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ABSTRACT

This thesis claims to be an accumulation of information and their centralization including a compendium of unconventional techniques and components. Implicitly, I’m interrogating the artists of reference of a time that’s specific to the hyperrealist current in contemporaneousness and it’s predominantly derivatives in sculpture since the beginning of XX century, until today. Also, I will present the ancestral reasons of the most powerfull representatives and the conditions requiered to perform from the perspective of new environment in sculpture. In this thesis I insert my personal art work, as a demonstration, being able to show an obvious example of the explored current. In order to strenghten my pleading I bring as an argument the statements of critics and curators that are recognized and advised internationally, such as Carolina Lio, Antonio Arrevalo, Cosmin Nasui and Bogdan Iacob. I will present the important conversations with reprezentatives and founders of this current as Patricia Piccinini, Francesco Albano, Anders Krisar, Richard Stipl, and others that brought their contribution reformulating aesthetics in the living being. It’s highlighted also the diversity of morphological and conceptual of contemporary space art, of course under the mark of organic art by representatives as Andrea Hasler, Francesca dalla Benetta, Mark Sijan and many others.

The problems I investigate in this thesis comes from human figure morphogenesis, from the beginning of primitive times until today. I also present ideas that comes from theories and philosophical systems who put for the first time under the magnifier of science the existence and the purpose of matter. Nothing new so far, but the effect of new science are the causes wich changed art, but have equally contributed, further, to it’s purification and enrichment. For this reason, during the research, it’s necessary a scientifically description of matter in the two fundamental categories (alive and not alive) and then, gradually we will find the answer to the basic question of this thesis: how it is living being possible? We will follow the application in visual space art, of a sculptural form with all the resembling of living, by visual point of view.

The images attached in this excursion are able to establish a theoretical and practical mark, impossible to ignore, in aesthetics research, and in a partial way demonstrates the possibility, to give an abstract form, that sensorial look wich takes to create visual perception of a thing with qualities of a living being. My opinion is that art and technique compensate eachother, and my confusion it’s justified by the complex relation between matter, colour, detail and ensemble, wich interrelate absolutely. There are four purposes to a believable representation of the living. They will be the subject for a deeply research. All the works I mention in this thesis and wich
I’m going to analyze in one way or another, is caring the direct human intervention by the technique of manual or mechanical labor, both ensemble as well as the smallest details.

The one person that makes an exception is a digital artist Richard Dupont, whose works are submitted to an almost industrialized digital transposing, but the technological originality with which transposes or better said, hybridises various formulas, completely justifies his right to be mentioned. We perceive realism in contemporaneity trough physical environment, realistic with concentrate datas of some verifiable qualities and tangible characteristics of the objects or beings, and realism and its intention in plastic art has as a basic principle the reflection of reality in her essential data. In other order, it’s purpose will be a true rendering of an object so that trough the environment or the technique, the reproduction of that object to be identical both morphological as well as retrofitting and typical for that representative object.

Especially in picture, hyperrealism takes a purpose to reassemble a high quality photo by classic methods of executions. This specific current is considered an advanced phase of photorealism. The term hyperrealism developed at the same time in Europe and United States and it was identified as an independently art current by the end of XX century. Hyperrealism is based on aesthetics principals of photorealism, such as, that a replicate image to provide the visual information offered by a photography. The evolution of photorealism it’s also due to the Pop Art, wich reached apogee since the 1950-1960, also by taking elements of abstract expressionism and from minimalist art from the end of 60’s. In modern times are revealed a multitude of possibilities to express the artistic phenomenon wich continues to proliferate the result being that everything can be deceptive in a paradigmatic way in universality of art. Art as an object, art as a design, even performative art have as a fundamental goal achieving a sympathetic relation. If this phenomenon is not achieved, it can be difficult to justify them. It is not enough a practical experience of application methods or unfettered alternation of shapes and colours. Despite of the years spent as a creator of shapes and objects in space, if we don’t find a logic of our work in compliance to nature, with all the devotion, we have just some objects, either they are bidimensional (flat) or tridimensional (spatial). We can also debate on the fact that new tendencies of imitation detected trough hyperrealism and postgenetic art, they have not exceed and managed the condition of passing trough the exhausted connotations abuse of human archetype. Wich means, the intention of representing living sculpture, is materialized only in powerfull anthropomorphic or zoomorphic shapes? Why can’t they be seen in others morphologic and compositional formulas of space art?

On the verge of a history with convulsions and transgressions, I will present some images wich have a mutual discourse regarding intentionality and their conserved technique in
compliance with nature, which is necessary to obey the demands of imitating the living.

Eventually, their results are conditioned by matter and permissibility, results derived from assigning to a multitude of practical interpretation, dissimilar from their purpose. Further I will do a short description of materials involved in any work. I will remind in this thesis, because the whole repertory of works mentioned it’s going to be analysed by materials point of view and technique experiments, which I have assimilated during my PhD research. Experiments which, inevitable, affects or improves the quality of nominated works to demonstrate my final theory. The origin of plastics it’s the result of discovering cellulose nitrate. Already artificial resins have their beginning since 1860. Then, Alexander Parkes (who didn’t have any prepare in physics or chemistry) was deeply preoccupied with the characteristics of cellulose nitrate, which could be used in liquid, flexible or solid way. So, this product could be rough as ivory, opaque, impenetrable by liquids, dye and malleable with metal. He developed further this material, making it neutral and usable in industry, but its discovery comes from 1846, from pure mixture of concentrated nitric acid or concentrated sulfuric acid with oil.

This material was certainly the first polymer that stand at the base of a family of several hundred members. The hyperrealist current it’s also a result of globalization and empirical experiment, which did not appear based on premises of a riot to produce a reaction against other current, and which balance and correct another way or process of work. Hyperrealism has unmistakable evolved having one goal from the beginnig until today, and that is to stay close to living being or even to exceed it as illusion. The desire to represent human body both in bidimensional art as well as spatial, it’s an ancestral one, perpetuating until today in artistic arts, I could say even delinquent art. Human body has an corporeal way in arts, literally, often being an generating factor and consumer at the same time of the effect of the work. This aspect is more common in feminist work of the 70’s and after, by postmodern revaluation, but mentally ironic. To imitate reality and to create a perfect illusion of some objects or open spaces, was an temptation for many artists in old art, but at the same time it applies today. Only that in this days manifest itself as art / picture, and is performed by reproducing an image (a photography in general) at a level where the viewer is deceived by the presence of the picture, when itself is intended to be a photography.

This intention and practice was also reproduced in classicism, even in antic Greece through wall paintings, that goes by the name “trompe l’oeil”, which means deceiving the eye by a chromatic perspective at the beginning, and later through linear perspective in the Renaissance. But the genes of imitation is one of the most ancestral examples of behavior in human evolution, having as foundation reproducing the image that you perceive by visual sense and reproduced on the
walls of first caves, in which the archaic human leaved their copies of the nature. The same intention of treating materiality and vitality due to the optical effect result of the alternance of materials, is rendered already in Charles’s Cordier sculptures in 1857. The combination of bronze with marble in this mannerist topic, creates the supreme intention of a much alive reproduction of human presence from that period. Standing in front of this famous work, I’ve got the conclusion that it is a very important phase of artistic perception evolution on redefining materiality in sculpture. The complexity of human body represent a big temptation for the hyperrealist sculptor, because it’s an empirical experience with a result conditioned by new techniques and materials, as well as the source of inspiration, and the correct correlation of this factors can give something new without terms of comparison. The first works considered Pop Art, but which predicted hyperrealism, are made by Duane Hanson and John de Andrea, under the form of identical copies of contemporary characters and reproduced using negatives taken directly from the bodies. From this moment on we can observe the evolution of hyperrealistic sculpture, while new materials infiltrate more in artistic practice. Reference works from this thesis will be displayed according to technological conceptual progress.

Further I will present hyperrealism as a pseudoscience, in opposition to an abstract image, characterized by eidetism, subconscious and a research of aborigine space of this artistic movements. As until now, the artist involved and which taste once with new spatial environments, begin to compose structures without competing or respecting a certain type of stylistic current. Multimedia installation, photorealism, realism, neo and post conceptualism, hyperrealism are just some of this who at any time, reach a syncretism innovation.

Factors as light, illusion, speed, synthetic, that interesting side of things that we know so well, we know their composition and their nature, and we successfully manipulate them in a small measure, they also stir emotions. Almost everything is copied, any matter can be doubtfull. Relatively, a few things or objects show us interest or interrogation. This is because of knowledge in question of the material, composition and what artificial and simulation means.

Thanks to the character, these materials infiltrated very fast in cultural spaces, galleries and museums, being used improperly, having a whole other purpose than what they were created. I think that experimental work have obtained convincing results, regardless by some parameters like materiality, wear tolerance, the actual lifetime of materials involved because some degrades dimensionally.

Before the technological revolution of plastics, the concept of materiality was not that well defined. Materiality was reproduced, however most predominant in bidimensional plan of painting, because in painting could imitate both texture and colour of the object. In sculpture
exists only simple material in content and surface, only by modeling technique you can reproduce a certain materiality, but those deceiving factors that gave an ancient style or archaic resemblance to objects, didn’t exist. Intention and possibility to imitate certain objects were extremely limited. The composition of an object, matter itself were easily identified without any misunderstanding. Materials reflected their consistency and composition, and the intention of the one who will process it was honest and respected the requirement of matter, as Aristotel used to say when he researched “material cause”, and for the first time puts under the magnifying glass of science the approximations that reaches to be justifications for the matter – shape relation.

Now you can play with a multitude of materials and the intention is to imitated as real as possible the materials, but only on a superficial level. This aspect has a devastator impact on architecture, of life, and especially on that thing already encountered so rarely that we call originality. The multitudes of possibilities that is given by the chemical industries with her innovative artifices, draw huge modifications in urban and private area. From architectural mega structures that shape the earth's crust already, and to the abuse of everyday objects replication which endangers more and at the same time increasing the value of the original object.

We can observe this by taking a look at Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux works but with all his dedication I can catalog this just as being sympathetic, dynamic, accurate, canonical, but no way expressive, visceral, transgressive, new reactions that only contemporary production can cause. To be even more explicit I will return with the theory about matter eulogy putting simultaneously, eternal dilemma and confrontation of classic and modern.

Classicism is dependent on the material provided and offers less techniques and options, therefore matter force the artist to be what it is, and appreciation is due to overflowing and master craftsmanship.

During this research we will notice that the modern artist seeks the material as long as it resonate best with the concept, so it excels the idea, justifying through experimentalism, conceptual, eidetism. A solid artistic research means obtaining concludent results to overcome the contemporary approximations in artistic production. Practically speaking, in the relationship of matter with all forms, of all space art and conceptual environment, but especially through new environment and technique, this impartial relations ask for a justification and we can find logical arguments to interpretate form and case-based matter and historical landmarks which are highlighted better. In actuality are seen a lot of possibilities for the artistic expression phenomenon, that continues to proliferate, the result being that, everything exposed can be deceiving, I mean everything except the paradigmatic sphere of universality of art.
This thesis does not pretend to be a stylistic monography of a forming sculpture current, but a biographical summary from sustainable sources, clarifying still a rare and young phenomenon on art scene. The settling oh the information on this thesis is based, in a great measure, on personal knowledge gathered from experience as well as from chemical reviews, articles, publications about artists, and personal conversations with some of the mentioned artist. At the same time looking forward with interest to identify motivation and inspirational sources which guided any one of them to find their own different identity from the others, without claiming to redefine sculpture in this way. But this thing happens with good conscience due to reason over time and space in which we are. By knowing this phenomenon deeply, I have the possibility to evaluate and practice the high standard of some artists like Ron Mueck or Patricia Piccinini. I identified the last one through a different expression, approaching a new attitude in front of hyperrealism and keeping the technique, but evolving in a new postgenetic univers. Overall, this phenomenon made his appearance later than hyperrealism being influenced by a larger number of sculptures production and by artist like Ron Mueck, Jamie Salmon, Sam Jinks, Evan Penny, Carole A. Feuerman, Mark Sijan or Jakie K. Seo.

I will put a strong accent on the change of ideas and personal conversations with important representatives and creators of new aesthetical reality or postgenetic art. Representatives who had direct influence on my personal creation, informations being valued and embodied differently because art is motivated by discussions and debates, and only the “Art”, as Gadamer says “begins only at the moment where it can be different”.

My need was always to get close as much from figurative and closer to visceral visual impact, but without deepen them in demanding concepts. Regardless of the matter we speak, the surface of works is not relative, therefore I suggest a analyse which shows a logical tight and justifiable connection, and each material requires a particular morphology. Jeanne Hersch points out better the significance of Aristotel that, through his eulogy proposes his own knowledge of the matter.

I strongly believe that both materials stirs emotions as well as the shape in which material limitates itself, also I strongly affirm from my conviction that is not possible to exist a work with a good execution, but from conceptual point of view to be mediocre or with a better idea, but with a lacking transposition and execution. This is because simply this two aspects can not exist together in different terms and different qualities. So, the two aspects are a whole, unchangeable, and they can have a single qualitative attribution, in any other way they can exclude themselves. Some form no matter how complex it is, doesn’t make us sculptors, the requirement that makes us fulfill our mission is to respect the “status of matter”. Meaning, the fact that there is
something stable and occupies a place in space and you can not pass through him, does not make us legitimate to say that is our work and we can not pretend that we are artist.

Regardless of morphology, the shape is justified by the existence of matter. I plead for the existence of substance, that actually makes us exist as artists. Therefore we always must refer to the importance of matter, to her knowledge, to the terms it sets, so that to produce the maximum of its permissiveness. As for the choice of form, admiration for the study of Henri Focillon in “Living forms”, which created my conviction that the searching process can only be empirical and experimental. Personally, I define art as an occult science of the senses, reason is also a sense differently developed and it’s not a measurable one. Through this angle I explain the purpose of the multitude of forms and formulas through which my work are going, in order to transpose and replicate them in several synthetic materials and its derivatives, this being the ones that at the end can receive the effect we wanted.

Hyperrealist arts is singularized as materiality and you can speak about a work as being hyperrealistic only in the moment when this is in accordance with the real both point of view, textural and functional.

In other words, works signed by Ron Mueck, Sam Jinks or Jamie Salmon, and other works of the recalled artists are legitimate to be considered hyperrealistic, because they represent human being as it is in the tiniest details, even without being able to make a difference between a work and an alive human being. From a personal perspective and not only, for the works that are going to be describe in this thesis, hyperrealism is just a tool progressing into final, towards a micro postgenetic art. On this I will describe it as a sculpture who respects hyperrealistic elements but passes into an indistinguishable morphology which does not subordinate to some rules, and which offers another identity, more complex in her known data until now.

Post genetic art is the definition of creative activity of most of those remembered in this thesis, with what they stand out for. Creative experiments asking the question, how could the living exist, but in other forms than the ones we know so far? At this question the most quickly answer it’s owned by Patricia Piccinini.

During the looming, hiperrealistic sculpture was considered a independent artistic current, but through different approaches mentioned above demonstrates at the moment, that it remains just a technique. Works are increasingly being characterized as hyperrealistic technique, but the morphological expression in this technique it’s still at the beginning and with every vision and plastical experience can enter into new aesthetical realities, as we see in works that belong to Berline de Bruyckere or Francesco Albano in the metamorphoses that portend a postgenetic emergent of the hyperrealism. Very clear in technique, and with an obsessive concept I may say,
Anders Krisar’s works, are beyond technique importance but can be described as full of life and vitality.

Initially my interest in this research is to try to remain in technique, which singularize the ones recalled, but to propose an experiment on forms discharged from any figurative sense. The more subtle operational concept from which emerges the first series of works with the title *Eidetic 1* and *2* is the eidgetism, as reflected in their names. Establishing that hyperrealism aims as theoretical premise to, practically duplicate the reality and it’s capable of such thing, then that reality with her realistic workmanship allows us also to deform her. Through this distortion of reality initiates another phase of my work by deepening genesis and building a form from the beginning in order that at the end to give the impression of a genomic manipulation of a sculpture.

Later, work series *Postgenesis 1, 2, 3* and implicitly *Soulportrait*, presents a stripping from a possible genetic rules and with help from technique and new media materials, allows interacting and conceptual exploration of some environments like alive and not alive. Under another visual aspect or better said cinematographic, this postgenic tendency is treated better by the director David Cronenberg in the famous movie *Videodrome* from 1983. By creating morphologies which are difficult to identify, such as “*Synthetic Organism 2*” (SO2) or “*Family*” of Patricia Piccinini, let us imagine how can beings evolve if... Interpretations gate is left open intentionally, ad for this, postmodernism is an approval by the simply words of Will Gompertz because he claims “the greatest thing about postmodernism is that it can be almost anything that you want it to be, and the most irritating thing is that it can be almost anything that you want it to be. The crucial image that depicts seeing one of Jamie Salmon or Sam Jinks works, is ambiguous and can transmit multiple states.

Just as in the work of Tony Matelli “*Total Torpor Mad Malaise*” from 2003, in which a male human figure, naked and deformed by disease and tumors, devastated by hot smiles, poses with an attitude of superiority for us, from his catwalk. An sympathetic image that I associate it to my personal works from the series *Artificial Life 1* and *2 (AL1), (AL2)*, which unquestionable creates visceral reactions, fact attested through experiments in the series of exhibitions until now.

From my perspective, hyperrealism is a phenomenon with strong ancestral roots, as I mentioned above, employing classical aesthetic rules which are based on techniques and not the opposite
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