TOUR DE MADAME

Edited by

Achim Hochdörfer Tonio Kröner

Museum Brandhorst
Bayerische Staatsgemäldesammlungen, München

Mudam Luxembourg
Musée d'Art Moderne Grand-Duc Jean

Verlag der Buchhandlung
Walther König, Köln

JUTTA KOETHER

PAINTING MORE NAKED THAN NAKED

Tonio Kröner

Jutta Koether, *Tate BP Bacon Balthus PdF*, 2015. Oil on canvas, diptych, each: 87 × 67 inches (220 × 170 cm)

PICTURE *I am independent of either of you. I am preparing to set out on life of my own.*
PAINTER *I forbid it!*
PICTURE *Fortunately you are powerless. Already the opacity of my pigment is ebbing, my oil is yellowing. I am beginning my long collaboration with time. My course is predestined.*
PAINTER *Does it end in glory, the national gallery?*
APPLE *The municipal rubbish heap?*
PICTURE *I shall keep my secret.*
—Lawrence Gowing[1]

The outlines of drapes, fruit, a jug, and a bowl are printed in black on a primed white canvas. The informed historical eye sees what appears to be a Cézanne; the aficionado recognizes a smaller, mirror-image rendering of his *Apples and Oranges* (ca. 1899), which hangs in the Musée d'Orsay. Luminous orange, red, violet, pink, gold, and silver spill over the outlines. Painterly gestures occasionally scrape along the emphatic black guardrails or hug them in a glazed arc. These gestures intensify the determination and spatial layout of the printed lines. Acrylic paint collects and coagulates into crimson-pinkish bruises within individual outlines. Heedless of contours, other free radicals streak across the canvas.

Does the darkish line that runs from the upper-right corner across the "apples and oranges" toward the middle of the picture (where it bifurcates downward and to the left toward the next sets of spheres) lock together the erogenous zones within this ready-made still life? Not to mention the spheres: the preprinted circles, the only closed forms on the canvas, have been modeled in fleshy red. But as what? Are they apples, bloodshot eyes, breasts? Their dominance is self-evident as the rhythmic flow of the paint transforms the arm of the chair in the lower-right quarter of the canvas—over which the fabric is draped and on which the fruit is sitting—into another composed yet pulsating organic circular form. Finally, glazed metallic paint in iridescent gold and silver washes over the whole canvas like spume. The transparency and sparkling pigmentation of this final layer of paint almost defies capture, but it actually seems to cleave to the painted gestures. The markings of color inside and over the printed outlines constitute the background of this flood of paint.

Has there ever been a more merciless encounter of banality and painterly pathos than in Jutta Koether's painting *JXXXA-PPR01-5* (2008)? Is there a more real support imaginable for painting today than this ready-made canvas preprinted with the outlines from a well-known Cézanne still life? 132

According to Meyer Schapiro's reading, Paul Cézanne, equipped with godlike surety and the stability of the desk strategist, found something in his apples, i.e., in the format of the still life, that proved impossible to realize via a human model: the ability to offer "an infinite nuancing of tones on the small rounded forms."[2] This scene, once staged in the artist's studio, is now available to buy in a radically attenuated form: as an industrially manufactured, preprinted template, which facilitates painting as a game played with color that never has to confront a human body (or indeed a piece of fruit). Manufactured by Reeves and used by Koether as the starting point for a series of works, these canvases decidedly target an adult market. Apart from the printed canvas, which Koether used for this particular painting, a set of this kind also includes a selection of paints, an instruction booklet, and a reproduction of the original painting as a template, all three of which Koether disregards.

By using a hobbyist painting set for her work, Koether is continuing what Andy Warhol touched on in his "Do It Yourself" painting series from 1962. Warhol enlarged the banal scale of paint-by-numbers paintings to that of "real" paintings. Painting as a hobby was thus elevated to the level of art, the sublime expression of the artist equated with the mechanical filling in of areas on the canvas according to the supplied numerical code. The simplicity of Koether's template motifs—bowls of fruit on a cloth—is, however, no match for the comparatively spectacular banality of the flower and landscape motifs Warhol deployed. The visual appeal of her motifs is generated primarily by the name *Cézanne* and his stature in the collective mind of canonized images. Reeves-brand Cézannes are an expression of modern art's victory parade to the heart of Western mass culture. Further, they represent the concomitant cultural transition from a disciplinary social regime that lays down the rules for the subject in every mode of life to an indirectly controlling one that encourages the subject toward creative autonomy and self-management in keeping with the model of the "modern artist."[3] The closed fields, replete with numbers in the classic paint-by-numbers mode, are replaced by an open, yet equally rigid, set of outlines. The purpose is not to fill in the shapes according to a numerical color code, but to paint "freely" using the color palette provided in response to the instructions and original template.

Contrary to the possible intention of her series, Koether by no means views this development as a pretext for salvaging the achievements of modernist painting since Cézanne (the sublimating power of "pure" form) or Warhol (the critical relationship between high and popular culture). Nor, indeed, does she condemn its shortcomings or expose the endemic problems that have existed since day one. Her painting doesn't pursue this sort of agenda; it has nothing to lose and therefore nothing to salvage.[4] Far from it: over and in the schematic outlines of this gentrified[5] visual language, she reiterates and varies subtle modes of painting from canvas to canvas. She adheres to the Reeves-kit imperative and simultaneously subdues it in the extreme visual turbulence of her characteristic red palette and gestures, a radical brand of "Do It Yourself" painting.

In three paintings immediately following the serial treatment of the Cézanne ready-mades, Koether stretched sealed but unprimed canvases on stretchers of identical dimensions. On the at once cryptic and yet tellingly titled painting *Jxxx-PR01 (#10) (the imagination has no sense of the inappropriate)* (2008), 136

as in the other two works, she draws the outlines of the same Cézanne apple still life, for which reproductions of the original and the previously painted prefab canvases serve as templates. Koether pits the classical craft of making a preliminary drawing and (subsequently) transferring the compositional sketch onto the canvas against industrially manufactured, preprinted outlines, whose connotations are described earlier.

The fluid line between autonomous composition, manual gesture, and imported artistic and nonartistic motifs has been integral to Koether's painting production from the very beginning. For example, a series of her works from 1985 is based on excerpts from paintings by Piero della Francesca, whereas her large-format paintings from the first half of the 1990s incorporate, among other motifs, traced figures from pornographic magazines and drawings by Pierre Klossowski.

The difference between *Jxxx-PR01 (#10) (the imagination has no sense of the inappropriate)* and *JXXXA-PPR01-5* is subtle: the motif's outlines come less to the fore, and thus the painting's support gains presence to the same extent that the painterly markings acquire a commensurate sense of visual independence. This intensifies the contrast between the decidedly undetermined tonal markings and the template's construction, perspective, and subject matter. The gestures develop a life of their own with regard to motif and support, again in the self-contained forms of the "apples" in particular. While the ongoing tussle between painterly gestures and preprinted outlines seems to have found a point of quiet by deforming the chair arm into a sphere, the central pieces of fruit in the later work transcend their drawn outlines and ease themselves out of the bowl, their spatial and narrative setting. Inasmuch as the flow of color wrestles less with the outlines than with its support and its flatness, the apples are arranged alongside one another in flat circles approximating—in dialogue with free-floating markings—pure form.

In tandem with the circular forms that grace many of Koether's paintings in the guise of apples, discs, little heads, spheres, suns or cells, the grid represents a second archetype in her visual armory. The "Bruised Grids" series, initiated at the same time as the Cézanne copies and still ongoing, finally consolidates the grid motif as an established component of visual organization in
119 Koether's practice. The series of drawings *10. Dezember 2000 – 6. Mai 2002* (2002) provides the central reference point for these painted grids. The 512 colored crayon drawings that she made on a daily basis during this period make use of another industrially manufactured template: reams of paper printed with blank grids comprise squares designed for practicing Chinese logograms. Again, (free) markings vie with preprinted boundaries, in this instance with explicitly educational overtones. Different from the Cézanne contours, the grids are printed in light red lines. And the crayon marks do not appear to be scrapping it out with the individual boxes—instead, they seem to find some kind of comfort in the very act of filling them in. Expression stays well within set boundaries. Nevertheless, it does register a plethora of undetermined variables in the prescribed, mechanical act of filling in the squares, in their specific colors, hatching, and repetition of the line.

Koether's "Demonic Options," an alternative title for the "Bruised Grids" in which a twelve-inch-square canvas is divided into one-inch squares, explores the surprising variability of the checkerboard in painting. In one variation, the outlines of the grid 133
have been drawn in red pen on a white canvas and alternate squares are either left blank or filled in with shades of orange, red, pink, and brown. However, the rhythm is interrupted by two settings. On the one hand, supposedly "dark" squares are only glazed with color and still tonally approximate to the light-colored ground. On the other, bright-orange squares, in lieu of what should be "white" squares, fluctuate in this dark/light arrangement. This transfiguration of the relationship between the figure and the ground tends to emphasize the fragility of the outlines rather than transgress them. A similar instance of unassuming interference occurs in sheets from *10. Dezember 2000 – 6. Mai 2002*, in which two squares painted in the same color adjoin one another.

In a process that Koether refers to as "bruising," a transparent acrylic finish is boldly applied across the canvases. Red and metallic paints are worked into this substance. The procedure seems to pay little or no recognizable heed to the layout of the grid, using it instead as more of a background, and further compressing its arrangement. Following the overpainting of gestures with metallic paint in Koether's ready-made Cézannes, the grid—the epitome of constructed, sharply delineated, and formal painting—serves as the ground for a glimmering skein of color that has no truck with boundaries. Do grids ever dream of bruises?

*

Koether's series of Cézanne still lifes and "Bruised Grids" materialize in the moment when painting is deemed "beside itself."[6] Painting has been pressurized to legitimate itself once more in the wake of the changes coined as the digital revolution and the massively accelerated forms of visual production and consumption that emerged during the 2000s. At the same time, it proved itself as a *dispositif* to be extremely lucrative, resistant, and capable of survival.[7] This is not the primary context in which Koether's painting practice experiments with the detritus and fringes of the debates surrounding modernist painting and visual vocabulary to capture characteristic functions and qualities of the medium. But the renewed challenge can no longer be ignored when Koether's contribution to the 2016 anthology *Painting beyond Itself* states that painting needs to be refitted, to have alterations of all kinds made—needs a veritable tailor's workshop for painting—but without resorting to any standardized patterns for necessary repairs.[8]

However, healing the patient isn't one of Koether's concerns. Her canvas is cut differently and is more of an invitation to participate in an adventure involving emboldened seeing and thinking through the language of painting. Not to mention her calling for the most direct encounter possible with—and a decidedly

Jutta Koether, *Untitled*, 1993. Ballpoint pen and ink on paper, 11 ¾ × 8 ¾ inches (30 × 22.5 cm)

fragmented experience of—the twitching and screaming contradictions of the medium and its ultimate referencing of expression, appropriation of the world, and the human body. The sheer excess of Koether's concentration and shifting of painting, as well as her repeating and recollecting of previously painted pictures (by herself and others), imposes itself without regard; no category nor concept of modernist painting—still valid reference points to this day—emerges unscathed. But they are neither disqualified nor denounced.[9]

Koether was never under the spell of the myths of the great artist. She wasn't trained as an artist. Her academy was the music and pop-culture magazine *SPEX*, named after the punk band X-Ray Spex, and for which she worked as a writer from 1981, and as an editor from 1985, until 2000. Her studio practice was centered for long periods—and at times from financial necessity—in her apartment, on stages, and in shared studios. She actively introduces her knowledge as an artist and her references into the debate about her work by writing, teaching, and speaking publicly about painting. This perspective toward artistic practice and painting is based on Koether's emphatic reading of punk, which she had already encountered in the mid-1970s as an alternative myth of an adjuratory "no future" nihilism. As a reaction to the social climate at the time, experienced as crisis-ridden and hopeless after the "wild" 1960s, punk's "Nothing matters anymore" attitude opened up new vistas of freedom and equality, seeming to blur and neutralize institutional restrictions as well as gender and class divisions. The attitude of punk, in particular the self-empowerment of its "Do It Yourself" creed and ethos of "Everything can be done by everyone," epitomizes Koether's attitude toward painting.[10] Virtuosity and knowledge are placed in the service of intensity, excitement, and tonality. From this it follows that the focus of engagement with the world seems to reside in being an emotional resource for acting at the mercy of the alluring forces of chaos—not for a pacifying, restricting understanding of the world.[11]

In this sense, punk is also a reaction to the all-embracing, impenetrable codification of life in the 1970s. Assertive punk takes on the semiotic conglomerate that goes by the name of the world and plays with it as a raw material, as Kathy Acker puts it:

> For the poet, the world is word. Words. Not that precisely.
> Precisely: the world and the words fuck each other.[12]

And just like the (punk) poetess, the painter also enters the underworld of words. There are no solutions in this "beyond,"[13] where the denotations and the "unknowable"[14] nature of the world meet in struggle and tenderness; instead, there is experience of the contours of the present and options for action within them.

One recalls the idea of Antonin Artaud that decisively influenced both Koether's conceptual outlook as well as the theoretical thinking in the 1970s in general: cruelty is nothing but determination as such, that precise point at which the determined maintains its essential relation with the undetermined.[15] Artaud's

Above: Lucian Freud, *After Chardin (Small Plate)*, 2000.
Etching, 6 1/16 × 8 inches (15.4 × 20.3 cm)
Opposite: Jutta Koether, *Demonic Options* (detail), 2008.
Acrylic on canvas, 11 3/4 × 11 3/4 inches (30 × 30 cm)

concept of cruelty is not related to sadism or to blood and torn flesh. It demands to be understood in a broader sense, as a fundamental mode of thought with cosmological proportions. His cruelty is the merciless connection of all concepts and forms with a seething, undetermined inner force. The contours of any elucidating or descriptive words are unable to convey this "turmoil of life" to which the world and being in general are subject.[16] However, the theater, with its expression in space and corporeal language of gesture(s), intonation, sound, screams, rhythms, and objects, is able to get closer. This involves a paradoxical, oneiric language that attends to a hieroglyphic system with an internal aesthetic logic. Its modality is to realize fluid ideas, which by their very nature cannot be limited or even formally depicted. And it is precisely in the paradox of a systematic language, which makes the undetermined palpable, that imaginings of a passionate equation between purportedly discrete concepts, such as individual, society, and objects, can be experienced.[17]

The design of a reproducible language—that turns the "unknowableness" of words inside out and elevates them to symbols that can be experienced as myths—corresponds to Koether's ongoing engagement with the color red. To the same degree as Artaud's cruelty isn't about bloodshed, her red paintings don't represent a naturalistic approach to the body. In their role as paintings, they actually wrest red's mythical dimension from the word *red* itself, as well as from motifs depicted in this color. To quote Koether, "Red paintings don't show flesh and don't resemble flesh; rather they resemble little red army units, cells: if anything, bloody money rather than bloody flesh."[18] On the one hand, *red* as such doesn't exist: instead there are different shades, historically and geographically determined, in different tubes made by different manufacturers for a diverse clientele. On the other, *red* permeates extensive areas of human existence. Ranging from blood to lipstick to political activism, its varied associations make it very much an Artaudian sign.

Above: Lucian Freud, *David and Eli*, 2003–2004.
Oil on canvas, 64 × 68 ⅛ inches (162.5 × 174 cm)
Opposite: Jutta Koether, *Ear Freud Chardin* (detail), 2014.
Oil on canvas, 47 × 59 inches (199.4 × 149.9 cm)

Koether's entry into this beyond—this province beyond words—reads like a play in its own right: Mrs. Benway, Koether's alter ego since 1985, is the "other half" in a forced marriage with Dr. Benway, a recurring fictional character in William S. Burroughs's narrative universe. Dr. Benway is a perverse physician more interested in his surgical performance, conducted under the influence of narcotics and with dirty instruments, than in the well-being of his patients. His treatment of dirty things—bodies, drugs, knives, trash, and language—is laconic, close to caricature. At his side and under the spell of his alternative, unnatural language of behavior, Koether was able to come up with her own operations.[19] She was able to appropriate the concepts, motifs, and paint tubes of painting. The painting itself is the auditorium where she turns its innermost world inside out and suspends it across the surface of the canvas, itself a paradoxical surface, which is simultaneously defined by Koether as pure like an abstract and dirty like a Pop art painting.[20] Koether—who has become a kind of fictional character in her own right—has immersed herself in "a genuine physical language with signs, not words, as its root."[21]

*

Orange, brown, and pinkish-violet lines in oil pastel traverse the primed white canvas, retraced in sections with oil paint. In the process, shrill orange and a white that absorbs, smudges, and is colored by the pigments of the oil pastels solidify the paints like shoals in a river. Gold and the duality of its presence/absence wash over the format. In the left-hand section of the painting, there is a huddle of three concentric, compressed ovoid shapes not quite closed on the right-hand side. Traveling from the top-right corner to the bottom of the canvas, a line of paint congeals into a dark-violet/pink spot in its middle and, battling against the tide, seems to be preserving a semblance of recognizable form. The statement made by this marking has the effect of rendering the sum of the gestures to its left legible as a form in juxtaposition with the sparsely painted support of primed canvas to the right.

The swirling eddies of color in Koether's *Ear Freud Chardin* (2014) suddenly coalesce into the profile of a face in extreme close-up. The initial apparent randomness of the shapes and the swirl of paint now appears as facial orifices, an ear, an eye. The surface of the painting is virtually dominated by imagination, its marbled waves modeling form to the same degree that they dissolve it. Dislocations, fragmentation, and distortions are givens, and are neither feared nor brought into battle as critical artillery.

However, all this is not from Koether's imagination, at least not to any greater or lesser degree than her grid paintings or Cézanne still lifes. It is based on observation, though not of a model sitting for her, but by looking at images. It is the most recent realization so far of a visual tumult, a human ear in oils. It is the very ear that obscenely disrupts the contemplative calm in Jean-Siméon Chardin's *The Young Teacher* (1735–36), and which Lucian Freud memorialized in 2000 in his etching *After Chardin (Small Plate)*, which acted as a template for Koether. Mostly left naked and protruding from the rest of the body, the skin-shrouded bodily orifice called *ear* is an absolute receptor. Unlike the human eye, it cannot be closed. The ear knows nothing of painting, but is cognizant of the melody of words, clamor, whispering, stuttering, and the silence of the world. The world breaks into the body via the ear as an abstract intensity and simultaneously the body folds toward the world as ear.

Along with Cézanne, Artaud, and Dr. Benway, Lucian Freud is another prominent celestial body in Koether's painting cosmos. His painterly project is the pursuit of the body, specifically its subjugation by the environment and, to the same degree, the subjugation of the painting by the body—the intrusion of the material body and its gestures into the studio situation. He represents the complementary opposite of Cézanne's treatment of corporeality, its sublimation in the round apple. The fleshy presence of the life model, which had neutralized Cézanne's concentration on the formal questions of painting, forms the nub of Freud's physiology of painting. The crudity of his painterly treatment of bodies is all the more extreme given the fact that although life models sat for these paintings, they were viewed and treated graphically, just like plants, furniture, or animals. Staying with the picture: whereas in Cézanne's case every apple stays a particular apple, in Freud's studio everything becomes an apple and everything has to assert its place in and shape toward the world *as* apple. This strife-ridden ontology is characteristic of the second half of the twentieth century, of the search for some purchase in a world of post-catastrophic social and technological upheaval, one that renders the status of the "male" human more than a little fragile. (How many penises feature centrally in Freud's bodies and paintings, all stumbling through the messy confusion of the world? How often has the penis been generalized as the purported center of a fragmented body and an out-of-joint

language?) Freud integrates the dual aspect of the "unknowable," the nonhuman and the annihilating, into a male sense of being human in the extreme. In this way, his painterly operations aren't so far removed from the kind Dr. Benway performs:

> the surgeon deliberately endangers his patient, and then, with incredible speed and celerity, rescues him from death at the last possible split second …[22]

Koether's reimagining of Freud's incursions into the body of life-painting only serves to increase the patient's stress levels. *Lucian David and Eli* (2014) uses Freud's *David and Eli* (2003–2004) as its template—David Dawson, Freud's studio assistant and model during the last twenty years of his life, and Eli, one of his whippets, are lying on a bed made with a white sheet, a yucca plant close by. Koether condenses the simultaneously fragile and delicate depiction in Freud's painting by retaining its height yet compressing its width to almost half the size of the original. As a result, the room, the bed, and the floor are tilted upright, which affords a top view parallel to the picture plane; the depicted body is hence lying beneath us frontally, as though on an operating table—we recall Cézanne's godlike perspective on his apples and Koether's radically planar depiction of her "Cézanne apples" in *Jxxx-PR01 (#10) (the imagination has no sense of the inappropriate).*

As though in a pressure cooker, the situation in the studio is brought to a boil with an intensity resembling that of caricature; the stream of the imagination is turned fully on to produce a feverish whirlpool of monstrous proportions. The preparatory sketching is considerably bolder than in *Ear Freud Chardin* and encompasses a broader spectrum of colors and contrasts, ranging from orange, red, and pink to olive green. The drawing and oil painting, comprising short, fluid, and spare opaque markings, struggle to provide the outlines of the individual figures, to delineate space, and to stabilize the discrete components in their relational configurations. Once again, golden metallic paint highlights the depicted bodies as a kind of optical glimmering, but also shifts the floorboards and the negative space of the supine David to the visual foreground.

The doubling of the picture's corners in torrid red emphasizes the boundary aspect of the format and lends cohesion to the mise-en-scène, which it literally frames. The same intense red spews forth from David's gaping head, cut off at the top by the edge of the canvas. The face itself—Freud's preferred site for establishing identity between paint and the depicted world—has been rubbed with this most intense red pigment on the canvas. The flow and burn of the paint concentrates itself again into an outline in a deep-pink section on the right beneath the middle of the painting. This marking provides the viewer's eye with support, in the very position of the only visible leg of the bed frame on which the composition in Freud's painting balances. Unlike the original, this upright doesn't correlate to David's penis as a kind of visual rhyme. The latter is quite literally decentered and, as a crude shape, creates space for a rough triangle, itself a negative space completed by the position of his bent left leg.[23] The apples are also reprised. Two circles, David's breasts, are beacons of calm in the overall tonal hurly-burly. At second glance, and as a visual key via their referencing the rounded shoulder and knee joints, the heels and the back of the hand, they plot the coordinates of the human figure. Ultimately, the appearance of a checkerboard grid in the spot of the yucca's woven enclosure in Freud's painting helps to strike a balance once more between the fleshy signifiers and the continuum of repetitive decor and painterly surface.

Lucian David and Eli is a declaration of love to monstrous painting: to the enigmatic qualities of a practice full of riddles without solutions, a model visual arena rich in inherent interactions and tensions, and the spatial scope for an alogical, closed surface. The vigor with which this visceral expression is projected outward, enmeshed as it is with the flow of the world, effectively connects the dots between Cézanne's still lifes, Artaud's Theatre of Cruelty, Dr. Benway's operating table, Freud's portraits, and Koether's painting.

The almost square painting *More Naked than Naked* (2016)[24] is a programmatic summing up of sorts: the overall flow of marks oscillates hazily between drawing and painting, contained by painted frames in the respective corners of the canvas. The flow gathers in the outlines of a naked body and pools into a face of intense materiality. At the same time, these eddies of color are countered by a contiguous grid in the top-left corner that is composed of separate individual markings. The grid itself abstracts a curved line, which has actually been painted on the other side of the canvas. A line in the shape of a walking stick right next to it subverts the painterly gesture once more. The stick provides depth of field as it disappears into and emerges from a bank of color. This is promptly annulled by the flatness of two crossed lines in the upper-right corner. Koether has painted an apple sphere in the lower-left corner diagonally opposite the cross. This in turn corresponds to the approximate triangular surface formed as a negative space between the human's left heel, lower thighs, and pubic area—and therefore his penis, too, which is shunted out of and marginalized by this space. At the same time, this "empty" triangle mirrors the densely painted face, its chin an inverted apex pointing downward. Furthermore, the style of the apple, or the pupil at the center of this orb, lends the discrete dots on the man's chest a larger-than-life, spectral presence. Thus, the act of looking itself paves the way for the dynamic relationship between even the most minimal painterly details in the picture.

The program of a kind of painting that is more naked than naked is inevitably and decidedly symbolic. With it, Koether has laid down and simultaneously expanded a fundamental genealogy of modern expression. This program is closely associated with the limitations of words; it shares their problems and, conversely, is supported and influenced by them. Evidently, it doesn't exhaust its potential in deconstruction as an end in

itself. Koether's interest doesn't lie in revealing, disrupting, and presenting the hierarchical orders and constructions of painting and its attendant discourses as historically conditioned entities. Quite the reverse: she is intent on capturing the properties of the medium's modes of production, the surface of the canvas, the colors, forms, and motifs in their webs of incomprehensible connections and contradictions. Her form of painting launches an assault on the core constitutive constructions of the medium itself in order to isolate its cosmological vigor and potential:

> Figure of Paint, as an existential means, in the behavior toward the growing and fading of EVERYTHING.[25]

NOTES

1. Lawrence Gowing, "Painter and Apple" in *The Arts*, no. 1 (1945), republished as *Painter and Apple*, exh. cat. (London: Arts Council of Great Britain, 1983).
2. Meyer Schapiro, "The Apples of Cézanne: An Essay on the Meaning of Still-Life," in *Modern Art: 19th & 20th Centuries*, ed. Schapiro (New York: G. Braziller, 1978), 27.
3. Cf. Ève Chiapello, "Evolution und Kooption. Die 'Künstlerkritik' und der normative Wandel" ("Evolution and Co-optation: 'Artist Critique' and Normative Change"), in *Kritische Gesellschaften* (*Critical Societies*), ed. Angelika Stepken (Nuremberg: Verlag für moderne Kunst, 2006), 38.
Taking this a little further, they are also an expression of the gentrification of the artistic processes at work in the appropriation, reproduction, and sampling of images, that is to say, of visual data. In her series "(traced)" (ongoing since 2013), Louise Lawler would appear to be mapping this cultural appropriation of methodologies that she helped develop. She traces what have by now become her canonical photographic appropriations of modernist and contemporary art digitally with black vector-based lines, so that she can enlarge or reduce them with absolute variability. Printed on self-adhesive vinyl foil, these spectral silhouettes of her work are mostly affixed to the wall directly, whereas the works in the series "(traced and painted)" (2014) have been printed on paper, with Lawler herself filling in the outlines using gouache.
4. In her *SPEX* column "Mrs. Benway," Koether writes about the music video to The Cure's hit "Close to Me": "They just carry on playing and the fact that they are drowning doesn't seem to matter.… Are they trying to make us believe that there is nothing to lose or nothing to be gained?" Jutta Koether, "Mrs. Benway Passagen. Kähne, Kunstmarkt, und eine Kur" ("Mrs. Benway Passages: Barges, Art Market, and a Cure"), *SPEX*, December 1985, 56.
5. With reference to the historicization of the AIDS crisis in the US, Sarah Schulman illuminates the processes of exchange and homogenization of complex, individuated, and dynamic forms of both thinking and activism on the part of diverse classes, ethnicities, races, sexualities, and languages with a gentrified, ring-fenced form of culture: Sarah Schulman, *Gentrification of the Mind: Witness to a Lost Imagination* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012).
6. David Joselit introduces the view of "painting beside itself" most decidedly in reference to Koether's practice in his "Painting beside Itself," *October*, no. 130 (Autumn 2009): 125–34.
7. Projects such as the conferences *Painting: The Implicit Horizon* and *Painting beyond itself: The Medium in the Post-Medium Condition*, with their accompanying readers; and the exhibition and catalogue *Painting 2.0: Expression in the Information Age* tried in immediate succession to capture the current specificity of this phenomenon. Koether played a central role in differing ways in the two latter projects. Cf. Avigail Moss and Kerstin Stakemeier, eds., *Painting: The Implicit Horizon* (Maastricht: Jan van Eyck Academie, 2012); Isabelle Graw and Ewa Lajer-Burcharth, eds., *Painting beyond itself: The Medium in the Post-Medium Condition* (Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2016); Manuela Ammer, Achim Hochdörfer, and David Joselit, eds., *Painting 2.0: Expression in the Information Age*, exh. cat. (Munich: Museum Brandhorst / Delmonico Books; Vienna: Museum moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien, 2016).
8. Cf. Jutta Koether, "Beyond, Beyond! Two Years after the Conference," in *Painting beyond Itself*, 55. *Änderungen aller Art* (*Alterations of All Kinds*) was likewise the title of Koether's last survey show in 2007 at the Kunsthalle Bern, which was also staged as *Fantasia Colonia* at the Kölnischer Kunstverein.
9. Cf. Isabelle Stengers, *Thinking with Whitehead: A Free and Wild Creation of Concepts* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011), 15.
10. Benjamin H. D. Buchloh, "A Conversation with Jutta Koether," *October*, no. 157 (Summer 2016): 18.
11. Cf. Pierre Klossowski, *Nietzsche and the Vicious Circle* (London: Continuum, 2005), 165.
12. Kathy Acker, "On Delany the Magician: A Foreword," in Samuel Delany, *Trouble on Triton* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1996): X.
13. Koether describes the idea of "Beyond, Beyond painting" as a kind of painting in which complex pictorial forces hold sway and the act of viewing becomes an act of love or bewitchment. Cf. Koether "Beyond, Beyond! Two Years after the Conference," in *Painting beyond itself*, 60.
14. Acker, "On Delany," X.
15. Cf. Gilles Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994), 29.
16. Cf. Antonin Artaud, *The Theater and its Double* (New York: Grove Press, 1958), 117–21.
17. Cf. Artaud, *The Theater*, 89–93.
18. Jutta Koether, *f.* (Graz: Edition Bleich-Rossi, 1987), 29.
19. Cf. Koether, *f.*, 21–22.
20. Cf. Koether, *f.*, 31.
21. Artaud, *The Theater,* 124.
22. William S. Burroughs, *Naked Lunch* (London: Penguin, 2015), 52.
23. The triangle has been another of Koether's long-serving companions over the years, from the abstracted form of the female pubic area to shaped canvases like the scarlet equilateral triangle titled *Palindrom* (2009). The red triangle likewise plays a central role as an occult universal sign in Kenneth Anger's film *Lucifer Rising* (1972), another fixed star in Koether's cosmos of references.
24. The painting's title is a quote from Jean Clair's reading of Freud's painting. He describes the painter's portraits as more naked than naked, as *écorché*, depictions of a body without skin or anatomical preparations of solely bones and muscles. Jean Clair, "Freud, the Biologist," in *Lucian Freud: The Studio*, ed. Cécile Debray, exh. cat. (Paris: Centre Georges Pompidou; Munich: Hirmer, 2010), 48. Koether consistently uses quotes from her reading as work titles. This indicates precisely the fundamental importance of writing (on painting) for her painterly practice. Her reference to observations sparked by painting or seemingly demanded by it that are formulated in words are on equal footing with her visual reference to images.
25. Jutta Koether, "Figure of Paint: On the Incontrovertible!," *Texte zur Kunst*, December 2015, 138.