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The focus of this essay is the suite of thirteen prints *The Last Supper* (1999) by the best-known British artist of the 1990s, Damien Hirst, which was instigated and published by British print publisher Charles Booth Clibborn and his Paragon Press.1 This context for Hirst’s engagement with print determines its scope: the series falls within the well-established conventional format of an artistic print portfolio, albeit distinguished by an unusually large size for such a project (152.5 by 101.5 cm).2 My concentration on Hirst’s series was prompted by the fact that critical evaluations of it have tended to pay little or no attention to the medium of print. Rather than bemoaning this not untypical lacuna in the critical writing on prints, this article aims to address this discursive gap.

Hirst is one of many contemporary artists who use the medium of print, often in collaboration with a ‘master printer’, alongside other artistic means, be they multi-media installations, more traditional sculpture, painting or even video. This is evident in a roll-call of artists represented with Hirst in Booth-Clibborn’s various print projects: Marc Quinn, Peter Doig, Jake and Dinos Chapman, Sam Taylor-Wood, to name but a few. Such prints, not surprisingly, tend to be examined alongside the artists’ other works, mainly in terms of their iconography, and this is the case for the discussion of Hirst in the publication that documents Booth-Clibborn’s print projects.3 Other critical reviews of the *Last Supper* series follow the same iconographical approach.4 Attention is drawn to Hirst’s staple concerns with death and religion, here filtered through consumption. Hirst’s other works involving pharmaceutical material are alluded to, as is his neo-conceptual Duchampian approach. Jeremy Lewison, in his contribution to the Booth-Clibborn publication, considers the work as a recasting of modernist ideals where ‘the act of re-presentation becomes an act of repackaging’.5

In his general introduction to that publication, editor Patrick Elliott asserts that prints – for the artist unfamiliar with the medium – allow for a new expression and ‘form an integral part’ of the artist’s ‘main body of work’ executed in other media.6 Lewison also stresses that print is ‘a vehicle for translation’ and further mentions appropriation as a strategy afforded by the medium.7

It is well known that within the critical debates since the 1960s, especially the critique of authorship and the division between high and popular culture, this propensity (as well as its ease of multiplication) has given artistic printmaking an increased status and critical purchase. In Hirst’s case – which can be taken as typical for a broad spectrum of contemporary art practice –
such appropriation is affiliated with his Duchampian penchant for the ready-made. Indeed, Lewison calls *The Last Supper* series an ‘assisted readymade’.8

The broader cultural context for artistic print practices lies in the explosion of ‘printed matter’ all around us, not least print media such as advertising, publicity material and so on. While it could be argued that this increase can be observed from the invention of the printing press onwards, developments in modernity and the more recent glut of printed material signal a qualitative difference. Print media partly constitute the often noted, if problematic, concept of the ‘visual turn’ in culture and the concomitant rise of visual culture studies since the 1980s.9 The ensuing familiarity with print media, as was true earlier of photography, has increased confusion as to the status of the ‘art print’.10 This situation may be exacerbated by the fact that – in tandem with broader artistic strategies since the 1960s and the use of digital media – artistic print practice now encompasses a broad variety of activities and approaches. The recent survey of current print practices by Gillian Saunders and Rosie Miles, *Prints Now*, is structured according to such different approaches and lists amongst others print in 3-D; found and appropriated print; site-specific print; print as public art; multiples; new media.11 This broadening of modes of printmaking and the increased appearance of print within contemporary art practice has as yet not been matched – unlike with photography – by a consideration of print in the critical debate, both within and without the printmaking community itself.12

The examination of Hirst’s prints here will serve to ‘infiltrate’ the general discourse on contemporary art and visual culture with a reflection on the ‘artistic print’. The latter is not understood in terms of modernist medium specificity but in terms of its discursive and performative quality in the wider cultural field. In addition, my investigation aims to contribute to a broadening of the theoretical debate within the academic printmaking community by applying theoretical tools which have gained currency in writing on art and culture. Such a task seems especially appropriate within the British context because printmaking practice and research constitute a vital contribution to British visual culture.13

This essay employs the critical term ‘discursivity’ and the affiliated categories of citationality and performativity with particular attention to the flatness of the print in order to complicate and thus extend the notions of ‘appropriation’ and ‘translation’ which have been used to explain the interrelationship of print with the wider culture and within a single artist’s oeuvre:

> Discourse and the law operate by concealing their citationality and genealogy, presenting themselves as timeless and singular, while performativity similarly ‘conceals or dissimulates the conventions of which it is a repetition’.14

Referring to Judith Butler’s conceptions of citationality and performativity this quote may be stating the obvious: that cultural discourses such as the law, but also art, function through the repetition or citation of cultural codes and conventions. These should not just be understood in purely linguistic terms,
but in terms of actual practice/s. The quote also points out that the enactment of these codes and conventions, or their performativity, tends to be obscured. In other words, when we performatively engage with them – whenever we participate in cultural activities such as the making or viewing of art – we do not necessarily reflect on their cultural codedness.

Postmodern art has done much to make such codes and conventions visible. For example, Barbara Kruger’s work in the 1980s exposed the linguistic and visual codes that define and delimit gender. Angus Fairhurst’s print *When I Woke Up in the Morning, the Feeling Was Still There* from 1992 (Figure 1) could be read as an exposé of the overlapping discourses of painting, photography and the artist’s performativity through the medium of print.

These two examples might be described in terms of postmodern quotation or appropriation. Why then the introduction of yet more theoretical terms? The difference between these terms and citationality lies in the performative aspect of the latter. Citationality and performativity do not assume a pre-existing subject that employs quotation and appropriation. Rather the stress is on their constitutive character. It is through the performativity or citation of cultural codes that the subject is constituted or comes into being. As Judith Butler has said of gender, we are not a certain gender, but we ‘do gender’. The flippant tone of this statement belies its complexity. Performativity is not to be confused with a simple ‘performing’ or performance by choice, but places the emphasis on the repetition or re-citation of cultural codes and practices in the constitution of the subject. This may include the making or viewing of images. Althusser’s concept of interpellation has been used to account for the specific quality or ‘hailing’ of the viewer through images.

But how might citationality be linked to print? It could be said that one vital sign of citationality in Western culture has been and is the multiple productions of the print media. Historically, it is through printed media that the political, social and cultural discourses of mass society and mass culture were established and maintained. Despite a much diversified media landscape today it could be argued – especially in light of the predominance of the visual – that a citational quality adheres to printed matter with its potential for reproduction or ‘re-citation’.

A hallmark of print media – in tandem with their rectangular format and paper quality – is their flat surface. While print shares flatness with painting, photography, film, television and computer screens, it possesses its own flatness which can be differentiated from them and – in the context of artistic printmaking – can be regarded as a signifier of its citational character. Unlike film, television and the computer screen, the flat surface of the artistic print shares with photography a tangible, tactile quality. But compared with photography, printmaking’s flatness – obviously made more complex by the different printmaking techniques, including digital processes – can be considered as different, more tactile.

Judith Butler, in the quote above, also states that the citationality in/of culture is concealed. Here, some of the stumbling blocks to the perception of printmaking as an artistic discipline during the twentieth century come into clearer focus. Unlike the flatness of the modernist picture plane, the flatness of the art print acts as a signifier for its mechanical nature, its re-producibility – in other words, its potential repetition, re-citation. This was anathema in the context of modern art and one reason for printmaking’s marginalization.

Printmaking’s flatness, its ‘superficiality’, has too often been read as ‘superficiality’, casting it in binary opposition to the touch of painting, painting’s contactful nature and ‘depth’. Touch or contact and depth are terms that become conflated. As will be shown later, these opposites are also characteristic of the concepts of sense or meaning and the sensory, although they shift and change. Meaning/sense and depth become linked. By contrast, the sensory and touch are regarded culturally as secondary to sense and
meaning. It is obvious from these brief remarks that the flatness of the print calls into play powerful cultural signifiers which themselves are indicative of broader epistemological frameworks or discourses, which inform artistic print practice and are reciprocally constituted by it.

How do these terms function or ‘perform’ in relation to Damien Hirst’s suite of prints? This work does not conceal its citationality – in that sense it is like much postmodern work that deconstructs its own cultural codedness. It draws attention to ‘the conventions of which it is a repetition’, to refer back to Butler again. How does it discursively enact or perform this citationality? More specifically, what is Hirst’s series’ status as a print and how do the typical binary oppositions between surface and touch, between superficiality and depth or between the sensory and sense play out in this work? In what way might a consideration of the work, through the terms used above, alter such dichotomies?

As already indicated, the medical/pharmaceutical theme of Hirst’s Last Supper series has been a continuing, often explicit trope in his work, frequently literally involving pharmaceutical packaging. For example, the installation Pharmacy of 1992 (now in the Tate Modern Collection) fills a whole room from floor to ceiling with glass-fronted cabinets stacked with cardboard boxes containing medicine. His unfinished series of dot paintings are known by the epithet The Pharmaceutical Paintings. The source of the Last Supper prints consists of pharmaceutical packaging, the design of which is almost exactly reproduced – albeit hugely enlarged – but with two important alterations: the logos of the respective pharmaceutical companies bear Hirst’s own name in various configurations, such as Damien, Hirst, HirstDamien, Damien & Hirst, Hirst Products Limited (see Figure 2). In addition, the usual designations of the drugs – which sometimes consist simply of their most potent chemical ingredient, or at other times of a more popularized version – have been replaced by those of British foods, namely: Chicken; Beans Chips; Cornedbeef; Salad; Mushroom; Meatballs; Steak and Kidney; Sausages; Liver Bacon Onions; Cornish Pasty; Peas Chips; Omelette; Dumpling; Sandwich (see Figure 3). Sometimes the food name is combined with elements of the original drug designation, for example, the superscripted® of the registered trademark and the amount of the active substance, in Corned Beef® 200 (see Figure 4).

In other respects, too, the ‘look’ of these prints maintains the design schemes adopted by the drug companies, such as the type faces, colours (largely muted with some bright exceptions) and other graphic design features, such as the lay-out. This is based on the simple, clear, geometrical lines of pharmaceutical packaging; for example, in Corned Beef® 200, a bright red vertical band of colour is set against a magnolia background of equal size above and below.

These prints, then, appropriate or ‘cite’ the format of specific, well-recognized consumer products. They also make a textual reference to food. Visual and textual elements of the discourses of food and medicine are transposed to or ‘cited’ in the discourse of art. Citationality has been linked by Butler – in the context of queer politics – to a critical, subversive enterprise, although she concedes that ‘citationality is not necessarily subversive’.
Hirst’s re-citation could be credited with such a subversive quality. Its humour derives to a large degree from an incongruous mélange: the semi-scientific ‘look’ or ‘image’ of the drug packaging clashes with the deadpan linguistic signifiers of food – British comfort foods at that. This matter-of-fact quality is in strong contrast to the cultural and emotional investment that all cultures bring to the subject of food – or medicine, for that matter. In a Western and specifically a British context, immensely popular media products, such as
TV programmes by celebrity chefs, newspaper and magazine features and advertising, turn the commodity of food into a hyperreal spectacle. The conflation of the name of a drug with the word for a particular item of food signals to the viewer that drugs have become the everyday fare of us all. Indeed, the emphasis is here on the so-called ‘average’ man or woman. In the foods alluded to, there is a strong connotation of the everyday and the working-class culture of post-war Britain, possibly partly on account of Hirst’s...
own petit-bourgeois upbringing in the Midlands in the 1960s. With the demise of the old manufacturing base, especially since the 1970s and throughout the Thatcher years, such references seem to have acquired, in the popular imagination, a reassuringly 'old-fashioned' quality. This includes the connotation of 'honesty' and 'directness'. More particularly, the yBa phenomenon of the 1990s, with Hirst as unofficial figurehead, is partly known for its frequent references to the British working class. National and personal

Figure 4. Damien Hirst, *Corned beef*, 'The Last Supper', 1999, edition of 150, screenprint, 153 × 101.5 cm. © Damien Hirst.
allusions to the post-war period in Britain are conjured up on the basis of the ‘homeliness’ of ‘peas’ and ‘chips’, or the slightly more elaborate ‘meatballs’ and the almost fanciful ‘French’ ‘omelette’. The nostalgic appeal of these foods is reinforced by the ‘retro’ look of the design, a point to which I will return. Julian Stallabrass has been particularly critical about the nostalgic element of the yBa’s working-class references.26 A general sense of nostalgia had been noted earlier as a characteristic of postmodernity by writers such as François Lyotard and Fredric Jameson.27 But the unusual and typically blunt combination of Hirst’s citation challenges pure nostalgia.

The mixing of references to food and medicine, especially in the form of their chemical make-up, signals the increasingly chemically enhanced, mass manufacture of foodstuffs that places them alongside the more obviously ‘artificially’ produced drugs.28 This undermines any comfortable association with ‘homeliness’ or safe nostalgia. The chemical make-up and potentially powerful effects of all foods is a subject that has been widely popularized in various media, not least in the fitness and dieting sector. A further complication is the widespread concern about the negative effects of fast- and mass-produced foods.29 The citational quality of Hirst’s references thus alludes to the polarities of the naively good and ‘natural’ versus the automatically evil and artificial, man-made.

Curator Colin Ledwith’s comments give another spin to the medicine/food analogy. Hirst’s title, The Last Supper, is a replay of his much-commented-on references, often in the guise of the prankster, to the ‘big’ themes of life and death as well as religion. Here is the pat re-iteration of his belief that drugs have replaced religious belief, or at least assumed a similar status. In addition to the title, the number of prints, thirteen, makes obvious biblical (and art historical) reference to Christ’s ‘last supper’. The popular belief in thirteen as an ‘unlucky’ number might reinforce this sense of doom. At the same time, Hirst’s prints marshal the antidote and Ledwith suggests that his use of colour can be read in this way. The artist conflates the effects of art with the meliorating, even life-giving, effects of drugs, religion and food. This places him in the position of ‘doctor-priest’ who ‘prescribes mood-affecting colour meditation in the guise of controlled substances’. If art can heal, Ledwith asks, ‘does Hirst also believe that like food, it can nourish and sustain?’30 The answer is yes. As with the Holy Communion instituted at the biblical ‘last supper’ in which the ingestion of bread and wine metonymically stands for the body and blood of Christ, art is similarly ‘internalised and becomes a source of metaphysical nourishment’.31 Here the serial quality affiliated with the print coincides with the repetitiveness and seriality of religious ritual: religious ritual is itself a potent form of re-citation. The list of all the foods, combined with the bland similarity of the individual prints, resembles that of an incantation or a litany. It is only through a performative enactment on behalf of the viewer that such citational ciphers attain reality.

Hirst’s re-citational operation makes the citational character of the specific cultural discourses – of medicine and food – evident. It could also be said to illuminate the citational or intertextual character of art, its parasitic quality, its dependence not only on the wider cultural context but on art itself. As has
been shown, this includes the re-citation within an individual artist's work itself, of which Hirst is a prime example. 

In a broader artistic sense, one can argue that the prints 'cite' quite specific artistic precedents. An obvious comparison is to Andy Warhol, especially his late Last Supper paintings and print series after Leonardo. Hirst himself has linked pharmaceutical packaging to Minimalism. As already stated, Hirst's work is customarily discussed in terms of the now ubiquitous Duchampian ready-made, which includes prints. Indeed, Hirst's prints can be compared to Duchamp's 'assisted ready-made' Pharmacie of 1914 – a bought commercially produced chromolithograph with two paint dots added – both in terms of their 'sentiment' and citational modus operandi. Their self-referential character can also be said to echo Duchamp's printed reproductions of his own work, albeit Hirst's prints were made without Duchamp's sustained type of personal involvement in the reproductive process.

What conclusion can be drawn from this mixing of artistic references? Hirst's work can be seen as typical of 1990s neo-conceptualism, which tried to differentiate itself, not only from any modernist purity or universalism, but also from the unity of purpose that still characterized its 1960s conceptual predecessors. As already indicated, in the context of the present debate, these references can be read as a basic formula of postmodern art, an indication of the self-referential or re-citational character of art itself. Within the context of print, one is also tempted to read such references as a pointer to the fact that the most frequent encounter with art for most viewers, whether they belong to a general or a more professional public, occurs through reproduced images as part of the 'printed matter' of everyday culture, in posters, books, magazines and so on.

A further form of re-citation occurs in the replacement of the pharmaceutical logos with Hirst's name. His actual signature appears – following customary twentieth-century editorial print practice – in the white paper margins of the prints, but the usual information as to the size of the edition and sequential number of the individual print is not included. Swapping the historically powerful graphic convention of the artist's hand-written name with the made-for-multiple-reproduction graphic ready-made creates, of course, an advertising logo. It is another instance of Hirst's familiar, self-ironic comment on his own status as a brand, suggesting the conflation not only of the work of art but also of the persona of the artist with the commodity. The art's value is hence less guaranteed by the particularity of the work than contained in the brand name of the artist. Artistic identity itself becomes a discursive convention in the material form of the printed sign. In a curious reversal, the hand-written signature in the margin, which constitutes the 'normal' guarantor of such market value for the 'fine art' or 'original' print, appears almost as an after-thought. Overwhelmed by the 'brand', the hand-written signature, when viewed within the context of the series as a whole, is itself revealed as a mere convention or citation instead of a sign of authenticity and identity. At the same time the signature continues to fulfil its conventional function of validating the market value of the print.

Hirst's re-citation of mass-produced objects as well as the playful branding of the prints with his name, constitutes a by now familiar questioning of
artistic originality. He is no doubt aware that his references to death include – as in Barthes’s famous dictum – the author/artist himself. Yet Hirst’s oppositional gestures remain ambivalent. As stated, he ultimately follows the convention of supplying the artist’s personal signature and therefore maintains the marketable value of the prints. This is not surprising, given the burgeoning market value of the yBas in general and Hirst in particular. Indeed, much of the criticism levelled at the yBas and Hirst specifically – by critics such as Stallabrass – lies in their savvy, media-courting entrepreneurship, to the detriment of a more critical stance. Cultural critique sits comfortably here alongside cultural conformism.

As well as these textual citations, the design of the pharmaceutical products that Hirst has appropriated can itself be defined in terms of citation. The preference in pharmaceutical packaging for simple geometrical graphic layouts and ‘modern’, often sans serif type faces, matches the look of modernist design, as popularized from the 1920s onwards. The connotations of these design codes – of rationality, objectivity, universality and social progress as a hallmark of Western modernity – help to construct and maintain modern science’s claim to empirical, objective truth. This is even more so with the medical sciences and the global pharmaceutical industry. The conventional naming of drugs reinforces such assumptions. Based on Greco-Latin derivations, they suggest a seemingly unbroken heritage of centuries of Western rational enquiry and claims to universal truth. Yet it could be said that this particular citational quality of the design, combined with the drugs’ designations, camouflages the medical and pharmaceutical sciences’ involvement with the pharmaceutical industry’s profiteering. Hirst’s recitation underlines that any notion of a purely value-free science or benignly humane medicine is a fallacy.

This is further proven by the selection of the particular drugs. In addition to their ability to pose as varied design statements, their selection seems to be based on the severity of the symptoms they purport to alleviate or heal. The medicines invariably address serious, even life-threatening illnesses rather than minor ailments. Despite the fact that the drugs were chosen not for their specific properties but for the design, this is what a study of the pharmaceutical information reveals:

*Chicken* is based on a pack of Oramorph® (Morphine Sulphate) oral solution. An addictive narcotic analgesic, it is used in the management of severe pain, and is often used to alleviate pain in terminally ill patients. Side effects include constipation and urinary retention.

Or take *Steak and Kidney*, which is:

based on a pack of Ethambutol Hydrochloride (400mg tablets) … The medicine is used in the treatment of tuberculosis. Side effects include a unique type of visual impairment which is usually reversible on cessation of therapy.

Included in Hirst’s choice are two anti-retroviral drugs used in the treatment of progressive HIV. All the drugs referred to in the series may have negative side-effects, as the quotes above show.
How does the encounter with Hirst’s prints further contribute to such a critical reading? As previously indicated, it is here that the notion of performativity assumes significance. As German cultural historian Sybille Krämer has argued, ‘Sense/meaning only exists in relation to dealing with [im Umgang mit] something that exists in space and time. Meaning is therefore an event, is “performativity” [Performanz].’

There is an increasing body of critical writing related to a reconsideration of phenomenology. This extends and, to some extent, rewrites the social-constructivist and semiotic theories of the 1980s and their often perfunctory treatment of the body. It questions the philosophical separation of body and mind which has been so prominent in Western philosophy and the implications this has for an understanding of vision. As Krämer has argued, meaning or sense and the sensory are inextricably intertwined. She quotes Merleau-Ponty:

To understand a sentence, does not mean anything other than to absorb its existence as sound [sein lautliches Dasein]; meaning does not lie atop the sentence as the butter on the bread or a second level of psychic reality spread across the sound: meaning or sense is the totality of the said.

Applied to an image or a work of art, one might add that a work of art’s meaning, similarly, does not lie behind it, as is commonly asserted, but that its material or sensuous form and its symbolic value or cultural coding together entail (perform) the meaning. This is why it is so striking that Hirst’s work is discussed without reference to its printed nature. Krämer again:

The classical ‘window-model’ differentiates between two worlds, body and mind. Sense/meaning and the sensory in this model are located differently as indicated by the metaphors of ‘above’ and ‘below’, ‘in front’ and ‘behind’; and especially with the preferred ‘inside’ and ‘out’ as the respective locations.

Drawing on the writings of Walter Benjamin, Vilém Flusser and Paul Zumthor, Krämer speaks of a ‘third dimension’ which avoids such divisions, ‘The sensory does not bring forth “sense” or “meaning” and it is not an expression of it – it is the execution [Vollzug], the performance of sense or meaning’. I would like to concentrate on this point to explore how the viewer encounters Hirst’s prints sensorily. It has been shown how the citation of the discourses of medicine and by implication of science and the pharmaceutical industry, as well as the discourse of art, is enacted through the textual and formal aspects of the prints. The sensory resemblance of the prints refers to both art and specific commodities. In particular this holds for the discourse of ‘printed matter’, which is affiliated with material culture and certain commodities and their packaging. In addition to the formal characteristics already mentioned, the discourse of art in relation to Hirst’s print series is also made complicit with that of pharmaceutical commodities through the particular mode of display: they are encased in ‘white seamless laser cut factory produced Formica frames’ (See Figure 5). The smooth, shiny, clean, perfect materiality of the framing corresponds with the rationality, purity, neutrality connotated by the design qualities of the packaging.
The size of the prints is crucial to their sensory effect. Dimensions highlight the design qualities, but above all they make visible these inconspicuous everyday objects. Pill packages tend to disappear into the clutter of our domestic environments. When they appear en masse, as in pharmacies, they are either literally invisible, hidden in drawers, or they form the backdrop to the model of efficiency and hygienic and cool neutrality that pharmacies superficially display. This is in contrast to the magnetic potency of their content. A single package similarly does not give the user much clue about the content. A flimsy little cardboard box containing aspirin looks essentially the same as one containing concentrated morphine. The size of Hirst’s prints and the concomitant scale of the ‘imagery’ can therefore be regarded as the sensory staging of the awe-inspiring power, if not necessarily the efficacy, of the packages’ contents. Yet, ordinarily, the drugs’ strength is in strict contrast to the products’ miniscule size. Hirst’s prints thus prompt other ‘big’ questions in addition to those previously mentioned, such as: Who is prescribed which medication? What are the factors that determine the research, development, production, distribution and marketing of drugs? There are numerous debates related to such issues.

Size, therefore, is more than a metaphor; it can be regarded as a performative cultural code. With their anthropomorphic scale, the prints leave behind the safety of packaging with its deceptive tactility and proximity to the body. Instead, they intrude on the viewer while remaining distant from the body. Indeed, Ledwith refers to the prints as ‘iconoclastic portraits of Christ and the twelve disciples’ … ‘adopting surrogate forms for the human body’.

Sensorily encountering the prints, the viewer experiences the physiological and cultural power of the designated foods and medicine, or ‘performs’ sense or meaning, in the way Krämer has suggested.

In order to talk about the specificity of print, further explanation is necessary as to how a performative model of understanding applies to seeing.
Considering vision as embodied and performative implies the notion of touch or ‘contact’. In order to consider the latter, it is important to examine the surface of these prints, with particular regard to their flatness. As indicated, a print’s flatness mobilizes a powerful cultural dichotomy, namely that between surface and depth. The cultural connotations or hierarchy between these two tropes run at many levels through Western thinking. They can be linked to what Krämer has called the ‘Epistemologisierung der Sinne’, the epistemologizing of the senses, in other words the predominance of the mind over the body, as already discussed. In this scenario, the senses and the body become associated with mere surface or the superficial; in contrast, the mind is linked to depth. Paradoxically, alongside these connotations runs the association of the sensory, in as much as it implies touch, with the ‘real’ and ‘authentic’.

The notion of ‘surface’, while not exclusive to modernity, has been considered as a significant factor in its definition. Various writers have recently paid critical attention to this concept in relation to art. Smooth, flat surfaces have attained a specific place in the technologies of vision, as originally in cinema and television, and now on computer screens. Modernity itself, in particular its spectacularization of society, could be conceived as a turning of the world into surface. This seems to have come fully to fruition in postmodernity. Fredric Jameson speaks of ‘a new kind of depthlessness, a new kind of superficiality in the most literal sense’ as ‘perhaps the supreme formal feature of all the postmodernisms’.

In the history of modern art, as we have seen, mechanically produced flatness, like that of the print and the photograph, has been cast in opposition to the flatness of the modernist picture plane. While the former could be linked to the perfection mainly achieved by the machine, the latter still retained the mark of the human hand, of touch. Strictly speaking, one could define all touch as a function of surface, namely a bringing together of two surfaces: hence ‘contact’, from ‘tangere’, to touch, and ‘con’, together. But it is only touch which entails evidence of the human hand that is generally characterized as possessing not only depth but also the authentic or the ‘real’. Here is true contact, presence and depth. There – in the perfect flatness of the machine – only the most fleeting of touches, mere appearance or superficiality.

Printmakers have countered the print’s flatness through a multitude of depth-generating techniques. Examples are numerous. Embossing has been popular in recent years, as can be seen in the portfolio by British artists Langlands and Bell from the Booth Clibborn Editions. Under the title *Enclosure and Identity*, this portfolio from 1996 consists of ten blind-embossed prints from zinc line block plates based on the ground plans of world-famous mosques. Printmaking conferences feature numerous technical workshops, many of which are dedicated to enhancing the printed surface. Even Andy Warhol, the deadpan broker of the flattest of print techniques at the time, tampered with the uniform evenness of certain printed surfaces of his work. In his screenprinted self-portraits from 1967, resin was applied in ‘expressive’, non-descriptive strokes to the surface before printing. This yields a slightly rugged, ‘deep’ texture, instead of the usual flat veneer of the screenprint. Of
course this is only evident when one encounters the ‘originals’ rather than a reproduction. Warhol possibly owed this method to Robert Rauschenberg’s early-1960s habit of painting ‘real’, ‘expressive’ marks onto his screenprinted collages in, for example, Press, 1960. Warhol reverses this process, as it were, by applying the expressive marks before the printing. Thereby the expressiveness of the painted mark, which had already been problematized in Rauschenberg’s method, becomes playfully obscured.

Despite the complexity of the printed surface, the supposed lack of touch or presence in printmaking is due to the perceived excess of the print’s surface. With its fateful connection to reproducibility – fateful in the context of modernist art – its ‘sur-ficiality’ has both marred and, since the 1960s and the subsequent re-working of the modernist idiom, furthered printmaking’s artistic status.

There may be another reason for the artistic print’s relative marginalization on account of its ‘sur-ficiality’. It functions as an uncomfortable, albeit unacknowledged, reminder – especially in the seamless expanse of the screenprint – of the sense of loss that has accompanied the changes in bodily contact or tactility as a result of industrialized mass production. This cultural trauma manifests itself in a paradoxical fascination. On the one hand, the perfection of gleaming surfaces is coveted (as with plasma-screen televisions). On the other hand, there is a craving for authenticity that manifests itself in a variety of ways: take the widespread predilection for seemingly hand-crafted objects, such as ceramic pottery, which exhibit the cultural markers of ‘touch’ (even though the items have been mass-produced).54

As to Hirst’s Last Supper prints, there exists no version in another medium.55 These prints are not a ‘translation’ from painting, as with the work of many other artists who are not primarily printmakers, although Hirst has of course made paintings, such as his ‘dot’ and ‘spin’ paintings, which also tackle ‘sur-ficiality’. In such paintings, the power of the image rests on difference, the difference of ‘superficial’, utterly mundane, even arbitrary subject matter coupled with an anti-painterly, mechanical and flat use of the medium transposed to the history-laden, high-art medium of painting. This has been a familiar strategy amongst painters from Pop art onwards: Warhol, naturally, but also Richard Estes and, more recently, German painter Neo Rauch, to name but a few. From Duchamp through to Sigmar Polke this approach has been complicated by the adoption of ‘mundane’ painting materials. Whether this be household paints or decomposing substances, Duchamp set the tone for the now explosive broadening of painting’s (really, art’s) substances, with his early Apolinaire Enameled of 1916/17 and later his notorious semen painting, Paysage fautif (Wayward Landscape) in 1946. This extension of painting media has found its parallel in printmaking. For example, some of Ed Ruscha’s prints from the early 1970s, such as the screenprinted portfolio News, Mews, Pews, Stews and Dues (1970), use unusual, visceral printing ‘mediums’: Hershey’s chocolate syrup, coffee and squid ink in Pews; crushed baked beans, caviar, strawberries, cherry-pie filling, mango chutney, tomato paste, leaves and crushed daffodils and tulips – not surprisingly – in Stews.56 Among the numerous contemporary examples are Sarah Lucas’s set of twelve fruitcakes.
with images of some of the artist’s previous works in edible ink (2001); the work of fellow British artists, such as Lee Wagstaff’s self-portrait *Shroud* (2000) printed in his own blood or David Faithfull’s *Pieces of Silver* series (2000–01), which includes shredded banknotes. Such strategies clearly aim to recuperate some of the loss in bodily contact referred to above.

The screenprints that constitute Hirst’s *The Last Supper* are printed conventionally, without the telling materiality of the examples mentioned above. Moreover, the surface of Hirst’s series can be said to be another incidence of citation: it not only cites the ‘imagery’ of pharmaceutical packaging but also alludes to the latter’s smooth appearance and implicitly references popular print media such as magazines and publicity material. Hirst’s prints ‘work’ on the viewer via their similarity or sameness with their ‘originals’, pharmaceutical packaging. Printmaking serves here not only to guarantee the citational character of the work itself but to foreground the citationality, or the codedness, of these other products of culture. In this process the flatness or superficiality so typical of packaging and the screenprint, is shown to be at the very heart of our mediated consumer culture. In the density of the artistic screenprint – depending on the material quality of the support, in Hirst’s case high-quality paper – there may also be an element of the recovery of the sense of tactility that these other printed-matter surfaces lack.

The reference to pharmaceutical packaging in Hirst’s work becomes not just a metaphor for the bodily embeddedness of medicine. With their human scale and uniformly smooth surface, the prints literally ‘work’ on our bodies as do the drugs they refer to. The discursive or representational structures of the packaging as embodied in the flatness of the print mesh with the molecular structures of our body and mind. Hirst’s work succeeds in bringing into focus the falsity of the dichotomy of flatness/superficiality versus depth and presence. At some level, everything is surface and nothing but surface. While the outer body may be one surface, the inside of the body is not surface but consists of multiple further surfaces which in their turn consist of yet further surfaces, and so forth. As Gilles Deleuze has said, “Surface” does not imply mere appearances, a Platonic notion that would oppose false surfaces to true, abstract depths or heights. Surface is all there is. Nevertheless, the complexity of the changing surface in modernity and postmodernity and its concomitant cultural tropes require careful examination, as my investigation of Hirst’s prints has shown.

Notes

1 This was only the second time that Hirst engaged in printmaking. His first, a single screenprint, was made for Booth Clibborn’s *London Portfolio* in 1992. See Patrick Elliot in the publication that documents Booth Clibborn’s print projects: Patrick Elliot, ed., *Contemporary Art in Print: The Publications of Charles Booth-Clibborn and his Imprint the Paragon Press 1995–2000*, London: Booth-Clibborn Editions, 2001, p.326.

2 Elliot mentions in his introduction that ‘Booth-Clibborn’s original stipulation was that they [the prints] should be able to fit into the boot of a New York cab’. One can only speculate on the reasons: was it to allow the publisher to transport such work more easily for participation in fairs such as the New York Art Fair? But both Damien Hirst and Gary Hume ‘persuaded the publisher otherwise and made much larger prints’, Elliot, *Contemporary Art in Print*, ‘Introduction’ (n. p.).

3 See Elliot, ibid., and the essay in the same publication by Jeremy Lewison, ‘Contemporary British Art in Print?’, in Elliot, *Contemporary Art in Print*, pp.13–21.

See also Elizabeth Manchester’s untitled 2000 essay which accompanies the individual prints of Hirst’s series in the Tate Modern Collection: Elizabeth Manchester, 2002, http://www.tate.org.uk/servlet/ViewWork?workid=26837&searchid=25322&tabview=text

5 Lewison in Elliott, Contemporary Art in Print, p.16.


7 Lewison in Elliott, Contemporary Art in Print, pp.17 and 20.

8 Ibid., p.16.


10 Saunders and Miles in their recent survey report: ‘There has been some debate about whether prints produced by artists such as Damien Hirst, through the mediation of print publishers such as the Paragon Press, can be considered the equal of prints that are not only conceived by the artist, but also worked on and printed by them’; Prints Now, p.10. Such attitudes clearly draw on outdated notions of artistic practice and may explain why even in the wholly print-oriented Booth-Cliborn publication Elliott feels compelled to point out that, ‘Rather than simply being flat reproductions, they [the prints] have the same integrity and weight as the artist’s main body of work’, Elliott, ‘Introduction’, Contemporary Art in Print (n. p.).

11 See Saunders and Miles, Prints Now, Contents page.

12 See Kathryn Reeves, ‘The Re-vision of Printmaking’, conference paper, IMPACT Conference 1999, University of the West of England, Bristol, England, published in Impact Proceedings 1999 as a CD by The Centre for Fine Print Research, Faculty of Art, Design and Media, Faculty of Art, Design and Media, UWE, Bristol. As Reeves’s paper shows, there has been an awareness of a need for a more theoretically inflected approach. Printmaking conferences, such as IMPACT, have been addressing the issue through appropriate panels. The present article, for example, is based on my presentation to the panel ‘Printmaking and an Enlightenment Aesthetic’ at IMPACT IV in Berlin-Poznan in 2005. Another acknowledgement of this need for a direct theoretical engagement is the theory section in the recently re-issued international printmaking journal Grapheion (see issue 1, 2005).

13 In the academic context, see the website of the Centre for Fine Print Research (CFPR), University of the West of England: http://amd.uwe.ac.uk/cfpr In contrast to other European countries that do not possess such facilities, Britain’s public-access printmaking workshops represent a rich cultural resource. The best known of these are the London Print Studio and Spike Print Studio in Bristol, and Scotland alone boasts four large print studios of a similar kind at Dundee Contemporary Arts, Peacock Visual Arts (formerly Peacock Printmakers) in Aberdeen, Glasgow Print Studio and Edinburgh Printmakers. All these workshops provide essential facilities for artists and numerous, lively outreach programmes for the general public. In addition, there are smaller community, as well as private, commercial print studios. The changing financial and institutional circumstances and impact of these on British visual culture in the last fifty years, especially in the context of recent cultural policies, still waits to be fully researched.


16 ‘… both Butler and de Beauvoir assert that gender is a process which has neither origin nor end, so that it is something we “do” rather than “are”;’ Salih, Butler, p.46.


18 Although he does not specifically deal with print, alas, an article by art historian Richard Shiff about the surface in the work of Seurat and Chuck Close proves instructive. The main gist of Shiff’s argument – that both the construction and the perception of the materiality of a surface change historically – may not be startlingly new but it is his extremely sensitive and detailed analysis that makes it compelling. His investigation explains how this change has occurred, in modernity, in relation to the painted surface of certain realist painters: a painting or drawing by Seurat appeared wholly ‘mechanical’ to his contemporaries. The question was raised, at the time, as to whether the work might have even been executed ‘automatically’, as with the surfaces of photography or printmaking, especially the then popular lithography. Yet today, at a time when screen surfaces abound, Seurat’s painting ‘becomes subject to an ironic reversal’; it appears ‘organic’ rather than ‘automatic’, imbued with presence or the evidence of the artist’s individual marking. See Richard Shiff, ‘Realism of Low Resolution, Digitisation and Modern Painting’, in Terry Smith, ed, Impossible
THE DISCURSIVITY OF PRINT


See, for example, Sioban Piercy’s paper ‘Centre/Periphery – The Predicament of Fine Art Printmaking’, at the second IMPACT conference in Helsinki in 2001, for one analysis of the marginalization of printmaking: URL http://www2.uiah.fi/conferences/impact/[10/10/2005].

Here Joselit’s essay, mentioned in note 18 above, provides a welcome and necessary differentiation of the modernist surface to its often binary casting within modernism and postmodernism. His essay charts the changes in surface depth within modernist painting and postmodernism in terms of a ‘transformation in spectatorship’ whereby flatness becomes a ‘powerful metaphor for the price we pay in transforming ourselves into images’. He speaks of ‘compulsory self-spectacularization’ as a ‘necessary condition of entering the public sphere in the world of late capitalism’, Joselit, ‘Notes on Surface’, p. 293.

Hirst’s 2005 exhibition ‘New Religion’ at the Paul Stöpler Gallery in London extended the blend of pharmaceutical references and religion of the ‘Last Supper’ series through 44 silkscreen prints and four sculptures in an integrated display. For images of this show, see: http://www.paulstolper.com.

‘Cite’ from C15: Old French citer, to summon, from Latin citare to rouse, from cito quit, from cire to excite (Collins Dictionary). It is tempting here to link the connection of ‘cite’ with the verb ‘excite’ to Althusser’s ‘hailing’ of the subject in interpellation. Despite the linguistic character of interpellation in Althusser, the term is now more broadly used for the address extended by products of culture, such as images, to the viewer or subject of culture. See also Salih, Butler, p. 90.

See Salih, Butler, p. 96.


Much publicized in the late 1990s was Hirst’s co-ownership with the restaurateur Marco-Pierre White of the restaurant Quo Vadis in London, followed by Hirst’s own, short-lived restaurant, called Pharmacy (it closed in 2003), which was decked in medicine cabinets full of drugs as well as his trademark animals or animal parts preserved in formaldehyde. See Elliot, Contemporary Art in Print, p. 126; for an (unauthorized) update, see the entry on Damien Hirst in Wikipedia: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Damien_Hirst [as of 10/2005].

Examples abound. See The Observer’s monthly ‘Food Magazine’ on the effects of monosodium glutamate in both ‘natural’ and prepared food: ‘If MSG is so bad for you, why doesn’t everyone in Asia have a headache?’, July 10 2005, reprinted at http://observer.guardian.co.uk/print/0,3856,5233288-108294.00.html [12/10/2005] Another example is the popularity of Morgan Spurlock’s 2004 film Super Size Me, a documentation of a self-inflicted experiment in which the filmmaker adhered to a strict diet consisting entirely of MacDonald’s food. The connection between class and health concerns in the UK is a constant feature of the public debate and governmental initiatives.

Ledwith, British Council essay (see note 4 above).

Ibid.


‘… a lot of the actual boxes of medicines are all very minimal and could be taken directly from minimalism, in the way that … minimalism implies confidence’. Hirst quoted by Elizabeth Manchester, 2002, on the Tate Modern web site: http://www.tate.org.uk/servlet/ViewWork?workid=2809&tabview=text

See also Lewison in Elliot, Contemporary Art in Print, p. 16.

opposed to a more autographic, traditional one. Paul Thirkell, ‘From the Green Box to Typo/Topography: Duchamp and Hamilton’s dialogue in print’, Tate Papers, Spring 2005, available at http://tate.org.uk/research/tateresearch/tatepapers/05spring/thirkell.htm [27.09.05].

Hirst’s working process for this project is described by Elliott: ‘Hirst photocopied the original drug packets, indicated changes of text and other details, and passed the instructions to Jonathan Barnbrook, who had designed Hirst’s book I Want to Spend the Rest of my Life Everywhere, with Everyone, One to One, Always, Forever, Now. Barnbrook created new versions on computer, and the digital information was output onto full-scale film. The screenprints were made from these films by Brad Faine at Coriander Studio, London: each print is made from between four and seven separate stencilled screens, plus varnish.’ See Elliott, Contemporary Art in Print, p.326.

Hirst’s immediate role model, Andy Warhol, had included corporate logos in some of his Last Supper series works. Although by no means the only artist to engage in such self-reflexivity, Hirst’s self-branding brings the Warholian project – here as in other respects – to its logical postmodern conclusion.

Hirst’s reference to minimalism with regard to pharmaceutical packaging, quoted in note 33 above, hints at this.

Elliott, Contemporary Art in Print, p.326.

Ibid.


Ibid., ‘Sinnlichkeit, Denken, Medien’, p.24 (my translation).

Ibid., p.33.

Ibid.

This approach goes beyond the more usual notion of metaphor in relation to images. See Ledwith: ‘Metaphorically, ingested food and medicine parallel images that are visually and mentally absorbed by the viewer’, Ledwith, British Council essay (see note 4 above).

Ibid.

To name but one example, in recent years, the pricing policy of Western drugs companies of anti-retroviral medicines has allegedly increased the death rate, especially in Sub-Saharan Africa, by millions. See Sarah Boseley, ‘Aids Drugs Scandal: Toll Soars’, The Guardian, 3 July 2002, http://www.commoditydreams.org/cgi-bin/print.cgi?title=/headlines02/0703-05.htm [30.09.005].

Ledwith, British Council essay (see note 4 above).

In addition to Richard Siff and David Joselit, mentioned previously, see the selection of essays edited by Terry Smith, Impossible Presence: Surface and Screen in the Photogenic Era, Sydney: The Power Institute, 2001. The essays chart – to a greater or lesser extent – the surface of the image in modernity in terms of ‘enervation’ and ‘viscerality’. See the familiar concept of the ‘spectacle’ in Guy Debord’s The Society of the Spectacle (1968). ‘The spectacle is a society which continually declares: “Everything that appears is good; whatever is good will appear”, ’ Sadie Plant, The Most Radical Gesture: The Situationist International in a Postmodern Age, London and New York: Routledge, 1992, p.13.

Fredric Jameson, Postmodernism, or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism, London: Verso, 1991, p.60.

One such example, presented at the Fourth IMPACT conference in Berlin-Posnan in 2005, was a particular silkscreen printing technique invented and promoted by the so-called ‘Hand Print Workshop’ in the USA. Printing with various coats of wax results in a flat, yet deeply rich surface. As the chosen name of the workshop indicates, this type of printmaking seeks to counter the seeming inauthenticity affiliated with the purely mechanical.


This dilemma has had its effects and has been the subject of much debate in craft circles; see Paul Greenhalgh, ed., The Culture of Craft, London: A. & C. Black, 2002.

Hirst’s only other version of The Last Supper was also a screen print, created for his exhibition at the Gagosian Gallery in New York autumn 2000 and subsequently destroyed. It consisted of ‘thirteen silkscreened packaging covers … mounted on aluminium panels and hung as one large piece nearly ten metres long. It covered another list of potentially fatty foods, which combined such English favourites as “Cornish pasty”, “Cauliflower cheese” and “Toasted cheese sandwich” with such imports as “Vindaloo”, “Duck liver”, “Foie gras” (staples of internationally influenced, post-colonial British cuisine) and such American cuisine terms as “Eggplant”, “Vongole” and “Zucchini” (also internationally influenced); Elizabeth Manchester, ‘Beans and Chips’, May 2002, Tate Online, http://www.tate.org.uk/servlet/ViewWork?groupid=99999961&workid=26837&searchid=5245tabview=text [5/10/2005]. While it is doubtful that ‘Foie gras’ constitutes a staple of
internationally influenced post-colonial British cuisine’, it is interesting to note the change in Hirst’s references. In the first instance, this was to suit the American market, no doubt, but at the same time the internationalization of food and its status as an aspirational and fashionable sign are also indicated. Further, Hirst may signal his own ‘arrival’ on the international scene. There is also a portion of Hirst the prankster evident in the doubling of the fancy ‘foie gras’ with the mundane ‘duck liver’.

