

This article has been published in a revised form in Papers of the British School at Rome, 84, pp. 345-346. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0068246216000313>

This version is free to view and download for private research and study only. Not for re-distribution, re-sale or use in derivative works. © *British School at Rome* 2016.

## ***Shade Between Rings of Air: Architecture, Sculpture, Replication: Carlo Scarpa/Gabriel Orozco, 1952/2003***<sup>1</sup>

### **Introduction**

In 2003, the Mexican artist Gabriel Orozco produced a sculpture entitled *Shade Between Rings of Air* for the 50th Venice Biennale (fig. 1). The work was a full-scale replica of *La Pensilina* (1952), an architectural structure that functioned as a pergola, designed by the Italian modernist architect Carlo Scarpa (fig. 2). Scarpa's construction was part of his Sculpture Garden situated at the inner courtyard of the Italian Pavilion in Venice. *La Pensilina*, however, was itself deemed to be so sculptural in its form, according to Orozco, that it proved difficult to exhibit other sculpture there, and as a result the project was abandoned soon after completion (it was, however, completely restored in 2004). Orozco's *Shade Between Rings of Air*, described by the artist as a 'platonic pavilion', was fabricated in birch wood and placed in an interior space adjacent to the patio where *La Pensilina* was situated. It was presented thus in contrast to Scarpa's concrete structure which stood outdoors like a 'modern ruin' already deteriorated by time and weather (fig.3).<sup>2</sup> Orozco's *Shade Between Rings of Air* was subsequently exhibited in diverse sites as an independent sculpture, raising issues about site-specificity, cultural memory, replication, as well as the dialectical relationship between architecture and sculpture.

This article explores, first, how Orozco's work negotiates ideas related to architectural sculpture, while drawing attention on the role of the replica (including its spatiotemporal relation to the original). In particular, it argues that with *Shade Between Rings of Air*, Orozco probes the relationship between the original and the replica by introducing a deliberate anachronism, thus putting into question the idea of history as a linear process, while at the same time interrogating the mechanisms for the construction of cultural memory. Both the designation of Scarpa's pensilina as a 'modern ruin' and Orozco's replica as a 'platonic pavilion' introduce significant anachronisms; the phrase 'modern ruin' because it entails a temporal contradiction between the term 'modern', usually understood to be present and future orientated, and 'ruin' referring to the past, while in the second instance, envisioning the replica as a 'platonic pavilion' denotes both a

platonic, ideal model predating the original and, simultaneously, a replica constructed after the original. This deliberate anachronism entrenched in Orozco's sculptural replica and the relationship it sets up between architecture and sculpture, as well as its subversion of a linear chronological order between the past, the present and the future, will be driving my discussion of the work and setting up the terms of the central argument in this article.

Secondly, the article examines how Orozco internalizes with this work, and by using replication, aspects of modernist architecture, in order to recast his own identity as a sculptor at the turn of the twenty-first century, at a time when the category of sculpture had become largely obsolete. The notions of replication and anachronism also resonate here with ideas of authorship and artistic identity, since Orozco negotiates his identity as a sculptor by replicating, in this case, the work of a modernist architect. Finally, I suggest that the best way to address these intricately intertwined issues is to discuss Orozco's replica, conceived and initially presented as it was in the context of Scarpa's sculpture garden in the Italian Pavilion at the Venice Biennale, by focusing on the history of the modernist pavilion and the sculpture garden where the intersection between architecture, sculpture, replication, anachronism and their concomitance with the construction of cultural memory is particularly fertile, even if little-researched.

### **Gabriel Orozco's *Shade Between Rings of Air***

Orozco made *Shade Between Rings of Air* (2003) for the 50<sup>th</sup> Venice Biennale art exhibition entitled *Dreams and Conflicts: The Dictatorship of the Viewer* (2003), under the artistic direction of Francesco Bonami. Orozco's work was presented as part of the exhibition *Delays and Revolutions*, co-curated by Bonami and Daniel Birnbaum. In his catalogue essay, Birnbaum explores issues of temporality in art, writing in defence of a temporality that is not linear or simply forward-moving but is characterised instead by 'repetition and syncopation, detours and delays.'<sup>3</sup> Orozco's 'platonic' pavilion made of wood and metal, a pristine yet anachronic 'model' of Scarpa's architectural structure standing in the patio with visible signs of erosion from time and weather, reverses the temporal order between the architectural model, the built structure, and its replica.

In its original installation at the Biennale, Orozco's sculptural replica was situated in a room next to the patio albeit rotated ninety degrees in relation to Scarpa's pergola. It was thus rendered visible through the door that connects the two spaces, the interior gallery room and the exterior sculpture garden, so that the viewer could make immediate comparisons between the two structures. In Orozco's replica, according to Birnbaum, 'nothing seems given over to chance, everything is essential: we enter a matrix, a three-dimensional model, which lays out the basic proportions and principles of an architectural structure to be built.'<sup>4</sup> Challenging, however, linear, chronological time the replica is a 'late arrival' that potentially turns the copy into a form of origin, an anachronic 'three-dimensional simulacrum making that which it duplicates retroactively possible.'<sup>5</sup> Birnbaum makes reference here to Jorge Luis Borges, one of Orozco's favourite authors, and his celebrated anachronism, the notion that 'every writer creates his own precursors.'<sup>6</sup> Further foregrounding this idea of anachronism, the art historian Briony Fer has described Orozco's replica of Scarpa's 'ruined sculpture court' like a 'ruin in reverse,' referencing Robert Smithson's term for new construction sites about to be built.<sup>7</sup>

Emphasizing the temporal and spatial distance between Scarpa's construction and his own sculpture, Orozco notes that what interested him in making the replica was 'the experience of walking between the two, between the ruin of the dusty, open-air pavilion and the wooden replica inside - one to one, almost like a model, which stood in a white room that was very pristine and clean (fig.4). It was about the time between the platonic pavilion and the pavilion eroded by weather. It was a shiny new idea that was immediately eroded and accidented by reality.'<sup>8</sup> Orozco implicates thus this remarkable anachronism in the form of his replica, not only in order to demonstrate the passage of time, or to offer alternatives to a linear historicist art history, but also to reflect on the discrepancy between the utopia of modernist design and his notion of 'reality' (social, environmental, historical) that incorporates accident and chance.

As with his use of Scarpa's pergola, Orozco often works with found objects in order to develop and redefine his sculptural practice. Another instance where the artist critically addresses the aspirations of modernist design is with *La DS* (1993), one of Orozco's most

well-known and spectacular works that involves the remodeling of an iconic French car, the 1950s *Citroën DS* (fig. 5). For this work, the artist modified the vehicle by having it split vertically along its length, removing a portion from the middle of the car, and then putting the remaining parts together again to generate a new shape and a new experience. Even though part of the body of the car is missing, the artist contends that it is still present ‘in our bodily-cultural memory of the object’.<sup>9</sup> Orozco here combines his concerns with bodily presence, memory and absence, with the mass-produced industrial object, in this case a cultural symbol and an example of modern design utopia. Art historian Benjamin Buchloh, who has been Orozco’s long-term interlocutor, remarks that by cutting through the *déesse* (which translates from French as ‘goddess’), the artist not only enacts ‘a classical sculptural procedure onto the body of the commercially designed object’, but with this destructive gesture and by then putting together the two halves he is also rendering the iconic object as a ‘carcass of promises’, revealing ‘the inherent betrayal of desire of all design culture’.<sup>10</sup> In other words, Orozco’s *La DS* deconstructs the utopian ambitions of modernist design, while at the same time intimates how such aspirations, as well as their frustration, might be engrained in our cultural memory, especially in relation to certain iconic objects.

Similarly, for *Elevator* (1994) (fig. 6), a work that was commissioned for an exhibition at The Museum of Contemporary Art of Chicago, the artist managed to acquire a used elevator cabin with the request to have it extracted intact from a building that was being demolished. After obtaining the cabin, Orozco had it cut horizontally and reassembled to his height. With works such as *Elevator* and *La DS*, Orozco literally opens up sculpture and places the body to inhabit it from within, like architecture, inverting the traditional perspective of the visitor who looks at an object situated vis-à-vis himself or herself in the exhibition space. In these works, however, the experience of sculpture as a container and empty space is further punctuated by another void, a missing part. In both the *Elevator* and *La DS*, the missing volume that has been cut away and removed from these objects is retained in the memory of the spectator that occupies that familiar space. The idea of sculpture as architectural container and an empty space thus figures both formally and conceptually on different levels in the works, both phenomenological and semantic,

crucially involving the experience of the physical body in a space whose absence is actively inscribed in the memory of the body that inhabits it.<sup>11</sup> Orozco's *Shade Between Rings of Air* similarly operates in this gap created by the distance (temporal and spatial) between the sculptural replica and the architecture, which effectively activates memory and imagination, but also opens up a space that triggers critical reflection and enables the construction of meaning.

### **Carlo Scarpa's Sculpture Garden and Venice Biennale projects**

The Venetian architect Carlo Scarpa's long collaboration with the Venice Biennale began in 1942 with a sculpture-related project, when he was commissioned to design an exhibition with works by his friend, the sculptor Arturo Martini. Throughout the next two decades, his numerous commissions for the Biennale included exhibition designs, new buildings, as well as modifications of existing ones. In 1948, he designed the display for a retrospective exhibition of Paul Klee, while in 1958 he realised the design for an exhibition of sculptures by Alberto Viani. He further designed around forty other rooms in 1960, and made several modifications of the interior of the Italian Pavilion in 1962, 1964, 1966 and 1968.<sup>12</sup> The first one of his realised buildings for the Biennale was the Art Book Pavilion at the *Il Cavallino* modern art gallery, situated outside the entrance of the Italian pavilion in the Giardini di Castello. The structure, built in 1950, was made of iron, wood and glass and it employed elements from the architectural language of Frank Lloyd Wright who was an important influence for Scarpa (this work draws in particular on Wright's 1929 *Ocatilla Camp* and 1937-40 *Taliesin West*). The Art Book Pavilion, from which all that survives today are its concrete permanent sections, was a remarkably open and disjointed structure that 'felt like an open air shelter' with panoramic views over the surrounding Giardini.<sup>13</sup>

In the following two years, between 1951-52, Scarpa designed and built two more projects for the Biennale: the Italian Pavilion Courtyard and Sculpture Garden, where La Pensilina is situated, and a new Ticket Office at the entrance of the Giardini di Castello. Other projects include the Venezuelan pavilion (1953-56), whose interior has now been heavily remodeled but which preserves its original exterior and façade intact.

Demonstrating Scarpa's unwavering commitment to visual arts which repeatedly served as a source of inspiration in his work, the original spatial arrangement in the interior of the building, characterised by two slightly offset sections along the gallery, drew its inspiration from the paintings of Paul Klee. In the external section, the patio of the pavilion is sealed off from the Biennale gardens, which it overlooks, by rotating wooden panels, creating a modifiable space reminiscent of Japanese architecture.<sup>14</sup> Another one of his collaborations with the Biennale, particularly important in my discussion about architecture and sculpture, was Scarpa's only exhibition that featured his own sculptures in 1968, which I am discussing in more length in the following section of this article.

Scarpa's sculpture garden at the Italian pavilion was an intervention to the existing building, renamed Central Pavilion in 2009, which is the main and largest building at the Biennale. To create this patio, Scarpa modified an existing room by demolishing the roof and turning it into an open garden, creating thus a transition space between two of the pavilion's indoors galleries for visitors to rest between the exhibits. First, he stripped the surrounding walls from the plaster covering them to reveal the brick structure underneath. There, he placed *La Pensilina*, a free-standing reinforced-concrete canopy made of three eye-shaped (*vesica piscis*) pillars orientated in three different directions, which support a curved cantilevered roof that appears to hover above the cement columns (fig.7). The way to achieve this effect was by placing each pillar halfway under the edge of the roof canopy, with the roof's full weight resting on small steel spheres that sit on pyramid-shaped stands placed on the top of each pillar.

Orozco's wooden replica carried on this effect of lightness, whence a viewer looking at the sculpture at a first glance 'could easily mistake [it] for an over-refined balancing act - small balls carrying a roof on curved walls.'<sup>15</sup> Only after walking all the way around the gallery space and alongside the structure could one discern, by looking through the open door, that this was an exact replica of Scarpa's pergola situated in the garden next to the gallery. Scarpa's canopy is moreover shaped into three elegant curves, each one of a different diameter, that give the construction its defining character, poignantly reflected in the title of Orozco's own work: *Shade Between Rings of Air*. Orozco's title is thus an accurate description of the formal qualities of Scarpa's structure, while also conveying

the poetics of this unique architectural piece; the wooden replica being both a study and an homage.

Scarpa's patio further includes four perpendicular pools of water of varying sizes and depths, which appear to cover equal amount of space as the concrete paving on the ground, 'so that we experience the space as half-land, half-water, and thus in this way reconnecting this inner court to Venice, even when the city is not visible.'<sup>16</sup> In this elaborate landscape that comprises different planes of paved surfaces, planting beds and reflecting pools laid out on several horizontal levels, the sculptures are situated both on land and water. Sergio Los, an architect, scholar, and occasional collaborator of Scarpa, remarks that 'the presence of Japanese culture can be detected in the treatment of the garden-patio, in the materials, and in the use of water.'<sup>17</sup> Indeed, while conducting research for his replica, Orozco ponders in one of his working notebooks, below a photograph of Scarpa's sculpture garden, on the distinctly oriental features of Scarpa's architecture, his notes accompanied by a Japanese haiku poem:

'So long as the old pond remains a container of a certain volume of water quietly reflecting the thing around it, there is no life in it. To assert itself as reality, a sound must come out of it; a frog jumps into it, the old pond then proves to be dynamic, to be full of vitality, to be of significance to us sentient beings. It becomes an object of interest, of value.

But there is one more important observation we have to make, that is that the value of the old pond to Basho, the poet and seer (or mystic), did not come from any particular source outside the pond but from the pond itself. The pond did not become significant to Basho because of his finding the value in the pond's relationship to anything outside the pond as a pond.

¡Oh! Ancient pond!

A frog leaps in

The water's sound



Basho<sup>'18</sup>

In this dialogue that traverses different historical periods and cultures, Orozco's own interest in Zen philosophy meets Scarpa's fascination with a Europe that looks towards the East – indeed, Scarpa has explicitly expressed his interest in 'characteristics that involve a Europe that turns towards the East,' explaining that he sees himself as 'slightly Byzantine.'<sup>19</sup> Furthermore, in light of his notes, Orozco's replica can also be thought of as a reflection or echo of Scarpa's canopy which it brings to life, not by highlighting any context exterior to it but by acting as an agent (like the frog in the haiku poem) that reverberates the structure's own particular qualities. In other words, Orozco's *Shade Between Rings of Air* does not simply revisit or re-interpret Scarpa's modernist project maintaining a critical distance, but in effect 'awakens' and sheds (critical) light to its inherently modernist values: its simple and elegant lines; the lightness of the structure; the technology and properties of concrete (a modern material par excellence); the relationship it establishes with the city through the use of water; and its function as a social, intermediary, public space.

These qualities, moreover, as Orozco has implied in an interview, are both architectural and sculptural: in his view, the sculpture-garden was 'a difficult space to show sculpture in, because Scarpa's pavilion is itself very sculptural.'<sup>20</sup> While Orozco highlights the sculptural qualities already present in Scarpa's work, the intricacies of this relationship materialise fully in his own intervention: Orozco's much lighter wooden replica of Scarpa's concrete architectural structure was subsequently exhibited in different sites as a free-standing, autonomous sculpture independently of its original site-specific context at the Biennale. More specifically, *Shade Between Rings of Air* has been presented at the Palacio de Cristal in Madrid, as well as at the Marian Goodman gallery in Paris. (fig. 8,9) The art curator Jessica Morgan observes that despite the work's site-specific point of departure in Venice, the 'vast, luminous space' of Palacio de Cristal provided an ideal situation for the work, 'its elegant white curvilinear ceiling creating a respite from the otherwise exposed space of the glass and steel structure.'<sup>21</sup> Moreover, removed as it was from the original Scarpa building and 'as a sculpture dwarfed in a much larger space than in Venice,' the work's linear, curved shapes, 'suggesting a thin slab out of which two

circles had been cut,' echoed the characteristic circular forms of other work by Orozco, becoming more comprehensively integrated within the artist's oeuvre: 'Like so many of Orozco's appropriations, it was fluidly absorbed into the artist's vernacular, becoming a sculptural drawing in space.'<sup>22</sup> In other words, Orozco's architectural appropriation became fully engrained in the domain of art and more specifically in that of sculpture.

This transition from architecture to sculpture enacted by Orozco's *Shade*, also reverberates with the close relationship between architecture to sculpture that informed Scarpa's own work. This central preoccupation is best demonstrated with *Ambiente*, a unique moment in his practice when Scarpa exhibited his own sculptural work – at which point Scarpa claimed: 'I am, too, a sculptor.'<sup>23</sup> In 1968, Scarpa was invited to participate at the 34<sup>th</sup> International Biennale of Art in Venice with an exhibition of his works, alongside three other architects: Louis Kahn, Paul Rudolph and Franco Albini. For the exhibition, rather than showing his architectural work, Scarpa made his own sculptures and presented them in an installation entitled *Ambiente* (Environment). The installation was part of the exhibition *Lines of contemporary research: from informal to new structures* (Linee della ricerca contemporanea: dall'informale alle nuove strutture), which was dedicated to the 'new abstraction.' For *Ambiente*, Scarpa made three sculptures, 'Asta' ('Beam'), 'Contafili' ('Counting Glass') and 'Crestia' ('Growth'), complimented by 'Erme,' a structure consisting three marble L-shaped supports. The architect presented these works in a display of his own design, set against three freestanding semi-transparent textile panels set in iron frames. The panels functioned both as spatial partitions and as backdrops to the works, while they were also used in order to modulate the light in-between the sculptures. The exhibition demonstrates the degree of Scarpa's engagement with sculpture, its modes of display, and its relation to the architectural and natural environment, ever present in his work since his earlier projects such as the sculpture garden.

For the 1968 edition of the Biennale, besides presenting his sculptures at the exhibition, Scarpa redesigned the interior of the Italian Pavilion where he doubled the exhibition space by constructing a raised area that functioned as a loft which was connected to the

main hall by stairways.<sup>24</sup> The *Ambiente* installation was situated below that loft, right at the centre of the Italian pavilion in the midst of the exhibition *Lines of contemporary research*. *Ambiente* was thus serving as a place of transition between the different exhibition sections, while also designating an interdisciplinary space in-between architecture and sculpture. In *Ambiente*, Scarpa developed some of the ideas he had initially explored in his Sculpture Garden where the distinctly sculptural Pensilina was situated. In the recently published volume *Carlo Scarpa e la scultura del '900* (Carlo Scarpa and the Sculpture of the 1900s), that explores the role of sculpture in Scarpa's work, it is noted that these two projects, the Sculpture Garden at the Italian Pavilion as well as his sculpture exhibition *Ambiente*, have several features in common including formal characteristics, such as their rectangular plan, but also the fact that they contained sculpture, that they were both conceived as places of transition (*Ambiente* was accessible through the staircases that are connecting various parts of the exhibition *Linea*, while the Sculpture Garden was a place of transition and repose in-between two of the Italian Pavilion galleries), as well as the presence of nature (in the Sculpture Garden there was water and plants, while in *Ambiente* there were plants in containers).<sup>25</sup> Unlike the other two participating architects who showed segments, drawings and photographic samples of their work (Rudolf displayed the model of his Graphics Art Centre, while Albin showed part of the façade of the superstore La Rinascente di Roma), Scarpa's treatment of the exhibition space and its interaction with the sculptures highlighted his preference to participate 'in a creative way, than just display his sculptures as documents'.<sup>26</sup> In other words, Scarpa finds in sculpture a field of experimentation that allows him to think through and to resolve in new and imaginative ways certain spatial issues related to his architectural practice.

### **George Kolbe's *Morning* (1925) in Ludwig Mies van der Rohe's Barcelona Pavilion (1929)**

It would be particularly elucidating at this point, for the purposes of this discussion, to consider the close relationship between architecture and sculpture in the rich historical context of modernist pavilions and sculpture gardens. In May 1929, Ludwig Mies van der

Rohe's (1886-1969) Barcelona Pavilion, one of the most iconic modernist buildings, was inaugurated as the German National Pavilion for that year's Barcelona International Exhibition. The pavilion, which was pulled down in 1930 and reconstructed in 1986, has become paradigmatic of twentieth-century architecture. It has been widely celebrated for introducing a groundbreaking modernist vocabulary with its distinctive use of large glass panes, straight lines, simple rectangular shapes and open spaces, promoting the principles of transparency and clarity, and materialising the concomitance between form and function. Inside the pavilion, however, Mies selected to put on display a little-known figurative sculpture by George Kolbe, titled *Morning* (1925). The choice of this particular sculpture has often been deemed incidental; its traditional figurative form was not seen to conform to modernist values. Yet the architect's deep familiarity with the sculpture of his time is indicative of an informed personal vision with regards to his choice of the work.<sup>27</sup> As Penelope Curtis eloquently argues in her book *Patio and Pavilion: The Place of Sculpture in Modern Architecture*, Mies's employment of sculpture surpasses a merely decorative or functional role (demonstrating scale, for example), in order to encapsulate the viewer's very experience of the architecture itself.<sup>28</sup>

Whether Mies considered the sculpture to be modern, albeit in a different way than the pavilion, or he saw it as a contrast to his modern architecture, is open to debate. Certainly, Kolbe's *Morning*, made in 1925, is contemporaneous with Mies' architecture, however, the work's contemporaneity does not necessarily make it a modern sculpture.<sup>29</sup> The sculpture represents a female nude standing on a plinth with knees slightly bent and arms extending upwards, slowly unfolding over the head. In an elegant circular movement, almost like a dancer's, her left palm is turned toward the face, while the right palm is stretching up outwards towards the sun as if she were slowly waking up into the new day. The head is looking downwards and diagonally to the left, engaging the whole body in a slightly spiral movement. Mies placed the sculpture on a plinth in the outdoors pool, as if it were emerging from the water. The figure's gaze is falling towards the glistening still water surface as if looking at her own reflection on it. Curtis brings attention to the centrifugal movement of the figure, as 'it opens outwards, rippling, in a manner suggestive of the pool where it stands, and the building around it,' in a way that

the sculpture's formal characteristics make it responsive to its distinctly modernist architectural surroundings.<sup>30</sup>

In terms of its placement in relation to its architectural environment, the sculpture can be seen as residing both inside and outside of the pavilion. Mies uses transparency to achieve the effect of bringing the sculpture inside the building in the same way that his architecture typically brings nature (the garden) inside the house.<sup>31</sup> In this setting, according to Curtis, Kolbe's sculpture provides, in formal terms and in the way that classical sculpture does, the 'focal point for the viewer, leading the eye and telling it where to rest' in this 'house of mirrors.' Moreover, as Mies situated the sculpture in a backdrop of travertine marble walls, the sculpture itself 'participates in this game of illusion, its green patina merging with the green of the Alpine marble and the foliage above'.<sup>32</sup> Following these observations, Curtis argues persuasively in favour of the modern qualities of Kolbe's sculpture, noting that it is 'echoing or paraphrasing [Mies'] architecture,' acting 'like a reprise of the visitor's dream-like passage around the travertine pedestal, with its variously transparent or reflective panels of water, glass and coloured marble.'<sup>33</sup> Finally, the author concludes that, besides acting like a focal point as well as a 'moving target, which continually reappears in this transparent, reflective building,' Kolbe's sculpture is also 'a component that is crucial to the architecture's meaning: The sculpture not only gives the building human quality, but illuminates its architectural ones too. It encapsulates the journey we have just taken, and promises its endless repetition, inside or out.'<sup>34</sup> It can be argued that the classically figurative sculpture itself does not strictly belong in the tradition of modernist sculpture as Curtis suggests, yet Mies's treatment of the sculpture is undoubtedly modern in the way he positions it in order to reflect and to accentuate the meaning of its architectural surroundings.

With a different approach to constructing an equally compelling modern vision, Scarpa designed in 1967 one of the three sections for the Italian Pavilion at the Exposition Universelle de Montreal, alongside the artist and designer Bruno Munari and the architect Leonardo Ricci. Scarpa's section, entitled 'Poetry,' included the reproduction of the groundbreaking perspectival floor design from Piero della Francesca's small-scale

painting *Flagellation of Christ* (c.1455-60). The floor pattern was painted on a raised platform upon which the architect placed a copy of the bronze sculpture of Donatello's *David* (c.1440). At the entrance of the pavilion, greeting the visitors, Scarpa presented another one of Donatello's small-scale sculptures, the playful *Athys* (Little Eros, c.1440). While both Mies in his Barcelona Pavilion and Scarpa in Montreal use figurative sculpture, Scarpa engages with decisively historical material in order to carve out his own brand of modernist sensibility, one that engages the past as much as it looks forward into the future. Rather than employing exclusively contemporaneous or modern elements, Scarpa's national pavilion thus dynamically incorporates the celebrated historical tradition of the fifteenth century Italian renaissance, bringing it to play a decisive role in the construction of modern Italian cultural identity in the late 1960s. The emphatic implementation of a glorious past, then, becomes instrumental in promoting a distinctly modernist vision, while reinventing a sense of cultural continuity triggered by significant technological innovations (i.e. della Francesca's linear perspective) and artistic achievements carried on from the past into the present. The replication of elements that could not have been otherwise physically included in the pavilion, such as the translation in three-dimensional space of the perspectival floor from della Francesca's painting and the copy of the bronze sculpture of Donatello's *David*, is crucial in creating the impression of cultural continuity or at least evoking a strong correspondence with the past.

Indeed, during his career, Scarpa had undertaken many projects involving the preservation of the historical past, with the restoration of several historical buildings. In one of his most acclaimed renovations, at the Castelvecchio Museum in Verona, the architect significantly positioned a centerpiece of sculpture, the historic equestrian statue of Cangrande, in such a way that its placement is making sense of the complex architectural structure of the building. Curtis remarks that 'this sculpture gives human body to the bewildering array of shapes and textures of the space around it. ... The sculpture thus provides the concentration which synthesises the space around it. In offering itself in the traditional role of 'focal point' it in fact serves to make sense of the multiple spatial experiences by which it is surrounded.'<sup>35</sup> While Mies' use of sculpture in

the Barcelona Pavilion stands for the experience that the viewer has of the architecture, Scarpa's placement of Cangrande's statue at the Castelvechio provides the spectator with a key to grasping the spatial complexity of the entire building. In both cases, sculpture, and its placement in relation to the architecture, becomes a hermeneutic device about the function of architecture. Overall, while Curtis's analysis of the role and significance of sculpture in advancing a modern architectural vision, in the context of modernist pavilions and patios, is extremely pertinent, her overarching narrative might be supporting the idea of a linear historical trajectory where the close interrelation between architecture and sculpture eventually leads to the point where architecture becomes entirely autonomous aesthetically, precisely like a sculpture. The final stage of this transition becomes apparent, for example, with the artwork of Dan Graham which Curtis discusses in detail in the concluding chapter of her book, and which I am introducing in the section that follows.

### **Dan Graham's Pavilions**

The 1976 Venice Biennale included an exhibition entitled 'Ambiente' (Environment), incidentally recalling Scarpa's 1968 Biennale contribution, which showcased recent developments in art. The general theme of the 1976 Biennale was the 'environment,' and architecture in particular. Dan Graham was one amongst the artists who participated in 'Ambiente,' with a work titled *Public Space/Two Audiences* (1976) (fig.10). This work was a site-specific installation designed to fit into a container, an empty space where the artist placed a mirror so that the visitors to the exhibition could observe themselves as they moved across the space. As Graham writes in his 1978 essay 'Notes on *Public Space/Two Audiences*', he intended the work 'to function doubly as art and as simply an exhibition pavilion (for itself), following the examples of Mies van der Rohe's Barcelona Pavilion or El Lissitzky's two exhibition rooms.'<sup>36</sup> With his intervention, however, Graham took those earlier modernist formulations further not only by presenting the architectural container itself, 'its own material structure,' as the artwork, but also by turning the viewers into the subject-matter of the display. Graham is thus setting up his pavilions as sculptures, while at the same time with the use of the mirror-image the spectator himself or herself effectively becomes the display. In comparison to Kolbe's

figurative sculpture in Mies' Barcelona pavilion which, according to Curtis, 'replicates the viewer's experience of architecture,' in Graham's *Public Space/Two Audiences*, 'the spectator replaces sculpture.'<sup>37</sup>

Graham has been working on his pavilions, these structures that stand between architecture and sculpture, since the mid-1970s. By that time, the idea of the modernist art gallery as a neutral container for the artwork had already come under scrutiny by minimalism in the 1960s. The minimalists investigated the 'white cube' gallery as part of the structure of the artwork itself and not simply as a seemingly 'neutral' spatial container, exploring the ideological context and implications of modernist institutional spaces. With his work, Graham went beyond the main task of minimalism, which he considered to be concerned with the compositional and formal structure of art institutional spaces that became absorbed into the formal structure of the artwork itself in a literal way by making the gallery (architectural container) part of the artwork. Rather than simply focusing on formal aspects, Graham's pavilions further fused the container (gallery space) and the contained (the viewer), drawing attention on the social experience of the viewer who is looking at himself or herself looking at the artwork (via his or her own reflection in the mirror). At the same time, while minimalism was exploring the phenomenological experience of the viewer at the present moment, 'here-and-now,' Graham was investigating new theories of viewing involving the body of the spectator and overlapping timeframes, with emphasis on the 'just past' experience, the recent past, thus highlighting and heightening transience and the experience of *time passing*.

As Daniel Birnbaum writes in his exhibition catalogue essay 'Delays and Revolutions', as early as 1974, Graham had produced a large number of works involving delays and delayed renderings of already delayed imagery.<sup>38</sup> In the 2003 edition of the Biennale (that also presented Orozco's *Shade Between Rings of Air*), Birnbaum and his co-curator Francesco Bonami included Graham's 1974 installation *Opposing Mirrors and Video Monitors on Time Delay*, which consists two mirrors, two video cameras, and two monitors with time delay. In a statement about the temporal complexities of this work, Graham describes that the viewer encounters, when looking in the direction of the mirror, the following elements: '1. A continuous present-time reflection of his surrounding



space. 2. Himself as an observer. 3. On the reflected monitor image, 5 seconds in the past, his area as seen by the mirror of the opposite area.’<sup>39</sup> Birnbaum notes that on the first level, perception is seen as the trustworthy rendering of our surroundings, immediately available to our senses. On the second and third levels, however, perception becomes problematised, as we enter first: ‘the level of self-reflection traditionally described with the mirror image’, and second the impression that ‘the system is equipped with a memory, i.e. things don’t just disappear once they are no longer perceived. Instead, they are given a second run, five seconds later.’<sup>40</sup>

Birnbaum brings these examples of extra-perspectival renderings of delay into his wider discussion about the temporality of a work of art, involving repetition, replication, and the notion of the ‘original’ (referring, for example, to criticisms of the neo-avant-garde art as mere repetition by Peter Burger)<sup>41</sup> to claim, following Borges’s celebrated anachronisms, that: ‘The neo-avant-garde is no mechanical copy of some once-and-for-all-given original, but must be said instead to retroactively give new significance to that which no longer can be seen as unquestionable origin.’<sup>42</sup> However, while in Graham’s pavilions the viewer becomes aware of the immediately preceding time, the focus is still on the present moment, which somehow becomes accentuated by rendering evident the very passage of time. While also interested in the phenomenological experience of the spectator on the exhibition site, Orozco and Scarpa are most crucially concerned with engaging historical time within the phenomenology of the present moment. Orozco evidently does so with his replica of Scarpa, while Scarpa with his numerous architectural renovation projects and with the use of historical sculpture, even in the case of his modernist pavilion in Montreal. Furthermore, as Sergio Los has argued, Scarpa’s idiosyncratic modernism, the ‘figurative complexity of his compositional system’ that engages with a historical and cultural ‘pluralism,’ including classicism, can be seen as a forerunner of deconstructionism: ‘Scarpa’s resistance to the bans and restrictions of modern design, his radical non-conformity, and likewise his marginal status - all these allowed him to be well ahead of the curve in dealing with the problems we now face and in indicating some possible solutions. Who could deny that those of his compositions that work throughout dissociation are in some sense forerunners of the disjoint creations of

the deconstructionists?’<sup>43</sup>

### **Conclusion: Replication and Anachronism**

The question that remains to be addressed is: what is the specific role of replication in this discussion about the relationship between architecture and sculpture? And what is the role of replication in the construction of cultural identity and historical memory in modern times and beyond? In 2007, Tate Modern organized in London a workshop on the subject of replication entitled *Inherent Vice: The Replica and its Implications in Modern Sculpture*, followed by the publication of a special issue in *Tate Papers*.<sup>44</sup> The project emerged from pressing concerns related to the impending conservation of Naum Gabo’s sculptures in Tate Gallery’s collection. Gabo’s works, made in early plastic, had deteriorated significantly and any decision-making with regards to their restoration immediately raised legal, ethical, and aesthetic issues about the limits of conservation, restoration, and the use of replication. In order to address these issues, the art historians, conservators, and artists who participated in the workshop investigated the different roles of the replica, including ideas of replication as conservation, artists’ editions, mass reproduction, as well as related issues of originality and authorship in art.

*Shade Between Rings of Air* touches upon many of these aspects akin to replication. It can be seen, for example, as an initial impulse to recuperate something from Scarpa’s pergola which had deteriorated dramatically from time and weather. At the same time, Orozco’s *Shade* deeply resonates with Scarpa’s own engagement with the historical past, demonstrated by his architectural renovation projects. Orozco’s replica thus engages with a unique strand of modernism that is represented by Scarpa which, while inclined towards material and conceptual innovation, it is also committed to incorporating the past into the present. Furthermore, replication is extremely significant in the historical context of several key modernist pavilions which, because of their initial function as temporary structures, had either been taken down after the end of each exposition or deteriorated in time, and were subsequently reconstructed -- Mies’s Barcelona Pavilion, for example, was build in May 1929, was pulled down in 1930 and was reconstructed in 1986.<sup>45</sup> These temporary pavilions were thus made permanent and exhibited as exemplary cases of

modernist architecture and, in a sense, as autonomous artworks in their own right.

In their book *Anachronic Renaissance*, Christopher Wood and Alexander Nagel describe the architectural model, in its usual sense, as a ‘maquette or mock-up that helps patrons and architects visualise a structure during the building process.’<sup>46</sup> However, the authors crucially explore a different notion of the model that is ‘not necessarily linked to a particular building, nor pointing forward in time, nor being small,’ explaining, for example, that ‘a real functional non-miniature building can also model an idea about how buildings are made.’<sup>47</sup> In this context, the authors further link the function of the model with the practice of replication. They recount, for example, that around the time the Romans were beginning to construct buildings in marble in the second-century BC, they made a model of the city’s first building, the Casa Romuli. That building was a wooden hut situated on the Palatine hill, which purportedly served as dwelling of Romulus, the city’s founder. Apparently, the hut was reconstructed based on the post holes found on that location in the second-century BC, yet Wood and Nagel argue that the whole idea that remnants of the original hut were found on that site was in fact an invention of the late Republican period: ‘The huts were artificial relics of an archaic wooden architecture embedded in a city of stone,’ and as such, they created ‘the fiction of a building chain leading back to the original hut.’<sup>48</sup> According to the authors, ‘the hut of Romulus was the construction of an increasingly sophisticated, rationalized culture inventing pride in its humble origins.’<sup>49</sup> The model, then, in its anachronic sense as replica, serves as a means with which to preserve cultural identity and to promote certain cultural values by fabricating a fictional sense of cultural order and historical continuity. A similar logic of fabricated continuity can be detected in the history of the replication of modernist pavilions whose replicas stand as paradigmatic models, expressing and preserving the core values of modernist architecture. Examined in this context, Orozco’s replica further illuminates the role that replication plays in constructing modernist narratives, while critically exposing their *modus operandi*.

Additionally, while Orozco’s *Shade* is situated in a convoluted relationship to modernism by means of anachronism -- conceived as a platonic, idealized model for a modernist structure, while in fact it is a replica of Scarpa’s deteriorating architecture -- the artist

treats both modernity *and* sculpture as anachronistic objects. Orozco, that is, finds a way to address the problem of contemporary sculpture as an obsolete artistic medium and to redefine it in his practice through the use of the replica. His replica thus becomes an apt metaphor for contemporary sculpture's own anachronism, while re-examining its conditions of possibility today. To this point, Orozco has argued that, unlike painting, there has never been a proclaimed 'end of sculpture'. However, he indicates that sculpture has been occupying an uncertain place in the history of twentieth century modernism, implying that it had long become obsolete. In his own words:

The problem with sculpture is that it always has been an inconvenient object. I would say that in the twentieth century, they didn't even know where to put sculpture. It has been so uncomfortable that it needs a special place, but it is not intriguing enough to make its own room. So I think that probably it is because sculpture was long gone that we don't even need to say that it is now finished.<sup>50</sup>

However, despite this problematic status of sculpture throughout the twentieth century Orozco insists in defining himself predominantly as a sculptor. In a discussion with the artist in 2004, Buchloh inquired about Orozco's decision to engage with a sculptural vocabulary since the early 1990s, at a time when the practice of sculpture had long been devalorized. Buchloh remarked: 'All of a sudden you make sculpture; in the 1960s and 1970s nobody thought sculpture would ever be possible'.<sup>51</sup> In the same conversation, Orozco confirms that his sculptural concerns are not simply symptomatic but fundamental in defining his identity as an artist. He declares: 'I'm a sculptor, I'm into gravity and I perceive the world in volumes, even though I use photography, drawing, or painting'.<sup>52</sup> Importantly, as I mentioned at the beginning of this article, Orozco internalizes with *Shade Between Rings of Air*, and by using replication and anachronism, aspects of modernist architecture, in order to recast his own identity as a sculptor at the turn of the twenty-first century. *Shade Between Rings of Air* further highlights aspects of modernism's engagement with the past and the role of sculpture as well as replication in this process. It reveals anachronisms already inherent in the modernist canons -- in the case of Scarpa, as well as in the context of modernist pavilions. At the turn of the twenty-first century, while particularly attentive to and critical of the utopian aspirations of

modernist projects, with *Shade Between Rings of Air*, Orozco re-imagines contemporary sculpture as a historically reflexive medium that opens up a space for the re-evaluation of the past and for the critical consideration of the present.

To conclude, by engaging replication and anachronism Orozco's replica deconstructs notions of historicism and historical determinism, the idea of history as a linear and causal sequence of events. In his book *The Usable Past: The Imagination of History in Recent Fiction of the Americas*, Lois Parkinson Zamora writes about Borges' use of 'deliberate anachronism' in developing his notion of a 'circumstantial rather than ideal' history:

In accordance to the Latin American antipositivism ... Borges history is circumstantial rather than ideal, subject to many minor adjustments and many readings: The loci of culture are numerous and widespread. Borges' history operates by means of small shifts in a world where historical interactions are eccentric, not progressive or causal; such history can be understood in terms of Borges' philosophical anachronism and narrated by means of 'new techniques' of 'deliberate anachronism and erroneous attribution.' This is not cause for disillusion but for imaginative recuperation and revitalisation.<sup>53</sup>

While Scarpa employed sculpture as a means of experimentation that enabled him to reinvent and enrich his architectural work (in the context of Italian modernism), Orozco uses Scarpa's sculptural architecture in order to redefine contemporary sculpture as a historically reflexive medium. Finally, with *Shade Between Rings of Air*, Orozco critically examines different aspects of replication, problematising issues of originality and questioning the role of the replica in preserving cultural identity and constructing a sense of historical continuity.

---

<sup>1</sup> A draft version of this article was completed at the British School at Rome, while I was the Henry Moore Foundation - British School at Rome Fellow in Sculpture, October-December 2015. I am grateful to the Henry Moore Foundation and to the BSR for this

---

wonderful opportunity to live in Italy and to conduct my research on the work of Carlo Scarpa and Gabriel Orozco.

<sup>2</sup> One of Gabriel Orozco's first and relatively unknown artworks, made in collaboration with Mauricio Maillé, and Mauricio Rocha, was the installation *Scaffolding for Our Modern Ruins* in 1987 at the Biennale of Alternative Spaces, Museum of Modern Art, Mexico City. With this work, we can trace his concerns with addressing modernity, the architectural environment and ruins back to the early days of his artistic career.

<sup>3</sup> F. Bonami (ed.), *Dreams and Conflicts: The Dictatorship of the Viewer*, La Biennale di Venezia, 2003, p. 3. Other works in the exhibition addressing questions about temporality, origins and genealogies included Tacita Dean's film about Mario Merz (2002) and Felix Gmelin's *Color Test, The Red Flag II* (2002).

<sup>4</sup> Ibid., p. 3.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., p. 3.

<sup>6</sup> Jorge Luis Borges, 'Kafka and his Precursors' in *Everything and Nothing*, New Directions, 1999, p. 70.

<sup>7</sup> B. Fer, 'Crazy about Saturn: Gabriel Orozco Interviewed by Briony Fer' (2006), in *Gabriel Orozco*, October Files 9, 2009, p. 177.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., p. 177.

<sup>9</sup> B. Buchloh and G. Orozco, 'Gabriel Orozco in Conversation with Benjamin Buchloh' (2004) in *Gabriel Orozco*, October Files 9, 2009, p. 111.

<sup>10</sup> B. Buchloh, 'Gabriel Orozco: The Sculpture of Everyday Life' (1996) in *Gabriel Orozco*, October Files 9, 2009, p. 44.

<sup>11</sup> Natasha Adamou, 'Impossible Objects: Gabriel Orozco's *Empty Shoe Box* and *Yielding Stone*' in *Sabotage Art: Politics and Iconoclasm in Contemporary Latin America*, Halart, S., Polgovsky, M. (eds), I.B. Tauris (March, 2016).

<sup>12</sup> <http://www.labiennale.org/en/art/history/scarpa.html?back=true>

<sup>13</sup> R. McCarter, *Carlo Scarpa*, London: Phaidon, 2013, p. 41.

<sup>14</sup> S. Los, *Carlo Scarpa: An Architectural Guide*, Arsenale, 1996, p. 42.

<sup>15</sup> J. Heiser, '50<sup>th</sup> Venice Biennale,' *Frieze*, Issue 77, September 2003, [http://www.frieze.com/issue/review/joerg\\_heiser/](http://www.frieze.com/issue/review/joerg_heiser/)

<sup>16</sup> McCarter, p. 45.

---

<sup>17</sup> Los, p. 34.

<sup>18</sup> O.T. Suzuki, *The Awakening of Zen*, pp. 71-72, quoted in Orozco's Notebook 13, p. 46. Reproduced in Ann Temkin, *Gabriel Orozco*, Tate 2011, p. 180.

<sup>19</sup> L. Le Feuvre (ed.), *Carol Bove/Carlo Scarpa*, Henry Moore Institute, Leeds; Museion, Bolzano and Museum Dhondt-Dhaenens, Deurle, 2014, p. 72

<sup>20</sup> Y-A. Bois, B. H. D Buchloh (eds), *Gabriel Orozco*, October Files 9, Boston, MA: The MIT Press, 2009, p. 177.

<sup>21</sup> J. Morgan, *Gabriel Orozco*, Tate, 2011, p. 105.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 105.

<sup>23</sup> G. Beltramini (ed.), *Carlo Scarpa e la scultura del '900*, Marsilio, 2008, p. 19. Selected excerpts from the book were kindly translated from Italian to English by Federico Casari.

<sup>24</sup> In addition, Scarpa redesigned the exterior of the Italian pavilion, where he built a temporary screen-like structure on its façade.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 281.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 281.

<sup>27</sup> His brother was a sculptor, and he was friends with several sculptors such as Wilhelm Lehmbruck, Rudolf Belling and Paul Henning. His sketchbooks also include numerous sculpture drawings in relation to his architectural plans. *Ibid.*, p. 281.

<sup>28</sup> P. Curtis, *Patio and Pavilion: The Place of Sculpture in Modern Architecture*, Ridinghouse, 2006, p. 11.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 15.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 19-20.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 26.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.* p. 20.

<sup>33</sup> *Ibid.*, p.19.

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 27.

<sup>35</sup> Curtis, p. 113.

<sup>36</sup> Dan Graham, *Two-Way Mirror Power: Selected Writings by Dan Graham on His Art*, MIT Press, 2000, p. 155. Graham's essay 'Notes on *Public Space/Two Audiences*' was originally published in *Aspects*, no. 5 (Winter 1978).

---

<sup>37</sup> Curtis, p. 138.

<sup>38</sup> D. Birnbaum, 'Delays and revolutions' in F. Bonami (ed.), *Dreams and Conflicts: The Dictatorship of the Viewer*, La Biennale di Venezia, 2003, p. 3.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 3.

<sup>40</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 3-4.

<sup>41</sup> P. Burger, *Theory of the Avant-garde*, Manchester University Press, 1974.

<sup>42</sup> Birnbaum, p. 3.

<sup>43</sup> Sergio Los, *Carlo Scarpa: An Architectural Guide*, (Verona, 1995), p. 20.

<sup>44</sup> 'Inherent Vice: The Replica and its Implications in Modern Sculpture,' *Tate Papers*, special issue no. 8, Tate Gallery, Autumn 2007.

<sup>45</sup> Other notable examples of pavilion reconstructions include: Gerrit Rietveld's 1955 pavilion for the Third International Sculpture Exhibition in Arnhem's Sonsbeek Park reconstructed in 1965 by Aldo Van Eyck; Aldo Van Eyck's Sonsbeek pavilion was reconstructed in 2006 in Otterlo, The Netherlands.

<sup>46</sup> C. S. Wood, A. Nagel, *Anachronic Renaissance*, The MIT Press, 2010, p. 51.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 51.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 52.

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 53.

<sup>50</sup> B.H. D. Buchloh et. al. (eds), 'To Make an Inner Time: a Conversation with Gabriel Orozco,' *October* 130, Fall 2009, p. 183.

<sup>51</sup> Gabriel Orozco, 'Gabriel Orozco in Conversation with Benjamin H. D. Buchloh' (2004), in *Gabriel Orozco*, October Files 9, edited by Y. A. Bois, (Boston, MA: The MIT Press, 2009), 105-120, p. 105. This public conversation took place at the Sackler Museum at Harvard University, April 18, 2007, under the auspices of the M. Victor Leventritt Lectures on Latin American Art.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 120.

<sup>53</sup> Lois Parkinson Zamora, *The Usable Past: The Imagination of History in Recent Fiction of the Americas*, Cambridge University Press, 1997, p. 39.