

Sean Scully Lecture- Kunstmuseum Nordrhein- Westfalen, Dusseldorf, Germany.

---

Armin Zweite:

I am really happy Sean that you came, that you have come here again to see your show and to talk to the public - who are a very enthusiastic public I have to say and we are all looking forward to hearing what you will say about your development and about your ideas of how to marry, let us say Mondrian, with Pollock over all other approaches with a rational structure of the painting. I think this is the main issue that you are involved in and I guess that is also very clear in this show that we have organised together.

(applause)

Sean Scully:

As Armin has said, what I have tried to do, I guess, is to marry two extraordinarily important impulses in twentieth century art and one being classicism, a drive towards a spirituality that's quite concrete and rather compressed, a kind of compressed emotion which interests me very deeply. I am extremely interested in the work of painters like Masaccio and Chardin, Cezanne and Valasques and a lot less interested in the work of artists such as Rubens who is too obvious for me. So the work that I always fall in love with has a lot of austerity about it as a kind of modesty or a sense of the reverential. The other impulse that has fascinated me is the drive towards a loss of subject. A drive towards all overness, expansiveness in going off the picture surface exemplified in Europe in the work of Yves Klein, who I think is a very important figure and in America of course by Barnett Newman, Jackson Pollack et al. The other little thing I would like to stress when I talk about my work I think as very important in understanding my work is that I am one of the few people involved in abstraction who really worked his way through figuration to get there. So in other words, I have made the journey that other artists like Matisse were involved in, of course Matisse never reached pure abstraction but I moved from figuration to abstraction in the same way as perhaps as Pollock or Rothko. This is very important when you are looking at my work because I think it gives it its distinctive quality.

The painting on the left is "Passenger White White" and the painting on the right is a very small painting called "Seal". Both of these paintings use the window motif and what I am trying to do in here architectural terms is make a figure ground relationship and also in just strictly painting terms to try to deal with the issue of something in a situation. An object or a person or personage, a form, a being, a personality in a context. I always try to paint my surfaces or my stripes, my forms with personality and in that respect I find myself very much at odds or certainly have a stand alone position in New York where I think that most of the people of my generation have developed a kind of sophisticated irony with regard to painting, emptying out gesture and making painting look like photography or relating it to a pure process. In other words, distancing oneself from the surface. What I've tried to do, my painting is precisely the opposite so I am fighting for a painting, a painted surface that is very loaded up with personality, the physical fact of being alive and moody colour as you can see on the painting on your left which is called "Gate". There are two insets, one of them is real, a physical inset which is orange and next to it is painted black and grey inset and I think of these in a sense as two highly abstracted figures like two figures that are somehow jammed together, holding each other in an embrace in a landscape. They are floating in a landscape. So it is a highly abstracted, figurative painting and of course it is what we call an abstract painting but its

extremely associational. The painting on your right which is a passenger painting again, is a cooler picture but again with colour that relates to things you can see in nature. The title "passenger" comes from the idea of something inside something else. The first painting I made called "passenger" - actually it wasn't called "passenger" it was called "precious" related to a boat trip that my parents and I had when we left Ireland when the boat got lost. This was after the war when the Irish sea was full of mines and I made a painting about the memory of it. In this way it is not a picture in the sense of a description, it's a very distilled form of abstracted and highly stylised representation, if it is a representation maybe I even question that. But the feeling that the painting is supposed to give is the sense that something is inside something else. The painting is inside a bigger painting so it's a painting in a landscape or it's also possible to see it as collage where you are looking at two things simultaneously which is of course very contemporary I believe. You know the world being so complicated. I wanted to show you these two paintings and you've probably realised by now that they have not been painted by me but they are very good anyway! The one on the right is Schmi?? And the one on the left of course is Nolder. When I was an art student in England I fell madly in love with the work of the German expressionists and the Fauve painters and I made a lot of paintings like that and unfortunately I haven't got any pictures with me so you will have to imagine it. They were quite big, brightly coloured, very free in the way that the colours were put down but always working out a drawing, figure drawings, people in rooms, two or three figures in a room and the relationship between the importance of the colour and the importance of the gesture, the way things are painted and the loosening of the relationship between how you feel about something that you're painting and how much you are prepared to represent it. It is in the loosening of that relationship that is pretty much where I entered the History of Art. So I painted very very much under the influence of these two artists and I was particularly fond of Andre Durand's wonderful sense of colour as a Fauve painter. I believe that he was the ultimate Fauve painter. He composed paintings with bright colours and soft colours, with slightly melancholic colour and very assertive colour all in the same picture very beautifully. And of course Matisse who has been an abiding influence on me. I hope that that helps you to see that the paintings are painted with a certain kind of personality and a relationship to nature that when I am entering my studio I am always looking at the sky and my paintings are full of the colour of the sky. So on one hand there is very strong classical sense of structure, or a very fundamental simple kind of drawing that I am working with and at the same time this is being subverted and informed by a very strong sense of mood so that my colour is always complicated. I have no idea at all of how a painting will turn out or what the colour will be at the end. I draw the painting out, usually I start working fairly softly and then I can change it up to certain point and then I can't.

The painting on your right, which is another "passenger" painting, so this is literally a striped painting inside a chequered painting. The inset is painted physically outside the painting and then put back into the painting so I am always trying to make the thing that I am painting the only thing that matters. So that has a relationship of course with all over painting. So when you are making an all over painting your sense of relationship is reduced as much as possible to one or two things working against each other. So the idea with an all over painting of course, is to free the emotion so that the painter is not thinking about how to make things work together. It's ambition is to be as emotional as possible. What I'm doing here is taking two all over paintings, painting them apart and then I'm putting them back together to remake a relationship so in a sense what I'm doing is undoing all over painting. I am using it and undoing it by putting them back together again so this is constantly asserting itself as a figure ground painting. So you've got two things working against each other or with each other, They're in competition for survival in a certain sense.

Now the painting on your left is a painting that's in the museum now in Bogota I think. This is I think it's called 'Dark Light' and there are a lot of titles like this in my work, titles that are rather moody. I always see light as an issue of hope and then I'm constantly fighting with impending darkness and these are the forces that are working within me. This is a painting that's painted entirely on one surface which is a very very different sensation to the painting on your right where the surface is cut and where the inset is really carved out so you've got a sculpted painting. You've got a romantic painting that's being brought into sharp reality by the fact that it's cut so the romance in the painting is being undermined all the time or checked or critiqued. So now using our memories - you know that faculty we call information - the painting that was on your right is a very romantic painting, there's nothing about it that's hard, all the edges are soft and there's a red light that's comes from the back that's being pressed down by black. So in a sense I think of it as a tragic painting, or a sad painting because the light at the bottom of the painting is a lost light, it's a light that's pressed down and weighed down by the weight of the material, the weight of the paint and the difficulty of putting the paint down.

Here there are two brighter paintings. Again the painting on your left, in a sense it's the simplest kind of colour I can use but even when I do that what's revealing about this painting to me is that even when I do that when I think of black, white, red I have to interfere with it so it's got mood attached to it. It's not white, it's got some other colour in it and it's laid on top of other colour. So the colour in my paintings is extremely complicated and it's always a subtext to what could be a very simple image. And they are very difficult to reproduce but lately I have been very successful at reproducing them. The painting on right is quite a small painting and again it goes back to these two figures that are kind of ragged roughly painted, the paint is really banged down quite tough. The inset on the painting is pulled in and out the red and the yellow is painted outside the painting is put back in the painting so it gives the painting a kind of rough, tough, soft quality. I think there are a lot of things going on in the picture.

This might be a good point in which to talk a little bit about the influence on Matisse on me which is very big. What I think is wonderful about Matisse's paintings and still do, is that in my favourite paintings of Matisse which are usually painted in the teens, there's a kind of juxtaposition of difficult, unlikely decorative happy, sad relationships that are always somehow alive and living. Matisse isn't working towards perfection and this is something very important that I took from him and at a certain point after working in New York for sometime - you'll probably would be interested to know how that was - I went to New York in 1975 and I made a lot of dark, very classical, extremely rigorous, highly conceptualised paintings and at a certain point I had really had enough of it. And I really had had enough of the whole thing, I have to say. I went to a meeting one night where some painters said, "Oh let's have a meeting!" Okay fine, we'll have a meeting and the thing about New York is it is so profoundly competitive that you can't really have a meeting. In Europe you can, in Europe you can really have dialogue with people and with other artists and I do and it's very nice but in New York there are so many people competing for so little that it's not possible. Or maybe it's the deeper ethic in the Culture, I don't know. It's the Culture itself that is based on competition. Anyway after sitting around talking about painting - you have to remember this was at the end of the seventies- what was agreed, not by me I might add, was that the only thing that was possible if you wanted to make a really pure painting was a square that was 1.5m x 1.5m and that was painted grey. Well that's really the end of the game I think. So I at that point began to check out and at the beginning of the eighties that were based on all the things that I loved about painting when I started painting and they were, as I said before, Kershner, Rottler, Durand, Noldner. And I thought about how it was possible to continue making paintings and whether they should be figurative or whether I could continue to make abstract paintings and it was a moment of deep crisis for me because I felt that

painting itself had begun to lose the ability to communicate. I started to make paintings where I put everything back in, where I took everything out, I put it all back in and I did not revert to figuration - although I have considered it since and I have toyed with the idea from time to time and I still draw things from real life. You know, plants and chairs. So this kind of painting and you can see this picture in the show is probably as close as I come to a return to figuration. It may not seem to you that that's a very figurative painting but it really is because the characters in the painting have such a lot of personality so seen in relation to other pictures of mine, I think it's a very figurative painting.

Now here's two more very figurative paintings. The one on your right is called "Vita Duplex" one of my favourite, favourite pictures and of course it means double life. And in a sense that is my life, I have had a double life because I was born in Ireland after the war, right after the war and lived in England, grew up in England and that was okay at times but it never felt right. There was some mismatch there between the spirit of the Culture and my spirit and I took on American painting and obviously I moved there to take on American painting. I will recount to you a charming little story about my time at Harvard, well I'll tell you two stories because I think it's time for some hilarity (?). They didn't know what I went to Harvard as I went on a Fellowship so they thought that I might be a member of staff and we were in a (?) building in a staff meeting and the sun was streaming in because the carboutier building was built like this. And as the sun moved around it keeps coming in and it was really hot and it was on the back of my neck and it was making me crazy and these people were just talking away, talking away, talking away about this celebration for twenty-five years of Harvard of visual arts and everyone of them had European accents by the way! At one point I rocked backwards in my chair when one does when I'd been sleeping and I realised I'd been sleeping for twenty-five minutes and they didn't invite me to any more faculty meetings because they realised I wasn't a member of staff! I like to talk about Harvard because it was a very nice year of my life. On another occasion I told the Art History professor who was a very nice woman - she was from Germany actually - she was very sweet to me and I said "look I'm going down to New York to see Rothko." She said "that'll be very difficult my dear" and I said "Oh that's because it's not friendly" and she said, "no, the problem is much deeper than that." So then she told me that Rothko had died two years before. I remember this because it leads actually to an intellectual point. I think my move to New York was based on a misunderstanding and that's very interesting. Having realised that it was based on a misunderstanding why didn't I leave? Too stubborn I guess because once the battle is engaged it's very difficult to retreat so I think what I did at a certain point was started to go back to Europe to reattach myself to what I had lost, or what I was in danger of losing. It's this very dynamic relationship between being in Barcelona which is a city of walls and heat and sweat and humanity and sensuality and affection and deep memory. Going to New York where people just want to kill you to get your position. I moved between the two. I had a drink recently with a painter friend, I won't tell you the name of this person, he said "I think you should change your work, because your work does not express your entire personality." So I asked what that meant. So this person said, you've done the work that you've done for long enough now, you should something completely different kind of work. It was just a way to get me to move out! It's incredible in New York, it just never stops!

"Vita Duplex" is a field, a façade scraped down it's got traces of green left so it's very atmospheric and running through it is a bar divided into a bars and I see those bars that run through those paintings as ascending structure. So the idea is that they are in some way spiritually, emotionally, metaphorically going up through the painting, cutting through the painting, giving the painting another possibility so that one is looking at a finished painting but it's a finished painting that is open. This goes back of course to my great love of Matisse and to what I think it the secret of his success. His paintings are in a

sense, never fatally concluded and that is something that I strive for in my own work. The painting on the right "Angelica" is a painting that is in a long series of paintings that have been named likes Angel, Angelica, Angelo, where I am clearly trying to do something that's very spiritual in a direct sense by using delicate whites and by using extremely rarefied colour and I've scraped out that area there that left this beautiful pink trace of what was there before and put it into the painting and left it so it's pushed into the side of the painting so it's as if something were entering the painting. In my painting there is a lot of coming in and going out and this painting on the left is called "This this" the reason I called it this this is because I wanted the two figures to be equal so I gave them the same status, this this. Of course you can't give them the same status because one of the "this" has to be in front of the other this so one of the this has to be said second but you understand what I am getting at.

The painting on the right is a big Catherine painting which is one of the paintings I made for Catherine Lee who I lived with for twenty years, This led on to a very significant group of paintings called "Union." When I give paintings titles, they always have, I hope a lot of resonance. So this again goes back to the idea of figurative painting, of content filled painting. So the idea of the union paintings is that they really are coming together, they are not so pulled apart of some of the other paintings where you really get very strong juxtapositions of field. The one on the left is called "Plains of light" and the one on the right is a landline painting. This is another title I've used quite a lot and again it is deliberately relating to landscape so as you can see this is a very useful comparison because one painting has cut insets and I give it a title that relates to floating plains so its related more to an abstract idea and the other painting that is related a lot more to landscape and its got all the colours in it that one might encounter in a northern landscape and there is a lot of that impetus in my work, northern romantic landscape, I am always thinking about horizon lines and broken horizons lines and the way that things come together, the way that masses are pushed together, the way that the sky hits the earth, the way that rocks push against the water.

"Landline Blue", the one on the left and there is a pastel to go with it. I thought you would be interested to see the pastel in relation to the painting. They are interesting when they are the same size. Here you have on the left a very small painting "liquid lines" that are holding the little parcel of paint or a little block of paint that's been taken out and put back into the painting. It's a very small picture so it's quite delicate. The painting on the right is "Angelo" and that relates of course, to this idea of angelic, stripped down, obviously spiritual colour and the painting gives out this sense of body in the top right corner that's lost. Now the painting a little water colour on the right I just put in to show you some things that I do on my travels. That was made in Mexico and this year in October I'm going to have an exhibition in Mexico called Wall of light and it will based entirely on the paintings that come from the idea of wall of light. The first one I did was done actually in Mexico on the beach and I'd be going around looking at the Mayan ruins and all the old walls and the way the light transforms and it was so beautiful, In the morning you go and see a wall its pink and at the end of the day it will be dark brown or black and one can understand why those people that lived in that part of the world worshipped the sun. I would make a little watercolour in every place that we stopped and this eventually led on to a group of paintings called Wall of Light that come out of these paintings. This relates very powerfully to the big grey painting that the museum owns called "Durango" and Durango is a very rough arid rather physically brutal part of Mexico.

I'll just talk about these two paintings very briefly. I like them particularly. One of them is in the exhibition "Uriel" and the other one is called "Back" the pale painting. Uriel it's again this idea of some figure dropping into a painting so you've got the idea of a painting

that is very unified and sure of itself being subverted by the interruption of another presence. On the right is the first painting that I consider to be a Wall of Light painting. What happened in this painting is I started again to break up the picture frame. I also in a sense, abandoned the figure ground relationship that you saw in the last two paintings because everything in this painting is more or less equal with everything else. There is no real hierarchy, you can't say this is moving in on that, that was here first and so on and so forth. Everything is moving in and out but it is going back in a sense to all over painting and I won't talk about the floating painting except to tell you that I painted it in Munich in the winter and I lived in Munich one winter to punish myself. The only good thing that happened was that I went to the Post Office in my car and I was so depressed living on my own. I pulled up outside the Post Office and left a hole to see where I was going and when I came back my car was cleaned because there boys playing snow balls so they cleaned my car and I painted my car at the same time and I was thinking a lot in a strange way about Kafka David Fredrick and making a painting that was just all the colours of the winter.

This on the right is an etching. I am very fond of print making. Now to return to the theme that I am supposed to talk about tonight which is the relationship between Mondrian and Pollock. I think its very interesting that one of the greatest Pollock paintings is in this museum and that's a black and white painting. Pollock didn't need colour because the issue really was the line and the dance and the rhythm and the painting was a perfect, beautiful photograph of the dance. It was the dance and it is from the dance and it is not really necessary in my opinion for Pollock to bother too much about colour, it's a secondary issue. But in my work its primary because I'm using blocks and the blocks are moving in and out of space now because they have different colour because they have a different weight, they have a different sense of body, some are thin, some things fragile, some things very secure. Really they are like personalities but at the same time they are moving towards, again all over painting. They are and they are not. They are but they are trying to give it a kind of humanism and a place, a very strong sense of place and time so in that sense they are not abstract at all. This painting on your left is called Wall of Light Sky and someone was asking me once what it was like. I said, well what you have to imagine is a giant Mirandi and that is what its like. I don't know how many of you know Mirandi's paintings but they are very complex, beautiful paintings and he's gradually become more and more and more important. This painting took me forever to paint, extremely slow and very complicated as you can see but at the same time gentle so it's monumental, powerful but I wanted it to be delicate in some way. And the other interesting thing to me about this painting is that it seems somehow having problems to fit on a canvass. I find that very interesting because I'm sure we have all had problems to fit on the canvass in our own lives. So no doubt you can relate to that. The one on the other side is in the museum and this is a painting that is really influenced by Post-impressionism which a lot of my work is. I love the sensation of looking at a painting and you think you know what it is that you're looking at but it's something else. So the colour underneath is subverting the colour on top so what you are thinking and feeling are not the same. I find that very beautiful and it helps you to stay alive.

I like to do very small paintings they have a totally different function in the world. They are not meant to be impressive they are quite fragile and quickly done and it's really like a little painted rug, instead of the woven rug it's a painted rug which is at the same time a picture of the sky. And the one on the other side is a little painting that I made in Barcelona it looks very old fashioned so that's a nice point to end. It looks very old fashioned.

---

(applause)

Q: An observation - I must admit that everytime I realised that my favourite painting became deeper and deeper and I became more fascinated by the colour and the light that is demonstrated in the painting.

A: I think that painting is a very difficult art form. What's interesting to me about it though is that it is stubborn and is therefore somehow heroic and it's an antidote to everything that is easy, like TV, cash machines. So to work at something and to get something back for it seems honest and nurturing and true and most of the sensations we have in the world today are not like that. And I was always very impressed by something that Vincent Van Gogh said which was that he felt that "he was swimming in a sea of mediocrity." I feel, particularly when I am New York, that I am swimming in a sea of cynicism and it's quite difficult to fight against that but a lot more interesting than not.

Q: I've seen your photographs and I want to know what your relationship is to your photography?

A: I think of photography as taking and I think of painting of making and it makes a lot of sense to me that people don't like having their photography taken. You know like primitive people don't like having their photograph taken. I think photography is very interesting, I like it. At the end of the nineteenth century, photography was going to bring about the demise in painting, which in turn followed by the greatest century of painting in the History of Art. So I know everybody likes photography right but we will see.

Q: Do you see yourself as a moody person?

A: Yes, I do see myself as a moody person. I live on my emotions very strongly and I try to structure them intellectually otherwise I wouldn't survive. I think that I am probably an idealistic romantic and I suppose I very much like being in a stand alone position, I think it's really great. I think its quite difficult to represent directness and to talk about the way that you try to bring in landscape, the way that you are connected to the world, feelings that you have about the world and to try and make that as somehow locked in as possible when what we are really surrounded by now as a kind of common currency is a suspension of these values, a suspension of emotion of strong feeling. That's where we are at the moment and of course these things change - that's what art is for.

Q: Do you think this has come from a problem of not belonging - where do you affiliate Culturally today?

A: My Cultural affiliation is very split between Europe and America and I think the sensibilities of Europe and American are wildly different. They are only similar on the surface. People say that Europe is becoming more like America, I haven't found that to be true. On the surface, there are certain devices that we all have in common - you know the internet etc but that's only the surface. The way people relate to the body of history is quite different and that we are all caught in the same trap of course, diminishing possibilities but that is something else. The sensibilities are very different and I want to somehow make something big enough for it to pull it together, hopelessly romantic ambition/gender.

Q: Could you tell us about your relationship with Morandi?

A: I couldn't say that my relationship with Morandi was so strong that he had an influence on me. I appreciate him very much and he and I are quite different. He is the ultimate reverential artist. His reverence for the world is just immense and my relationship with the world is more lustful. But at the same time it is religiously based,

there is no question about that that my art is an attempt at making something spiritual. There are aspects of his work that I like but he also drives me a little bit crazy.

Q: Painting on your own do you listen to music, what kind of influence does music have on your work.

A: I think that painting is very lonely and I am quite a social person. I play music that is emotionally based and that would be Irish stuff. I love funk and soul based music. I used to have a club in London and this was about when I was about 18. The possibilities when I was growing up in the part of London where I grew up were to be a criminal or were to be a rock star. I thought of a third possibility. I had a big and religious idea about history. The importance of culture, which was profoundly important. I always wanted to do something deeper, and I started out with a very deep interest in rhythm and blues, which is of course the religious music of black people in America. That gradually turned into an interest in painting. I came to , although I was always good at it but I came to it seriously late.

Q: Do you do any preparatory works?

No, sometimes I do the watercolours after the paintings, so the paintings are studies for the watercolour. Everything with me is backwards. I did the watercolour for wall of light and wrote underneath it wall of light, in 1984. In 1999, I painted the first painting having forgotten that I had made the watercolour. This is how I work. I am not working with plans. I work out of the kind of repetitive motive obviously as you have seen but it is like it is kind of like a way person who plays blues. Always plays similar but not identical chords, but it always comes out a little different. My area of freedom is the way my relationship is with this, which is open. I have made colours to put on paintings and have spent a long time making it as it takes a long time to mix the colour and I have picked up another one that I have already made and just go and paint with that, after mixing the other. There is no rhyme or reason to it.

Q: How can you get form or structure into a painting if your emotion is so strong or connection to it is so subjective?

This of course is an extremely complicated issue and it brings up the whole history of painting and what has happened to painting. Painting became so subjective that it lost all form and then it was unable to communicate any more, It was just like someone screaming at you. Not making any words. The in and out part is so mysterious, how people are objective and subjective, moment by moment, that really if someone was to be an artist, really they were to have to find some medium that they were to have to find some medium that they were to find some way in which that they can be in and out in that perfectly lines up with what they are and that's what you have to figure out and I think that my relationship to the world is so affectionate that I am not really very interested in invention.

My paintings have changed and I have thought about things that I haven't thought about things that I haven't thought of, not the idea. On the other hand, if you get the artist, I don't want to mention anybody's name as I don't want to be negative about another artist, but let's say that there is an artist whose work is very objective and it's a question of invention, thinking of things, then eventually, this thing becomes empty. One has to find a way to give structure and to release a lot of emotion at the same time and to provoke a lot of powerful emotion at the same time, and this is so difficult to do, and I really think in the end, it is a question of work and authenticity. Art will ultimately find you out and



ultimately reveal whether your work is true, maybe not for a long time, but ultimately you will be captured. Sorry not it is a definite answer.

**Q: Is it true the way that you paint the stripes is more important than the painting itself?**

They are very important to me. The painting at the end must effect me. That is how I judge the painting. I don't judge my painting on whether they are successful as formal compositions because I consider that to be remedial. The process of painting, the moment that one is painting, in a sense with me particularly, is very intense. It is a deeply, emotional moment when I am putting that down, and then the painting must effect me. I must make a bond with it. Then it is finished. Then do I care about it? Not really.

**Q: Do you ever have a painting that you think that you went too far with by putting an extra layer of paint on?**

Oh, yes. As a friend of mine who I once had an argument with (who has gradually begun to forgive me) said to me, I'm glad to see that you can admit that you can see that you did something wrong! You know when somebody says something says something like that ten years afterwards, there is a lot of weight on it. I said to him, well actually, my life has been full of mistakes. And that is the answer to the question. I am sure that a lot of times that I did it wrong. I mean I make so many paintings that I must have made it wrong a lot of times, and since I am not working like Mondrian, I am not working towards some kind of irrefutable plane of perfection, there is a lot of wrongness in my paintings. They are all over the place, in fact, I titled a painting that is in a collection in Germany (one that I am actually very proud of) How Not, meaning how not to do it! This is how not to do it. This is a picture of how not.

**Q: How do you come to give your paintings their titles?**

Let me give you one title. Wall of Light. This deals with the opposition of two very powerful words with the word OF in between. One is Wall which signifies barrier, and one is Light which can signify knowledge, happiness, being able to see and feel and I am juxtaposing those two elements against each other in the ultimate metaphysical hope. Light can transform the wall into a Wall of Light. When I was thinking about that I was also thinking about Monet who painted Rouen cathedral and I think he was trying to make the stone of the cathedral turn into light. So in these wall of light paintings that is what I am trying to do, so in a sense I am trying to make a structure light. But to return to the question earlier which was very provocative, if I simply tried to paint light, very direct, I think it would be impossible, so one needs something to in a sense transform so in that title, lets say before, you would paint this what it is, and you would paint it and try to transform it and change its reality, and by introducing the word wall, I am in a sense replacing the traditional subject object with the idea of the wall structure, that being the wall and then I try to change it. So I am only doing what Chardanne did, except it is different. That is just an example of one of my titles.

**Q: Do you think about the titles of the paintings?**

Well sometimes I think of a title after the painting is finished. I did a painting that was a cryptic where all parts were equal and I put it together and I thought about everything being equal to everything else, so it was a pure democracy but it had all this stuff going on in it so I called it "One, One One." As I said before you've still got the fact that the one's are not in the same place because you can't say all the one's at the same time otherwise it would just be One one but it was as close as I could get to them all being equal even though the third one was said last.

Q: Do you think you would like to paint the idiotic voice in your life in circles or in squares?

Well the honest answer is I don't know!