



**HAL**  
open science

## Drawing Problems: Thought in Action

Roberto Casati

► **To cite this version:**

Roberto Casati. Drawing Problems: Thought in Action. Adaptive Behavior, 2021, 10.1177/1059712319861551 . ijn\_02163155

**HAL Id: ijn\_02163155**

**[https://hal.science/ijn\\_02163155](https://hal.science/ijn_02163155)**

Submitted on 24 Jun 2019

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

## Adaptive Behavior

### Drawing problems: Thought in Action

Journal:	<i>Adaptive Behavior</i>
Manuscript ID	Draft
Manuscript Type:	Special Issue in honor of John Stewart
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Casati, Roberto
Keywords:	Drawing, Action, Perception, Phenomenology
Abstract:	I investigate some aspects of the structure of the production of drawings, by developing a practice-based phenomenology articulated around some "drawing problems". The examples I chose cluster around decision making in drawing from life. I make a case for a propositional, explicit judgment-based action structure, that makes it possible to accommodate some typical practices used in addressing drawing problems. I further hint to by-products (e.g., attention modulation) and "surrounding practices" (e.g. communication during the observation of a drawing activity) that find a plausible explanation in the propositional account of drawing.

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2 Roberto Casati, CNRS-EHESS  
3 Institut Jean Nicod, Paris  
4  
5  
6  
7

## 8 *Drawing problem: Thought in Action*<sup>1</sup> 9

10  
11  
12  
13 Drawings are among the oldest documented visual representations, but they  
14 are quite peculiar insofar as drawing displays virtually no evolution  
15 (although it has a history of marginal technical changes). Drawings of the  
16 Lascaux cave (-18k years), use the same representational shortcuts used by  
17 draftsmen in all the subsequent history. Drawings' stability over millennia  
18 is a strong indicator of their deep biological basis (Casati 2011) Indeed,  
19 drawings trigger recognitional abilities by using as representational vehicles  
20 lines that refer to occlusion boundaries of physical objects. These  
21 boundaries are not visually perceptually marked (objects are not surrounded  
22 by thick lines) and conversely a representation of all visual discontinuities  
23 by vehicle lines would clutter the picture to the point of non-recognizability  
24 – painters have since long acknowledged that drawings do not support  
25 outlined shadows.  
26  
27  
28

29  
30 Fig. 1. In this unreadable drawing, based on a photograph, all contrast boundaries over a  
31 certain threshold have been turned into lines. See next page for the original photograph.  
32 Image credit: RC.

33  
34 The working hypothesis is that in mid-level vision objects are represented  
35 by their occluding boundaries to economically parse complex scenes;  
36 drawings directly tap into this representational level (Cavanagh 1999). This  
37 in turn makes it plausible to hypothesize that drawings were discovered and  
38 not invented (Kennedy 1975). And this further implies that drawings are an  
39 optimal solution for representing objects under time pressure and other  
40 constraints: they are both extremely economical to produce and brutally  
41 effective in inducing visual recognition. Drawing is thereby the most  
42 effective way to visually render imagined situations as e.g. in storyboards  
43 for movies; if other media have been proposed to replace the drawing  
44 practice for storyboarding, they are way behind the effectiveness of drawing  
45 (Cristiano 2017).  
46  
47

48  
49 The literature on drawing has focused mostly on the perception of drawings  
50 (Maynard, 2005), including the retrieval of motor intentions and of the  
51 artists's intention (Pignocchi, 2010). Production, on the other hand, is a less  
52 studied topic (Casati ed. 2011; see the seminal work by Van Sommers  
53 1984). In this chapter I investigate some aspects of the structure of the  
54  
55

---

56  
57 <sup>1</sup> John Stewart and I have been working side to side for four years in the large Enactive project  
58 (2004-2008) piloted by Massimo Bergamasco. At times dialectically opposed, we appear to share an  
59 insane interest for external representations and their mechanics, a penchant for existentially engaged  
60 research, and we both think that actual practices still do not attract sufficient attention in the cognitive  
science community. This paper mans to further the conversation on the topic, keeping the dialectic  
alive.

1  
2 production of drawings, by developing a practice-based phenomenology  
3 articulated around some "drawing problems". The examples I chose cluster  
4 around decision making in drawing from life. I make a case for a  
5 propositional, explicit judgment-based action structure, that makes it  
6 possible to accommodate some typical practices used in addressing drawing  
7 problems. I further hint to by-products (e.g., attention modulation) and  
8 "surrounding practices" (e.g. communication during the observation of a  
9 drawing activity) that find a plausible explanation in the propositional  
10 account of drawing.  
11  
12

13 Fig 2. The original photograph with superposed lines of contrast and a "natural" drawing  
14 parsing of the scene it represents.  
15  
16

17 *Drawing problems: The second line.* As I draw a woodstove in my living  
18 room, or the ruins of a cathedral, I pause to make a decision. Some  
19 occluding contours need reinforcement. I draw a second line over the one I  
20 drew earlier. This operation, the tracing of the second line, has its technical  
21 difficulties. I am an average amateur draftsman, and my expertise is local,  
22 domain specific – I am trained to draw inanimate objects (as opposed to  
23 faces or furry animals of fighting gladiators, say). This expertise means that  
24 the tracing of the first line was semi-automatic, done in a coherent, smooth  
25 gesture. The key problem is, it will be extremely unlikely that I will be able  
26 to trace the second line so that it fulfills two constraints: be done with the  
27 same smoothness, and perfectly overwrite the first. This in turn means that  
28 something must go: either the line will be offset, or it will be seen as  
29 hesitant.  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 Fig 3. Larchant, May 2012. Image credit: RC.  
35

36 Vintage instructional booklets (Anonymous, 1898) endorsed the practice of  
37 tracing a line over a semitransparent sheet through which one could see the  
38 template line. The result is immediately seen as hesitant.  
39  
40  
41

42 Fig. 4. Drawing and tracing book. The old practice of tracing reduces drawing to second line like  
43 tracing.  
44

45 The second line is, actually, a *caricature*, an enhancement of a feature that  
46 is conducive to a representational advantage. Its consumer is the perceptual  
47 system. By looking at a drawing where the first line is enhanced by the  
48 second line, we make a quicker and more robust parsing of the scene into  
49 objects. There is something to be said about caricatures, i.e. representational  
50 enhancements; the short story, sufficient for our purposes, is that they  
51 colonize a representational module (in the way in which certain forms of  
52 camouflage colonized recognitional modules (Sperber & Hirschfeld, 2004)),  
53 and are typically the result of random discoveries.  
54  
55

56 *Drawing problems: parallel lines.* Another example of second lines is the  
57 second of two *parallel lines*. Parallel lines are drawn for a number of  
58 different reasons: objects can exhibit parallel features, and then there is the  
59 ubiquitous hatching used to fill in surfaces. Strictly speaking, the parallel  
60 line problem is a special case of the problem of tracing lines at preset

1  
2 angles; any angle is problematic, but we can limit ourselves to the  
3 discussion of parallel lines, one instance of which is the discussion of the  
4 tracing of the second of two parallel lines.  
5

6  
7 *Known solutions: training, statistical drawing, and devices.* There are some  
8 solutions to the second line problem, in any of its forms. It is possible that a  
9 sufficiently long training could improve the precision of second tracing,  
10 without sacrificing its smoothness, but still the complexity of the task  
11 appears to be at the limit of human capabilities. (This is a spot where  
12 Computer Assisted Design may have an advantage). A different strategy is  
13 statistical drawing. I can try the second line as many times as it is necessary  
14 for me to obtain a satisfactory result. Of course the process is costly, both in  
15 terms of time and of resources, to the point of being utterly unpractical. It  
16 may work for certain types of parsimonious drawings (for Haiku drawings,  
17 for instance), but cannot be a general solution. Yet another possibility is the  
18 use of devices that strengthen or multiply the relevant line during the  
19 tracing process: thicker pencils, double pencils. Multiple brushes held at the  
20 same time seem to have been used e.g. by Hasegawa Tōhaku (1539-1610),  
21 in his *Pine trees*, Shōrin-zu byōbu, Tokyo Art Museum to draw groups of  
22 pine needles. But here the second line problem all but vanishes, as we have  
23 no second line tracing to begin with. It seems thus that, absent mechanical  
24 devices, the second line problem is here to stay.  
25  
26  
27

28  
29 *The first line.* All of the above implies that the first line, if it is traced with a  
30 smooth gesture, is necessarily *imprecise*. If it was possible to trace the first  
31 line with reasonable precision, it would be possible to trace the second line  
32 with the same precision, and thus it will be possible to trace the second line  
33 reasonably precisely above the first line. Thus a normative issue (what  
34 makes a line a precise line) looms large here. We'll see aspects of it in a  
35 while, but for the time being let us present another problem yet.  
36

37  
38 *Drawing problems: Detail and verisimilitude.* I draw the profile of a distant  
39 rock. Surely I cannot reproduce each detail, and I know it.  
40

41  
42 Fig. 5 Kefalonia. 16.08.2011. Image credit, RC.

43  
44 Much as I cannot reproduce each pebble on the beach. Still, when I look at  
45 this drawing, or I confront it with the scene that I depicted, it feels, if not  
46 true, at least accurate enough for it to be considered a drawing of that  
47 particular rock and beach.  
48  
49

50  
51 *Tracing, fast and slow.* If tracing the first line can be done in a single,  
52 mindless, gesture, tracing of the second line requires attentional control.  
53 The passage from automatic thought and action to controlled thought and  
54 action goes nowadays under the heading of "dual process" theory of mental  
55 activity. Originally introduced in studies of decision theory, in order to  
56 systematize reasoning biases, it turned into a convenient way to point to a  
57 general architectural feature of the human mind. (Stanovic and West 2000).  
58 (Casati 2016) has proposed to talk of two "modes" or styles, rather than  
59 actual processes.) A simple example from wayfinding and navigation is the  
60 following. You go mindlessly from your desk to the water fountain

1  
2 downstairs – your brain does all the work for you without you needing to  
3 think about it (Mode 1). But it takes you some conscious thinking and  
4 attention to plan a trip to the department store in the neighborhood (Mode  
5 2). In the case of drawing, second lines are normally executed in M2,  
6 whereas first lines go down in M1. The key feature of M2 is the use of  
7 attentional and working memory resources.  
8

9  
10 Talk of M1 does not coincide with talk about innate modules. First line  
11 tracing, for expert draftsmen, is in point of fact the result of a long training,  
12 the steps of which have been described by (Pignocchi 2008). First, some  
13 atomic graphic schemes (sensorimotor patterns) are interiorized and  
14 automatized. Second, the molecular graphic schemes that can be assembled  
15 out of the learned atomic graphic schemes are automatized in turn, to a  
16 lesser extent. There is an above limit to this complexification of automatic  
17 operations (one will find it extremely hard to draw, in a single gesture, draw  
18 horse and jockey jumping over a fence), but some complex automatic  
19 gestures are learned and constantly applied. A simple piece of evidence for  
20 the existence of atomic and molecular drawing schemes is the fact that it is  
21 very hard to draw objects upside down (from memory, but even from life  
22 when confronted with the object right side up).  
23  
24

25  
26 It is the nature of the task that calls for differences in the style of line  
27 tracing. The first line is swift, as it is controlled by the perceptual  
28 recognition of the represented object and the availability of a repertoire of  
29 atomic graphic schemes. The second line is slow, because it is controlled by  
30 the perception of the first line that one must follow. It is an interesting fact  
31 in itself that the accomplishment of the second line task is slower than that  
32 of the first line task. When tracing the second line, your action and your  
33 perception are coordinated in real time: you immediately see whether the  
34 second line works or does not work. Evidently, the activation of atomic  
35 graphic schemes in first line tracing has a time advantage as no accurate  
36 control is needed.  
37  
38

39  
40 It is further interesting that as atomic graphic schemes are activated by  
41 recognition (say, of a door's handle, if you have an expertise in drawing  
42 architectural features), they should be activated not only by the recognition  
43 of the object to be drawn, but also by the representation of the very same  
44 object that is conveyed by the first line. Thus in tracing the second line you  
45 should inhibit either recall or launch of the atomic graphic scheme that was  
46 used for the first line.  
47  
48

49 The difference in task is associated in a difference in constraints. There are  
50 less constraints, and in the end just verisimilitude for the first line; a much  
51 stronger constraint, i.e. exactitude, is operant for the second line.  
52

53  
54 *Drawing problems: the placement of T-junctions.* The ability to draw from a  
55 repertoire of drawing schemes is not the end of the story. The visual scene  
56 is seldom composed of a single objects, it is rather often cluttered by objects  
57 that partially hide other objects. The resulting configurations are too many  
58 and too random to be apprehended and then delivered through graphic  
59 schematization. I draw a tabletop that partially occludes a chair.  
60

1  
2 Fig. 6. Kalamos. August 2013. Image credit: RC.  
3

4 The occlusion is represented, in the drawing, by a number of T-junctions,  
5 where the lines of the chair are interrupted by the occluding line of the  
6 tabletop's profile (Kennedy 1974). Each single T-junction has its  
7 (verisimilar) place on the occluding line. I do not make (in the norm) gross  
8 mistakes, such as inverting the order of T-junctions (although this may  
9 occur, especially when T-junctions are coupled); the topology of the  
10 sequence of T-junctions is easy to respect. But respecting the metric is a  
11 different issue, and here the random aspect of the scene blocks the  
12 deployment of automatic, M1 modes of drawing. I need to make an explicit  
13 decision, based on an analysis of the scene; I adopt a measuring look; I  
14 observe and describe, as opposed to simply seeing. This generates a mental  
15 proposition – an *explicit judgment*. “The first junction is at about one third  
16 of the length of the tabletop”. The proposition articulated here is used in  
17 turn to generate a tracing action. All this process is conscious, slow, and  
18 controlled by judgments, i.e. thoughts that are expressed in propositions.  
19  
20  
21

22  
23 *Drawing problems: virtual alignments and crossings.* An analogous  
24 problem, again caused by the random distribution of objects in ecological  
25 scenes, arises with alignments. I do not precisely measure the position of  
26 the T-junction, but I can see that the prolongation of the vertical bar ends at  
27 the intersection with the horizon and the profile of an island out there. I  
28 register the latter as a crossing, and I register the alignment. All this, one  
29 more time, is expressed in a proposition, that is used for generating the  
30 tracing action. Crossings, in general, are expressed propositionally. The  
31 proposition expressing a crossing has the following *identity form*: "Point a  
32 on line A is identical to point b on line B". Parallelism is expressed  
33 propositionally: "Line A is parallel to line C".  
34  
35

36 A line analysis of a scene to be drawn requires a vast amount of  
37 propositional encoding, without which no line generation is possible. There  
38 could be alternative ways to produce drawings. One is pixelization: you  
39 proceed like an inkjet printer, from the top left corner to the bottom right  
40 corner, line after line, by marking a black dot each time it is needed,  
41 otherwise leaving a blank. Or you can look at the scene and not at the sheet:  
42 your tracing gesture is not checked by the eye, you rely on your feeling of  
43 where your hand is (artist Morgan O'Hara drawings from her series *The*  
44 *Live Transmission* are described as “a record, performed in real time, of the  
45 vital movement of living beings”). Or you can look at the whole scene for  
46 as long as you think is needed, and then only look down at the sheet when  
47 drawing, with no checking back to the scene((Ballard, Hayhoe, & Pelz,  
48 1995) explain why this strategy is not as effective as back and forth).  
49  
50  
51

52 But continuous back-and-forth from the scene to the sheet is the norm in  
53 drawing practice. At the beginning the check only concerns intersections  
54 and alignments, based on the propositional visual analysis. At some point in  
55 drawing a scene the check of verisimilitude takes over; the image in your  
56 hands is sufficiently verisimilar with respect to the scene, and thus the  
57 drawing leans towards success, or is not, and thus the drawing requires  
58 fixing (I will not go deep into the notion of resemblance referred to here; cf.  
59 (Blumson, 2014), (Casati, 2016)).  
60

1  
2  
3 From the fact that in the final phases of a drawing "analog control" takes  
4 over, one may have been led to infer that it was part of the whole process.  
5 But this cannot be the case, precisely as the process is run step-wise, and  
6 checkpoints are distributed along the way.  
7

8  
9 The propositional nature of visual line analysis reveals itself in the  
10 possibility of linguistic expression of the activity. Drawing teaching  
11 practices abundantly use scene descriptions that refer to crossings and  
12 occlusions. Even if we are not overtly talking to others or covertly talking to  
13 ourselves in the process of analyzing a scene, the availability, on demand,  
14 of linguistic expressions hints at the fact that the format of visual line  
15 analysis is compatible with linguistic expressions as it is the best  
16 explanation for cases in which actual linguistic expressions are uttered.  
17  
18

19 Visual line analysis is thus in part point and line tagging: this is an  
20 intersection, this is an occlusion line, this is a potential occlusion line, this  
21 line can be discarded, this line *must* be discarded. The repertoire of graphic  
22 schemes constrains the propositional structure of drawings. The type of line  
23 analysis one makes depends on the elements that are available for the  
24 analysis, and these are the graphic schemes. If this is the case, learnability is  
25 a strong constraint here. What ends up in the repertoire of basic graphic  
26 schemes is what one has learned, which in turn depends on what one can  
27 learn.  
28  
29

30 Drawing architectural items allowed me to skip learning of some graphic  
31 schemes. As I can compute online the meeting points of T-junctions, I have  
32 no need to automatize them. (i.e. no need to move from M2 to M1). And as  
33 I know or can judge that some items are repeated over in the architecture, I  
34 draw them all without looking back at the scene.  
35  
36

37 Many a draftsman uses a step-wise process based on tracing construction  
38 lines. For instance, when I start drawing a tower, I generate thin verticals  
39 that will guide the rest of feature placing (windows, balconies, etc.), and  
40 will be discarded in the final rendering. Construction lines in a drawing  
41 reduce part of the cognitive costs generated in judging about alignments,  
42 crossings and parallelism. (As in other cases, mind the fallacy lurking here:  
43 from the fact that you have a lighter cognitive load thanks to features of the  
44 drawing, it does not follow that the drawing itself is doing anything  
45 cognitive.)  
46  
47

48  
49 *Normative use of the principle of verisimilitude.* Given that you can  
50 represent a certain scene in many ways, each of which will look verisimilar,  
51 you do not have a reason for *not* representing it veridically (your subject  
52 will look like a sailboat even if you will not place the winch in the right  
53 position and proportion; but you do not have a reason not to place it in the  
54 right position and proportion, so why not do it?)  
55  
56

57 Fig. 7. Adonis moored in Kastos. August 2013. Image credit: RC.  
58  
59

60 *Drawing problems generate drawing encounters*



1  
2 In this second sequence I investigate loosely some of the by-products of the  
3 activity of drawing construed propositionally. Some of these are individual  
4 (e.g. attention modulation), some are of a more social nature (inquiry about  
5 an activity that is considered as unusual, comments on the quality of the  
6 craftsmanship). This exploration has a simple purpose: the complexity of a  
7 human activity, and the theory that accounts for it, are often measured, and  
8 evaluated, at its borders, or interfaces with other activities.  
9

10  
11 Drawing is an unusual activity and when performed in the public space its  
12 oddity creates peculiar encounters. Some of them are certainly due to the  
13 fact that draftsmen need to stay put for a while in a certain place, thus they  
14 are an easy target for bystanders. Others are due to curiosity, some end up  
15 in discussions and evaluations of craftsmanship. Here is a short report of  
16 some of those encounters.  
17

18  
19 Manali, 1998, I sit just outside the town boundaries, drawing a Buddhist  
20 temple in the woods. A group of young boys and girls gathers around me,  
21 they see that I am drawing but they feel the urge to ask "Can we know what  
22 you are doing?" It's more a request for explaining *why* I am drawing that a  
23 request to explain what I am doing.  
24

25  
26 Young tourists at Cape Sounios, near Athens, look at my work in 1994, then  
27 ask, probably disappointed by its imperfections: "Why don't you take a  
28 picture of the temple *instead*?" I answer, unconvincingly, that I am not  
29 interested in registering information somehow, but in understanding  
30 structures, a slow process that requires looking. But they do not seem to  
31 appreciate the point.  
32

33  
34  
35 Fig. 8. Playing Carmen at the Conservatoire Régional, Paris, 29.3.2015, Image credit: RC.  
36

37 Paris, March 2015. I am drawing a group of performing orchestra members.  
38 People look at me as if I was doing something indiscreet. But the very same  
39 people are taking photographs of the whole scene. Maybe the disturbing  
40 element was that I was checking the performers individually, in order to  
41 draw each of them. Drawing someone is apparently more invasive than  
42 taking a photograph of him or her, even though the photograph captures  
43 more details, and is more reliable (can be used for forensic evidence).  
44 Drawing is observation related (and taking pictures is a very good excuse  
45 for not observing.) In other cases (Al-Ain, February 2012) I had to make  
46 extra drawings to distribute to bystanders who asked for them.  
47  
48

49  
50 The point I want to make here is not particularly deep, but I do think that it  
51 deserves further study. It is about the social reception of the drawing act.  
52 The peculiarities of the reception sit well within a propositional framework.  
53 There is something peculiar about the drawing activity, which is not just the  
54 displaying of craftsmanship. Drawing is construed socially as a way to put,  
55 and answer, *visual questions*. The draftsman is perceived as the person who  
56 is able to ask those questions, and who is in the position to answer them.  
57 These answers are subject to normative evaluation ("You seem to have  
58 missed that wrinkle on the face"). They are recognized as enhancing our  
59 visual powers ("You made me see things I did not pay attention to"), or  
60 criticized for not enhancing them.

1  
2  
3 *Drawing as attention modulator.* At the end of a sabbatical, or before a  
4 move, I start drawing frantically the environment I lived in in the previous  
5 months. I am always struck by the sudden realization that you never really  
6 looked at the house you live in, until you started to draw it. You notice  
7 details you never paid attention to before.  
8

9  
10 There is a tale of a wise man who looks at a stone for his whole life and  
11 then in a single swift motion, just before dying, represents it in a  
12 quintessential way in a drawing. Possibly the reverse is true: the right thing  
13 to do is to draw an object right away, so that you can observe it  
14 subsequently with participation. Drawing is a powerful attention modulator,  
15 and this is why the act of drawing attracts, in turn, attention.  
16

17  
18 *Mental drawing.* Once upon in Greece (Porto Varko), under an oak tree at  
19 sunrise, I made a "mental drawing" of the tree as I was stranded without  
20 paper and pen. I looked at the branches of the oak tree as if I should draw  
21 them on the spot. No physical gestures except for head and eye movements,  
22 no movement of the hands - just attention and sequential observation of  
23 details. I am not very confident about the outcome, but surely during the  
24 exercise I was elated. And surely I would not be able to perform mental  
25 drawing if I was not able to draw. This suggests that there are different  
26 styles of mental drawing as there are styles of drawing. When I look at  
27 objects of the type I know how to draw, I look at it under the profile of the  
28 graphic schemes I have available.  
29  
30

31 I was elated, and this suggests that there is an important phenomenological  
32 quality of the drawing episode we should pay more attention to. We should  
33 shift some of our theoretical interest from the outcome of drawing to the  
34 drawing act.  
35  
36  
37

38 *Looking back at a drawing one made: interactions of the act of drawing and*  
39 *recollection*  
40

41  
42 If I look back at a drawing I made it is introspectively not clear that I recall  
43 the details of the scene I observed; something gets in the way, the memory  
44 of an action scheme. I remember propositionally what I drew, but do I have  
45 a *qualitative* recollection thereof? I recall that there were pipes in a certain  
46 conference room in Rio. I do not remember how they looked, but I have a  
47 feeling of being in front of those pipes, drawing them.  
48  
49

50 Fig 9. Rio de Janeiro, Eceme school, Conference Room. Image credit: RC, April 2013.  
51

52 It is thus true that drawing makes me remember. But when I look at the  
53 drawing I made, I cannot actually "see" the pipes with their colors, etc.  
54 However, this does not mean that memory is not helped. Probably we need  
55 different tests here (for instance, am I facilitated in describing a picture of  
56 the same scene?)  
57

58 *Mental redrawing?* Looking at a drawing I made, as if I was redrawing it,  
59 following with the eye details and traits, activates memories of the drawing  
60 act. This is different from the "general gist" of the drawing, which is

1  
2 however something I am striving for when I draw.  
3

4 *Attention modulation meets social interaction.* In her investigation about  
5 prosthetic appropriation by terminally ill patients in large healthcare  
6 institutions, ethnographer Marine Royer (2015) was not allowed to take  
7 photographs. However, she could make sketches. This opened up a window  
8 on certain aspects of the caretaker-patient interaction, that were so far  
9 hidden from research. The conformity to verisimilitude is certainly an  
10 element in making many types of conversation around drawing possible. If  
11 the draftsman was unconstrained by verisimilitude, there would be no point  
12 in arguing with her. At the same time, if the conversation is to move from a  
13 general appreciation of the gist of the drawing to a more detailed  
14 commentary on some parts of it, both draftsman and commentator must  
15 ascend to the level of judgment, embrace the propositional articulation of  
16 the drawing activity.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

### 22 *Acknowledgements*

23  
24 Research for this text has been made possible through funding by grants  
25 ANR-17-EURE-0017 FrontCog, ANR-10-IDEX-0001-02 PSL, Enactive  
26 Network of Excellence FP6-IST 002114, Design Iris PSL. Thanks to  
27 Taqvim association, Mariela Aguilera, Patrick Cavanagh, Simonetta  
28 Capecchi, Giuseppe Cristiano, Yolaine Escande, Denis Vidal, Valeria  
29 Giardino, the late Andrei Gorea, David Kirsh, Giuseppe Lorini, Patrick  
30 Maynard, Ruth Millikan, Stefano Moroni, Alessandro Pignocchi, Barbara  
31 Tversky, Samaneh Yasaei, to the participants to the *Anthropologie de*  
32 *l'Esquisse* seminar and to the *Drawing challenges* seminar (2017).  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

### 39 *References*

- 40  
41 Ballard, D. H., Hayhoe, M. M., & Pelz, J. B. (1995). Memory  
42 representations in natural tasks. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*,  
43 7(1), 66–80. <https://doi.org/10.1162/jocn.1995.7.1.66>  
44  
45  
46 Blumson, B. (2014). *Resemblance and Representation: An Essay in the*  
47 *Philosophy of Pictures*. Open Book Publishers. Retrieved from  
48 [http://www.openbookpublishers.com/product/282/resemblance-and-](http://www.openbookpublishers.com/product/282/resemblance-and-representation-an-essay-in-the-philosophy-of-pictures/2c0200249ef2ace9f385a9f719bd2ba0)  
49 [representation-an-essay-in-the-philosophy-of-](http://www.openbookpublishers.com/product/282/resemblance-and-representation-an-essay-in-the-philosophy-of-pictures/2c0200249ef2ace9f385a9f719bd2ba0)  
50 [pictures/2c0200249ef2ace9f385a9f719bd2ba0](http://www.openbookpublishers.com/product/282/resemblance-and-representation-an-essay-in-the-philosophy-of-pictures/2c0200249ef2ace9f385a9f719bd2ba0)  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55 Casati, R. (2011), « Introduction. The interdisciplinary study of drawing »,  
56  
57 Rivista di estetica [Online], 47 | 2011, Online since 30 November  
58  
59 2015, connection on 19 April 2019. URL:  
60

1  
2  
3 <http://journals.openedition.org/estetica/1904> ; DOI :  
4  
5 10.4000/estetica.1904

6  
7 Casati, R. (2016). Review of Resemblance and Representation: An Essay in  
8  
9 the Philosophy of Pictures, by Ben Blumson. *Australasian Journal*  
10  
11 *of Philosophy*, 0(0), 1–3.  
12  
13 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00048402.2016.1207691>

14  
15 Cavanagh P. (1999) Pictorial art and vision. In: Wilson RA, Keil FC MIT  
16  
17 Encyclopedia of Cognitive Science. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press,  
18  
19 648-651.

20  
21 Cristiano, G., 2017, Il visualizer. Napoli: Caracò.

22  
23 Kennedy J. M. (1974) Psychology of Picture Perception. San Francisco,  
24  
25 CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

26  
27 Kennedy, J.M. (1975). Drawing was discovered, not invented. *New*  
28  
29 *Scientist*, 67, (No. 965), 523-525.

30  
31 Maynard, P. (2005). *Drawing Distinctions: The Varieties of Graphic*  
32  
33 *Expression*. Cornell University Press.

34  
35 Pignocchi, A., 2008, Les intentions du dessinateur. Un cas d'étude à  
36  
37 l'interface entre la philosophie de l'art et les sciences cognitives.  
38  
39 Thèse de Doctorat, EHESS. <http://www.theses.fr/2008EHES0008>

40  
41 Pignocchi, A. (2010). How the intentions of the draftsman shape perception  
42  
43 of a drawing. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 19(4), 887–898.  
44  
45 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.concog.2010.04.009>

46  
47 Royer, M., 2015, De l'instrument à la prothèse : ethnographie de trajectoires  
48  
49 d'objets biotechnologiques en cancérologie. Thèse de doctorat,  
50  
51 EHESS. <http://www.theses.fr/2015EHES0685#>

52  
53 Sperber, D., & Hirschfeld, L. A. (2004). The cognitive foundations of  
54  
55 cultural stability and diversity. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 8(1),  
56  
57 40–46.

58  
59 Stanovich, K E.; West, R F. (2000). "Individual difference in reasoning:  
60  
implications for the rationality debate?". *Behavioral and Brain*

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Sciences. 23 (5): 645–726

Van Sommers, Peter 1984, Drawing and cognition : descriptive and  
experimental studies of graphic production processes. New York :  
Cambridge University Press

For Peer Review



Fig. 1. In this unreadable drawing, based on a photograph, all contrast boundaries over a certain threshold have been turned into lines. See next page for the original photograph. Image credit: RC.

182x145mm (96 x 96 DPI)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



Fig 3. Larchant, May 2012. Image credit: RC.

184x276mm (72 x 72 DPI)




Fig. 4. Drawing and tracing book. The old practice of tracing reduces drawing to second line like tracing.

369x164mm (96 x 96 DPI)



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




Fig. 5 Kefalonia. 16.08.2011. Image credit, RC.

286x218mm (72 x 72 DPI)



Fig. 6. Kalamos. August 2013. Image credit: RC.

304x204mm (72 x 72 DPI)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




Fig. 7. Adonis moored in Kastos. August 2013. Image credit: RC.

298x202mm (72 x 72 DPI)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



Playing Carmen at the Conservatoire Régional, Paris, 29.3.2015, Image credit: RC.

399x279mm (72 x 72 DPI)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




Fig 9. Rio de Janeiro, Eceme school, Conference Room. Image credit: RC, April 2013.

288x202mm (72 x 72 DPI)



Fig 2. The original photograph with superposed lines of contrast and a "natural" drawing parsing of the scene it represents.

369x139mm (96 x 96 DPI)