



*Untitled*, 2006, oil on canvas, 25 x 20 cm.

## PAINTING METHODOLOGIES

Alexandra Kennedy

“Painting was done for long ago.” (Kasimir Malevich)

This article addresses the manner in which much of contemporary painting is engaged with methodologies which cannot be accounted for within the established critical frameworks of modernism or postmodernism. In proposing a third alternative it draws together principles from a number of theoretical fields to position such contemporary painting as ‘amodernist’. The position of amodernism is then used to provide a theoretical framework for my own painting practice.

I illustrate the way in which painting has responded to changing circumstances and challenges to its ongoing validity and relevance through an engagement with the theme of the endgame, or death, of painting. Beginning within the critical frameworks of modernism and postmodernism, my article continues by identifying new forms of engagement which are then used to position much contemporary painting as ‘amodernist’.

On the one hand, the essentialist project in painting is identified, where the material nature of painting is positioned as being uniquely able to fulfil certain aesthetic functions. On the other hand, ways in which painting practice has engaged with the possibility of its own demise are explained. These positions are played out within the frameworks of modernism and postmodernism. ‘Amodernism’ is presented as a position which can make a claim for painting’s continuing validity as a critical practice through the manner in which it demonstrates an understanding of its own history: addresses its position within contemporary art practice; and finds new ways in which to engage with the themes of authenticity and the mediated image.

A painting is a mediated image. By this I mean that it is constructed, in the sense that ideas and concepts are presented via the intermediated agency of the hand of the artist or a machine. My argument begins in the early modern period, which saw in an important form of mediation, that is, the mass production of images. Heralded by the advent of photography, this was a significant development for the practice of painting and, by the mid-twentieth century, for its position in relationship to other fields of art making.

Many changes occurred in society and in the artworld during the early modern period. Avant-garde artists such as Manet began to draw their subject matter from contemporary life and to focus

on the way a painting was made through an emphasis on the materiality of paint. As Jason Gaiger says: "It is out of this productive tension between the exigency of truth to materials and exigency of truth to reality that modernism in the visual arts began."<sup>1</sup> Photography played a significant part in these developments. Firstly, it freed painting from its traditional role in depicting the world of appearances, thus enabling artists to explore other possibilities, and secondly, some painters made use of a number of the characteristics of the photographic image.

The practice of painting in the Western world in the latter part of the twentieth century can be made sense of in terms of its efforts to be progressive "in the face of widespread acknowledgement that by the mid- to late 1960s it had lost its position at the forefront of ambitious art."<sup>2</sup> In part at least this was because artists were beginning to engage in other forms of practice such as film, video, performance, land art, conceptual art and art and language. These practices were offering a critique of "the processes through which artworks were constructed and their legitimacy maintained."<sup>3</sup> Performance and land art's refusal to operate in any established sense within the gallery space and conceptual art's challenging of the role of the artwork as an aesthetic object oriented to visual or perceptual concerns, are examples. Much painting, in relationship to these practices, could not be identified as being engaged in any critique of itself or its own position within the artworld and its institutions. From this position painting could be viewed as merely a reworking of old strategies and consequently as conservative and outmoded.

The critical frameworks of modernism and postmodernism are both outcomes of the Enlightenment. Modernism, founded as it is in historicism and essentialism, represents a recapitulation of the Enlightenment ideal of human progress and the notion that humanity can be improved through an appeal to rationality. That is to say, modernism continues to develop the secularisation and individualism of the Renaissance and Enlightenment thinking and takes recourse in a rationality which has its basis in science. This thinking generated a number of elements of modernist art, not the least its self-referential nature and indexicality; with the index referencing the hero of the Enlightenment, the individual, and in modernism's case, the genius of the individual artist and their signature style. However, in the case of painting this indexicality is also self-referential in the sense that it plays a part in the development of the notion that essence will be discovered through the 'playing out' of a logic internal to the work of art. Suzi Gablick says in citing Clement Greenberg: "Only the 'dictates of the medium' – pure paint and the flatness of the picture plane – were held to be worthwhile concerns for painting."<sup>4</sup>

This approach seeks a synthesis of form and content, subject and object in an essentialist pursuit of the 'true' nature of painting. For critics such as Greenberg this essence of painting lay in its own plastic nature, in the physicality of the medium: "The purely plastic or abstract qualities of the work of art are the only ones that count."<sup>5</sup> The development toward this essence involved a process which is a logical outcome of Enlightenment thinking, in the sense that it participates in a notion of progress and self-criticality. This process can also be viewed, in the case of painting, as a response to the need to find a new purpose for itself since its death was first mooted in the early modern era.<sup>6</sup> From this there followed the development of the 'zero form' in the early twentieth century

by Malevich and Rodchenko; Mondrian's ideas concerning the dissolution of all art forms including painting into art as environment;<sup>7</sup> art's abandonment in the early part of the twentieth century by Marcel Duchamp who saw the readymade as a negation of painting; Ad Reinhardt's 'last painting'; and, other such 'zero' gestures. By the 1960s painting was seen by some as "condemned to an increasingly conservative rehearsal of strategies and gestures that had lost their original significance."<sup>8</sup> One aspect of essentialism, as a central theme of high modernism, is that it participates in the endgame of painting, since seeking the essence implies that there *is* one, and that, once found, or achieved, painting will have fulfilled its purpose and will therefore be redundant.

"Everything is empty at the centre"<sup>9</sup> says Suzi Gablick when writing on postmodernism. While modernism has organising principles in its pursuit of essence and meaning, postmodernism can be understood through what it opposes. In this sense it is against modernism. Postmodernism has as one of its characteristic trends the resisting of synthesis rather than the seeking of it and perhaps is best defined as "a critique of aspects of the established project of modernity."<sup>10</sup> The focus of its critique is the idealist or utopian aspect of modernism and it achieves this through the use of a plurality of methods, materials and strategies. It deconstructs, historicises, popularises and nihilises. Postmodernism eliminates the organising force of modernism and resists consistent or coherent form. Hence modernism involves synthesis in that it tries to create unity from disparate formal elements and postmodernism is pastiche as it makes no attempt at a new unity.

Postmodern painting resists an internal logic as a strategy. In so doing, it represents a move from an autonomous object with its own internal logic to an object which – while still operating indexically – acts as an empty sign in that it points to something, although the position or place to which it points is empty, devoid of, or resistant to, any particular meaning.

The work of David Salle embodies this strategy. He encompasses within a single painting a range of styles and subjects drawn from high and low culture, the historical and the contemporary, to create a random encounter of disparate elements with no attempt made at unity.

And further, "...the lexicon of postmodernism is the abstraction and reworking – the 'personification' – of modernist style itself, so that style is read through style, with the body of modernism serving as the original text."<sup>11</sup>

This trajectory has been eloquently played out in the work of Daniel Buren, where a signature of high modernism, the stripe, is employed in a manner which empties it of all meaning, direction and purpose. His work *Within and Beyond the Frame* (1973), extended beyond the confines of the frame of both the picture and the institution (the gallery). It was made of nineteen grey and white striped canvas sections extending nearly two hundred feet, starting at one end of a gallery in New York and continuing out of the window across the street to become attached to the building opposite the gallery. It operates as institutional critique through the challenging of the art institution's role in conferring authenticity and uniqueness to the artwork. The manner in which this work engages in a referential dialogue with the modernist project means that modernism can be identified as the 'original text'.

Thus, postmodernism is of the same order as photography, operating as a trace or index of

an external object (modernism) and “filled with meaning only when physically juxtaposed with an external referent or object.”<sup>12</sup> We can say, therefore, that it is both empty sign (shifter)<sup>13</sup> in its relationship to the world, and index in its relationship to modernism.

It is interesting to consider that postmodernist strategies in effect emulated the ontology, that is, recreated the same order of being, as photography. For while photography can claim any number of variations on the theme of the death of the image or author, it cannot escape the fact that at an ontological level it acts as a direct trace of something which *was* – even if for a fleeting moment in time – whilst simultaneously existing in the present. This one to one correspondence between the photograph and that which it depicts is an indexical relationship between past and present.

This is an important point because I want to go on to argue for a distinction between the postmodern and the ‘amodern’. The point that is being made here is that postmodernism has an indexical relationship to modernism, as photography does to its subject. My argument for the ‘amodern’ will develop along the lines of a much more ambiguous relationship with the original referent.

There are a number of contemporary painters whose work can be seen to be free of the entropy, the turning in on itself, which is a feature of modernist and postmodernist practices. In seeking to define a position for this work, use can be made of a notion such as ‘amodernism’. I will approach this notion through reference to the work of Gerhard Richter.

John Gaiger has said: “Richter has made the problem of how to continue painting central to his work as an artist, producing a body of work that incorporates a critical and reflexive understanding of the history of painting alongside a close engagement with the forms and structures of the modern, mediatised world.”<sup>14</sup>

Coming out of East Germany to train in West Germany at a time (the 1960s) when he was influenced by movements such as Fluxus and *l’art informel*, Richter could have chosen to abandon painting for more ‘contemporary’ art practices. Instead, he has continued to paint and his work can be seen as providing a way out of the *impasse* of painting in our period.

Richter’s subject matter is characterised by its heterogeneity and also by his assertion of his choices as ‘arbitrary’.<sup>15</sup> There is movement between the historical and the contemporary, the horrific and the banal, and the use of the photograph as a readymade in the form of press and amateur photographs.

An awareness of painting’s own history is demonstrated in his approach to – and reworking of – the genres of history painting and the German landscape tradition. In the case of the former there is a double subversion. This resides firstly in a side-stepping from the ‘main event’ and secondly through what is depicted – recent and contemporary German history – and its juxtaposition with his own personal family history. In the latter it occurs through a choice of subject which appears anachronistic within its contemporary context.

A reflexive practice is also evident in his use of the random composition of the found photograph, thereby taking painting out of a high art context, whilst still employing the means of high art. There is a questioning of what we are actually looking at through the inclusion of a ‘double register’ in the

form of photographic borders and an emulation of the black-and-white and blur of photography. These methods create a sense of doubt and uncertainty, on the one hand through a positioning of painting – and photography – as a copy of a copy; and on the other, through the emphasis of the painted surface as ‘real’, or as a real painting of a copy.

In the 1970s Richter embarked on a series of grey monochrome paintings. About this move he said that it: “...makes no statement whatsoever...so wretched a start could lead to nothing meaningful...”<sup>16</sup>

Richter’s work demonstrates doubt in the face of postmodernism’s “celebration of the ‘availability’ of different styles and forms of art.”<sup>17</sup> As such, his work is an example of painting as a critical practice. His work is self-reflexive in two senses. He doesn’t just question his own practice, he also engages with the history of painting itself and with questions concerning its validity, position and meanings.

The concept of the ‘amodern’ (or amodernism) was first presented by Bruno La Tour.<sup>18</sup> Later, Timothy S Murphy uses the term to, as he says, “...highlight what seems to me to be its distance from and resistance to the dialectical structure that defines modernism and postmodernism.”<sup>19</sup>

In positioning work as amodernist, there is an engagement with poststructuralist critical theory. Meaning is seen as something which is continuously involved in a process of on-going and unfolding change and is neither stable nor fixed. Hence it sees the structuralist ‘sign’ (De Saussure and Pierce’s ‘signifier’ and ‘signified’)<sup>20</sup>, as too fixed and stable and – importantly for the ideas presented here – as positioning the subject as part of a larger system. Poststructuralism is an open system, in distinction to the closed system of the sign as postulated under structuralism. Poststructuralism’s critique of the arbitrary, yet paradoxically, fixed, nature of a signifier/signified relationship developed by the structuralists, provides a position in which meaning is in a continual process of unfolding. The poststructuralist and the amodernist will want to locate the subject – in the manner of phenomenology – at the centre of meaning and of lived experience.

Hence, every moment is a moment in which meaning is made, created and opened up to change. This is what Jacques Derrida means when he talks of ‘différance’<sup>21</sup>. Derrida’s concept of the term ‘différance’ takes meaning as always in a process of ‘difference’ and ‘deferral’, hence never fully present, but both present and absent. In seeking to grasp it, we lose it. Poststructuralism has its eyes on the particular moment an image (or word) is located within a given context and argues that it is only at that particular moment that there can be a momentary pause to the deferral of meaning.

Amodernism rejects propositions, whether universal or particular. This position is grounded in an approach which rejects a consistent or coherent identity for artistic production and takes the form of breaks, both stylistically and in content. In so doing, it functions to defamiliarise perception and cognition and participates in the “antimimetic structural conception of poetic language.”<sup>22</sup> Its method is heterogeneous and metonymical, pointing in many directions at the same time and is neither diachronic nor synchronic, but rather anachronic – exploring the possibilities of being out of date, wrong or as no longer capable of self-renewal – and thereby engaging with the discourse of the death of painting. One outcome of this approach is the appearance of the arbitrary in the lack of stylistic formula and subject matter – which may be drawn from any number of sources and

orders – resulting in a refusal to determine a definitive phenomenal position in relation to the thing represented.

The position of amodernism enacts itself as a broken sequence of images, in the manner of cinematic or photographic contingency. But, while the cinematic and photographic embody the notion of the trace or index and hence of temporal distance in the way in which presence is formulated as “having been there”<sup>23</sup>, they participate in a notion of history as linear. In contrast, amodernism positions itself as ahistorical. It seeks to position itself in the ‘middle of things’ and in the process of ‘lived experience’<sup>24</sup>. In this sense it can be conceived of as noise: “The background noise never ceases: It is limitless, continuous, unending, unchanging.”<sup>25</sup>

The manner in which amodernism can be conceived of as being in the ‘middle of something’ gives a new significance to the principles of phenomenology and minimalism. The lack of an overarching scheme or plan points to the minimalist principle of “the work of the work.” This notion of being in the middle as non-teleological aligns it with phenomenological considerations of ‘lived experience’ and the positioning of the subject at the centre of that experience. This also points to a potential connection with – and consideration of – the importance of practices to do with immersive environments, interactive contexts and other forms of installed works. For example, Erwin Redl says that his work “reflects upon the condition of art making after the ‘digital experience.’”<sup>26</sup> He creates walls of light-emitting diodes which engage visually via slowly pulsating lights and which are also designed as a physically immersive environment.

The achievement of Belgian artist Luc Tuymans is that he has developed a practice which has relevance in the wake of modernism’s inward looking self-referentiality and he also sidesteps the criticisms of postmodern painting as overtly celebratory, yet empty.

In Tuymans’s use of subject matter there is – as with Richter – movement between the historical and the contemporary, the horrific and the banal and he also sidelines the ‘main event’. Everything receives the same attention. Tuymans is known to have said that he never spends more than a day on a painting and this – along with his mixing up of genres and demonstration of a willingness to paint just about anything – imbues his work with a sense of the democratic and ordinary. This can be seen as in contrast with the tradition of making grand statements or gestures easily identifiable in pre-modern, modern and postmodern sensibilities. There is the feeling that there is no grand plan that is being worked out here. He’s not going anywhere great or grand. There is no big message one has to ‘get’ or discover.

For example, the fallen skier in *Der Architekt* (1998) depicts Albert Speer, architect of the Third Reich, taken from a film-still made by his wife during a skiing holiday. This strategy of side-stepping from the main event – by depicting objects or things associated with it – and painting quickly and with a sense of the amateur to a small scale from a reproduced source image all work to make the extraordinary merely ordinary. His employment of a photographic or cinematic sense further develops this. This occurs through sequences of work which can be related to the idea of a series of random snapshots of different things or events.

Unlike Daniel Buren, Tuymans is not trying to engage in any form of institutional critique.

His work appears as a rejection not just of the pre-modern but also of the grand plans of the modern and postmodern and of the grand gestures of conceptual painting. But as Emily Dexter says, "...his painting betrays an awareness of the discourse of the endgame of painting, which hovers over it like a malevolent angel."<sup>27</sup> His work appears to be going nowhere, and there is the continual sense that one is not sure what is going to happen next.

It is recorded that at the beginning of his career Tuymans realised that it was not possible to do anything new in painting. As a response to this he created the notion of the "authentic forgery".<sup>28</sup> This demonstrates an engagement with the project of painting as a self-reflexive practice through an awareness of painting's quality of redundancy. Tuymans' paintings often share the look of a forged work, deliberately faded and designed to "look old from the start".<sup>29</sup>

My current work represents a strategic alignment with a modernism, and hence a conscious attempt to work outside of the established conventions and methodologies of modernist and postmodernist painting practice. Groups of images – in their relationship to each other and their simultaneous lack of an overarching scheme – seek to resist a process of assimilation within established frameworks. There is, therefore, a conscious attempt to undermine, or work outside of, established conventions and methodologies of painting practice.

In my work, the selection of subject matter moves between the referencing of history – through allusion and movement away from the actual event to aspects associated with it – to the purely banal. This represents an attempt to 'flatten out' the pre-modernist acceptance of hierarchies of genre in painting through the use of material drawn from a number of sources in works which are small, arbitrary and which demonstrate the contingency of chance occurrences. But, to be in the middle of something is to also be working outside of modernist notions of the series. The use of a



*Untitled*, 2006, oil on canvas, 15 x 15 cm.



*Untitled*, 2006, oil on canvas, 25 x 20 cm.



consistent stylistic formula and treatment of colour is thus also avoided. An engagement with orders of representation<sup>30</sup>, that is, the drawing of subject matter from second and third order sources, further develops heterogeneity and suggests the lack of an overarching scheme or fetishisation of the image/object. Mediation of the image is also developed through the use of photographs, both black-and-white and in colour; with colour often added to those that had none, or eliminated from those that did. There is movement between referencing the machine-based processes of the photographic and the digital and the direct action of gesture (indexicality). Through these processes the work becomes heavily mediated. In so doing, it self-consciously engages with the notion of the endgame of painting, a notion largely ignored by a postmodernism celebrating its reversal of modernist strategies. There is an attempt to express "...a de-centering, moving backwards and forwards between allusive and partial references to history, emotions and feelings, tiny details from everyday life, elements of popular culture and national identities, so that the world is seen as a series of partially interconnecting topoi"<sup>31</sup> – as a topography of interweaving, disparate elements.

This methodology positions the subject (the artist or viewer) at the centre of an experience which is phenomenological, in that any ultimate meaning is generated in and by the subject's own experience. Partial references and ambiguities in orders of representation exist in a space which is transitory, momentary and continually in a process of flux. There is no ultimate meaning which must be sought for the work to be understood, neither is there any particular position that should



*Untitled, 2006, oil on canvas, 28 x 21 cm.*

be assumed to achieve this. This play with partial allusions and references simultaneously evokes presence and absence. It uses methods which engage with that which is absent whilst simultaneously evoking presence, the presence of the artist and the presence of the subject.

The working methods of amodernism operate in a self-reflexive manner: As such, this is an instance of painting as a critical practice, and indeed this is its main claim. It is self-referential in a new way, distinct from the self-referentiality of modernism and postmodernism. It demonstrates an awareness of, and engages with, the discourse of the death of painting as part of its own history; and it employs methods which simultaneously demonstrate an understanding of and an elision of its own history, traditions and existence. It does not want to uncritically take up methods of the (pre-modern) past in the manner of current neo-romantic painting. It also does not want to evoke the grand plans of the modernist series or of postmodernist dispersal. It does not empty out the conventions of painting; critique an essentialist paradigm; or pose in or engage with some new existential dilemma in the manner of much conceptual art. It is rather aligned with the post-conceptual, taking as its task a self-awareness and acting out of a kind of 'last gasp' of painting. It critiques its own ability to provide a meta-narrative through working methods which mirror the notion of "a loss of faith in one single authoritative narrative."<sup>32</sup> As such, the case can be made for painting's continuing validity, and as Emily Dexter says, in writing on the work of Luc Tuymans, it "...relishes the ambiguity only painting can offer."<sup>33</sup> In saying this, Dexter is claiming for a critical, post-conceptual – and I would argue for amodernist – painting an order of mediation of the image which is uniquely its own.

- 1 John Gaiger, "Post Conceptual Painting: Gerhard Richter's extended leave taking", in Gill Perry and Paul Wood (eds), *Themes in Contemporary Art* (New Haven: Yale University Press and The Open University, 2004), 90.
- 2 Gaiger,(2004), 89.
- 3 Gaiger (2004), 92.
- 4 Suzi Gablik, *Has Modernism Failed?* (New York: Thames & Hudson, 1984), 23.
- 5 Clement Greenburg, "Towards a New Laocoon", in Charles Harrison and Paul Wood (eds), *Art in Theory, 1900-2000: An Anthology of Changing Ideas* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2005), 566.
- 6 In their introduction to "The Demands of the Present" in *Art in Theory, 1815-1900: An Anthology of Changing Ideas*, Harrison and Wood with John Gaiger (Oxford, UK: Blackwell, 1998) state: "Publication of the first successful results in fixing an image on a light-sensitive surface sent a shock wave through the practice of art. On hearing of the invention, the academic painter Paul Delaroche is reported to have said, 'From today, painting is dead.'" (146)
- 7 Piet Mondrian, "Neo-Plasticism: The General Principle of Plastic Equivalence" (1920) quoted in Charles Harrison and Paul Wood (eds), *Art in Theory, 1900 -2000: An Anthology of Changing Ideas*: " 'The future of the New Plastic and its true realization in painting lies in *chromoplastic architecture*..." (290); and: "'The new sculpture and architecture must destroy *the work of art as an object or thing*.'" (291)
- 8 Gaiger, ( 2004), 89.
- 9 Gablick, (1984), 17.
- 9 Paul Greenhalgh, *The Modern Ideal: The Rise and Collapse of Idealism in the Visual Arts from the Enlightenment to Postmodernism* (London: V & A Publications, 2005), 53.
- 10 Bernice Rose, *Allegories of Modernism: Contemporary Drawing* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1992), 11-12.

- 11 Rosalind Krauss, "Towards Postmodernism. Notes on the Index: Part 2", in *The Originality of the Avant-Garde and Other Modernist Myths* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT, 1986), 216.
- 12 In "Notes on the Index: Part 1", in *The Originality of the Avant-Garde and other Modernist Myths* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT, 1994), Rosalind Krauss says this about the term 'shifter': "The shifter is Jakobson's term for that category of linguistic sign which is 'filled with signification' only because it is 'empty'. The word 'this' is such a sign, waiting each time it is invoked for its referent to be supplied." (197)
- 13 Gaiger, (2004), 99.
- 14 Gerhard Richter, "Interview with Rolf Schön, 1972", in H-U Obrist (ed.), translated by D Britt, *The Daily Practice of Painting: Writings 1962-1993* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1995), 74. "It [photography] had no style, no composition, no judgement." (73)
- 15 Gerhard Richter, "From a letter to Edy de Wilde, 23 February 1975", Obrist, (1995), 82.
- 16 Gaiger, (2004), 116.
- 17 Bruno Latour, "Postmodern? no, simply Amodern! Steps towards an anthropology of science", *Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science*, 21 (1990), 145-171.
- 18 Timothy S Murphy, *Wising up the Marks: The Amodern William Burroughs* (Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California: 1977), 2.
- 19 Ferdinand de Saussure, "Nature of the Linguistic Sign", in Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye (eds), translated by Wade Baskin, *Course in General Linguistics* (London: P Owen, 1960), 65-70.
- 20 Jacques Derrida, "Différance", in *Margins of Philosophy*, translated by Alan Bass (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), 3-27.
- 21 Hal Foster, Rosalind Krauss, Yve-Alain Bois and Benjamin H.D. Buchloh, *Art Since 1900: Modernism, Antimodernism, Postmodernism* (London: Thames & Hudson, London, 2004), 35.
- 22 Roland Barthes quoted in Rosalind Krauss, "Towards Postmodernism. Notes on the Index: Part 2", in *The Originality of the Avant-Garde and Other Modernist Myths* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT, 1994), 217.
- 23 Maurice Merleau-Ponty, "What is Phenomenology?", in Alden L Fisher (ed.), *The Essential Writings of Merleau-Ponty* (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1969). He writes: "It is the search for a philosophy which shall be a 'rigorous science', but it also offers an account of space, time and the world as we 'live' them. It tries to give a direct description of our experience as it is. ..." (27)
- 24 Michel Serres, *Genesis*, translated by Genevieve James and James Nielson (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1995), 13.
- 25 Gloria Sutton, "Erwin Redl", in Lisa Mark (ed.), *Ecstasy: In and about altered states* (Los Angeles: Museum of Contemporary Art & Cambridge, Mass.: MIT, 2005), 118.
- 26 Emma Dexter, "The Interconnectedness of All Things: Between History, Still Life and the Uncanny" in Emma Dexter and Julian Heynen (eds), *Luc Tuymans* (London: Tate Publishing, 2004), 16.
- 27 "Juan Vicente Aliaga in conversation with Luc Tuymans", in Ulrich Loock, Juan Vicente Aliaga and Nancy Spector, *Luc Tuymans* (London, 2003), 8. Cited in Emma Dexter, "The Interconnectedness of All Things: Between History, Still Life and the Uncanny." (23)
- 28 "Juan Vicente Aliaga in conversation with Luc Tuymans", cited in Emma Dexter, "The Interconnectedness of All Things: Between History, Still Life and the Uncanny." (23)
- 29 Loock, (2003), 142, refers to the notion of a representation of a representation. This is what I am referring to when presenting the notion of 'orders of representation'.
- 30 Dexter, (2004), 22.
- 31 Dexter, (2004), 19.
- 32 Dexter, (2004), 23.

**Alexandra Kennedy** is a painter currently engaged with her Master of Fine Arts project concerning painting in a post-conceptual context. She is also a lecturer in Art Theory & History at Otago Polytechnic School of Art in Dunedin.