of the pair-choices.*

*AN: The author- is a synopsis of the artist-’s complex involvement, as the other of the conjoined pair stands back from the one – though negligibly – to reflect. If we see this in terms of connectivity, it is like an ellipse. In reflecting on the artist-, the author- dips into water as if to apprehend the reflection, and is brought out of the water again by the artist- as they swim in their own concerns.*

The author- says of their process that they dip back into the water in moments of still vision, and so end an arbitrary process that artist-author will as part of a joint operation take up later. However, the author- also creates their own reflection. But the author- is not as unique. The viewer is given enough criteria with the drawing, the video, and the voice, to do the same.

The artist- observes that the author- sometimes *caves in* to the idea of intellectual demonstration due to lack of confidence in their own ideas, perhaps, or to more obviously spell out their work’s basis in research.

*AAT: Er— Husserl talks about, Husserl talks about— Right the . . . the imploded vertical, of the action camera is right through this, word, ‘wandering’. Husserl talks*

about the ‘wandering glance’ which I love, in relation to drawing he’s talking about it, in relation to *the*, *the* ‘noema’, *the* . . . objective aspect or ‘content’ (clears throat) of an intentional experience, and, ‘noesis’, the subject—ive aspect, of experience or the ‘act’, of experience—the ‘content’, and the ‘act’ . . . of experience. . . so— And he says that this is— exploring this is the general task, of phenomenology. This is from his book, *Ideas* [. . .]. ‘The wandering glance’, which alternately, enlarges and restricts, its mental span, signifies a special dimension of correl— correlative modifications noetic, and neomatic, of which the systematic study on essential lines, is one of the fundamental tasks of general phenomenology’ – The ‘wandering glance’. I need— if I need to wander, if I wander, I have to wander with, *the*, camera . . . (Husserl: 2012, pp. 184-5; p. 194)

**AN:** The artist- part of the equation is alluding to what the artist-author is trying to do, which is to record, and in the author-’s case comment, on the mechanics of the experience, to get at the ‘essence’ of the experience and bring the task more into the realm of Husserl’s (2012) phenomenology (p. 186). The fact that it is in the centre of focus suggests that it is available to all; in this case the artist-’s perception in action as if it had made itself available to sight in front of them, and in the author-’s case the phenomenological reflection on the reflexivity of their effort.

**AAT:** I’m crossing the blind spot. Here this is the blind spot. At this point, at this point . . . there’s the central part of my hand I cannot see. It’s behind the ac— the blur— it’s blurred but it’s behind *the*, action-cam.

**AN:** The artist- suggests, while the author- wonders if they should tell? This is the question that pops out from the integral interplay between question and answer of the practice. In this they *will* tell. The point that the author- tells is physical, and the theoretical point that the artist- is making is that at the very centre of their focus they cannot see. ‘Blind spot’ is a reference from Žižek (2006), which alludes to the complex theory of the psychical ‘scopic drive’ according to Lacan (p. 17). The theorized term ‘blind spot’ also appears in Lacan’s Seminar XXIII, ‘The Sinthome’ ([1975-6] 2016), where he states: “There is a centrifugal dynamic of the gaze, that is to say, one that starts from the seeing eye but also from the blind spot” (p.70). Merleau-Ponty (1968), in the context of ‘chiasm’ – which influenced Lacan, (1981, p. 71) – refers to the sense of being looked at as if by the ‘outside’ as if it were a ‘phantom’, where “[. . .] the seer and the visible reciprocate one another and we no longer know which sees and which is seen” (p. 139). The artist- knows the point is there but cannot see it except by projecting it through the imploded blur of the action camera, and registers it in the drawing as a shifting point that is constantly gazing back. In this respect, concerning the imploded rectangle’s registration on the drawing surface, the viewer of the video, which includes the artist- as viewer, *can* of course see. The *Raum* is there in the RAUM (SPACE) drawing as a circle, through and across which passes the spine, or the border between left and right, with the author- as the microphone that holds the power of the listener against the artist-’s ushering in from the left, willing the author- to make and form their own contribution.

The artist-’s idea of Husserl’s division between ‘content’ and the ‘act’ affirms their determination to try to view perception in action through its own mechanics, including the integration of the visual with touch and sound. It is as though perception is an act of crossing between the point of vision in their eyes and the content on which their vision focuses. An aspect of such content is how other issues blur or complicate mere looking; aspects that do not disclose where they are ‘coming from’, the present

metaphor of which is an indefinable red tinge on the side of the blur of the action camera that the artist- often references.

**ARR:** The less likely such elements are to exist except optically, the more they key into the question of *phantom*. Lacan (1981) takes the idea of phantom in relation to *the gaze* even further as ‘ghost’ (p.88) – albeit a ‘phallic ghost’–, which is the element of the gaze that has nothing to do with the visible. While beyond the scope of the present article, this aspect of Lacanian theory is now challenged by Ettinger’s (2020) theory of ‘matrixial borderspace’.

**AN:** The author-’s own thinking is also not un-reflexive, evidenced in their occasional use of figurative language, for which reason they might also benefit from some application of Husserl’s method of isolating such basis to test it through reflection. The author-’s suggestion that the artist- sometimes ‘caves in’ to theory is that the artist- succumbs to temptation to academically reference, to have made a defensive environment of academic literature, which is a way of defending themselves from the more uncomfortable premise of self-revelation.

The artist- inverts their finger from a passive to operative role, perception in the artist-’s case being as much about the registration, through drawing, of multi-sensory awareness. The artist- has in fact layered several responsive concentric circles in the drawing, RAUM (SPACE). There is also the transmission of energy up and out from the artist-’s body and simultaneously performed on the page, suggesting the beginning of a concentric space around the pivot of the throat, which shares its motif with that of the imploded action camera, both of which are now in front of their eyes; the seeing of that which is the necessary extension of vision to enable *us* to see how the artist- sees in unison with hearing, the latter of which is the vocalisation of the *felt*.

The word *Raum* starts in the mouth and wells up from the artist-’s larynx, generated by an intention to form the utterance, then the motion of air from deep inside their lungs activates the vocal chords and expels both air and sound through their mouth, but since the artist- is here foregrounding the *enunciation* of their speech, they focus on the aspects of the voice that concern pronunciation and intonation.

It is the border – or wall, maybe – that attracts and repels both self and other as parts of the gameplay that is life, here converted to the throat through which space is propelled from a deeper region of the body as a presence in front of one, indexed on the page – despite the artist-’s best efforts to infiltrate the page as space.

**AAT:** Here’s my thumb. Here’s my thumb. Here’s the edge of my hand. I’m copying I’m copying *this*. I’m tracing it, I’m tracing it, I’m tracing it, I’m tracing it. I’m now looking at, *the*— I’m looking at, the creases in my, flesh, across my wrist (Slow resistant dragging sound; short faint rocking sound).

**AN:** The artist- alternates between either of the sides of the drawing represented by each hand, but suggests that as one side behaves involuntarily the other side behaves more directionally. The artist-’s thinking is through complex engagement with body and materials and lack of premeditation of what will happen next.

**AAT:** This moment in time I’m drawing this, red . . . sort of sense, of the right side of *the*. . . imploded rectangle of the, camera. . . . So the ‘wandering glance’ has become,



central focus, insofar as I need to attend to this. ‘The wandering glance’ ‘the wandering glance’, ‘the wandering glance’, ‘the wandering glance’ *the act of recording the movement, of ‘the wandering glance’ . . . central focus as I, trace it. [...] So I’m trying to speak about these things I’m trying to rationalize, I’m trying to reflect, on actions which are . . . in large part reflexive. For example I didn’t really think, that I was gonna attempt to push, push the pencil, in the shape of a curve until I started . . . . Something to do. I’m pushing up now, instead of pushing down pushing up, pushing up— Feeling the resistance. The ink is registering resistance, the pushing the, pencil against the, wetness of the, page . . . . And there’s a mutual, pushing and pulling, the pushing the pencil and pulling the brush, pushing the pencil, pulling the brush. And there’s the word . . . there’s the word *noesis*, comes in; *the act, the act of pushing and pulling . . . . The black, pencil pushing the red pencil . . . . The red line of the red pencil, is around the act. I need to keep this exactly, in place. . . . (Throat irritation)**

**AN:** The artist- habitually draws the motif of the imploded rectangle of the action camera that they can see, albeit in this refracted sense, where the viewer cannot. As the artist- draws the camera’s shape, the shape follows them laterally and up and down, synchronised with head movements. The camera’s shape is also blurred, and as the author- points out that the artist- says that it’s an “...affectionate, *infectionate* intrusion [...] into my perception...”

The artist- is careful not to move their eyes independently of their head, telling the viewer while showing them the rough positions of the orange rims of the goggles from either side. Husserl’s ‘wandering glance’ is in this case often only a very thin band of central focus that moves from moment to moment. The artist- explains that the difference between them as drawing and the viewer as looking is that they, the artist-, cannot see whatever they are drawing that is behind the width of the camera, whereas the camera records it clearly for the viewer. The artist- can only see as the viewer sees in the video recording after the event. This can be considered as a metaphor for the difference between the reflexive immediacy of the drawing process and later reflection on the drawing. Whatever reflection takes place by the artist- during the drawing activity is due to their having done similar work before, all the more likely since the peculiar refracted circumstances of the camera as the drawings’ key observable motif is a choice that interests the artist-.

The artist- observes that there is a slight redness, maybe iridescence, to the right side of the camera, which they draw but of which they do not know the origin. The camera’s imploded rectangle is decisively in front of the artist-’s vision, but as they index it on the drawing, somewhat distant from the object’s physical placement on the goggles, the drawn version becomes the nearest point of the drawing plane, between which all other recorded events take place.

**AAT:** There’s a sense of space, between the camera and *the*, the lens goggles, which, down here. . . . Ah, they’re further down . . . . Well, there’s a gap there’s a space, between here and the lens goggles. But it’s negligible compared to the space between, where I can *see the*, action camera, and it’s indexing on the space. So it’s as if ideally, I would want to say that . . . if it’s, in elevation, the action camera, is the nearest point . . . er, in space of the drawing, Everything else takes place behind it, apart from maybe *the*, lens goggles.

**AN:** The gap between the camera and its presentation as an image in the drawing is a void: that which was previously referred to as ‘blind spot’. However, it is not only a blind spot in its indexing on the drawing but as a physical space between the actual camera and the drawing of the camera. What are likely to be within such a space are the physical and material conditions of the practice – the artist-’s hands and fingers, and pencils and their tips.

There is an imbalance to the artist-’s vision in that they are left-eye dominant. Consequently, the artist- notices a perceptual situation of ushering in from the left, curtailing to the right. The border to the artist-’s external perception of this biological condition of the eyes – which can be either right or left – is the physical division of the camera that heightens their awareness of the relative ease with which they can look around it from the left, with the artist- at their most intuitively involved in this respect.

**ARR:** Such left-to-right movement results in a degree of lopsided-ness that may be noticed in the drawing shown in Figure 2. (Conversely, the drawing of the sound of *Raum*, which involves symmetrical mirroring of left and right, overrides the lopsided tendency.)

**AN:** The question of eye-dominance is a totally personal factor of the artist-’s perception, almost a biological version of Merleau-Ponty’s ‘phantom’ that does have bearing on the drawings’ pictorial schema.

**AAT:** But what’s interesting is that, I’m, left-eye dominant, so as I *stare* at this point, as I stare at this point, I’m more aware of this, side of my, vision, than this side . . . . It’s describing this, two different sides focus. I can see this of course, but, because of my left-eye dominance, I tend to see this *so*, it’s as though content, is ushered in, from the left, and, curtailed, at the right. I like this to utter in and to, curtail. (Throat irritation; tapping sound)

**AN:** The artist-’s reading glasses, insofar as they can be seen within the goggles’ shallow plane, are the most likely motif for recording peripheral vision. The ‘wandering glance’ is forced in this context to extend to the peripheral, because if the artist- moves their head to the right or left, such imagery, which scales up to just within the frame of the material surface, will disappear outside the drawing’s compass.

## Closing

**AN:** The author-’s sense of *now* is more in reflection rather in the artist-’s preferred moment of reflexive experience, but this places experience and its consideration after the event in too great contrast. Both components of artist-author act and reflect, while the artist-’s is the object that enables the act and the author-’s is the keyboard, which, with the digits of their fingers in operation, draws into the operation a reflexive flow of thought. What is different is that where the artist- fills their moments of reflection on drawing with speech, which embroils into their creative process another level of reflexive action, the author-’s stepping back involves reflective thought; what to type next, as if thinking before speaking; to try to be themselves in charge of their chosen pursuit rather than led by an inner demon, the ‘thee’ in the *semiotic* of the artist-’s speech.

**APV:** *Where am I, the author of the present text? To reiterate, I'm not completely separate, but at a far greater state of remove from, according to Merleau-Ponty (1968), the "[...] reciprocal, if not symmetrical, relationship [...]" between the reflexive and reflective process (p. 35). There's always something, I would argue, that's connected but tenuously to this interplay, which determines the scene mostly from the outside....*

**ARR:** The otherness of the article, mentioned at the start, is in a sense negated by a narrative of which the present paragraph is the final of a thread, albeit ambiguously connected with the reflections of the author- of the artist-author pair. On the other hand – since I do finally name myself as the author- in the paragraph immediately above – I also identify myself earlier as a homunculus in the article's midst. In this alternative sense, therefore, I counteract what I have suggested is often that of the impassive authorial voice of article writing. This is less in terms of either the artist- or author- voice of the text than as the imploded rectangle of the camera, a material tool that is performing a real enough task, yet acknowledged by me as, in effect, an image-based homunculus as at once a *phantom* and the performance of a blind-spot. The camera as a sheer mechanical eye, however, is what enables both their viewer and me as the artist to view the drawings' process, and imposes itself as respectively the predominant motif in the DRAWING QUA MONOLOGUE video, and as a prevalent motif in the RAUM (SPACE) video.

While the aim of the article has been to present phenomenology in practice in consideration of a drawing practice, the reader may, as suggested above, have viewed the process of making each of the two drawings as and through the actual video clips. While the drawings have continued further than their first-state determination in the videos, it should be clear that the syntax and subject of each of the drawings has remained the same as at the stage of their presentation in the article.

Due to an opinion I express towards the end of the RAUM (SPACE) video that one will not be able to assess the space of the drawing until it is viewable as a completed still image, drawings from both videos can be viewed as Figures 1 and 2 in the Appendix.

## References

- Ettinger, B. (2020) *Matrixial Subjectivity, Aesthetics, Ethics*, Volume 1 1990-2000. (Ed. Griselda Pollock) Palgrave Macmillan.
- Heidegger, M. (2001) *Poetry, Language, Thought*. Harper Perennial.
- Husserl, E. (2012) *Ideas*. Routledge.
- Lacan, J. (1981) *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psycho-analysis*. Norton
- Lacan, J. (2016) *The Sinthome: The Seminar of Jacques Lacan, Book XXIII*. (Ed. Jacques-Alain Miller) UK: Polity

Merleau-Ponty, M. (1968). *The Visible and the Invisible*. Northwestern University Press.

Žižek, S. (2006) *The Parallax View*. The MIT Press

## Appendix



Figure 1: *Drawing Qua Monologue*,  
Dermatograph pencils, black ink and attached filing card on laminated white  
cardboard, 109 x 79cm, 2020 © Michael Croft



Figure 2: *RAUM (SPACE) Final State*,  
Dermatograph pencils, black ink and white acrylic paint on laminated white  
cardboard, 109 x 79cm, 2020 © Michael Croft