

British Now:
Sculpture and Other Drawings

EDWARD ALLINGTON

TONY CRAGG

RICHARD DEACON

ANTONY GORMLEY

ANISH KAPOOR

RICHARD LONG

DAVID TREMLETT

ALISON WILDING

BILL WOODROW

Sandra Grant Marchand

Musée d'art contemporain de Montréal
September 21, 1988 – January 8, 1989

Acknowledgments

A great many people gave generously of their time and energy in the organizing of the exhibition *British Now: Sculpture and Other Drawings*. We wish to acknowledge the confidence and support shown by all of our collaborators in this major undertaking.

Particular thanks must go to Henry Meyric Hughes, director of the Fine Arts Department at The British Council. Also at The British Council in London, Roger Boulter, head of the Special Visits Section, and Amanda Hussey, program organizer, played an instrumental role, for which we are extremely grateful. We are also indebted to Malcolm Douglas for the invaluable assistance he provided. Norman Bissett, The British Council representative in Edinburgh, and Arthur Sanderson, regional director of The British Council in Glasgow, made our all too short visit to Scotland considerably easier. We would like to express our deep appreciation, as well, to Jackie Ford and Brett Rogers, exhibition officers in the Fine Arts Department of The British Council. And we could not have done without the help of our drivers, in particular Peter in London and Dick Martin in Edinburgh.

Charles Chadwick, cultural affairs representative of The British Council in Canada, and Anna Lamarra, The British Council director in Montréal, enthusiastically supported our proposal to present an exhibition of British art at the Musée d'art contemporain de Montréal from the very start and gave us their tireless cooperation throughout.

In our two research trips, we benefited from numerous interviews with artists and specialists who graciously agreed to share their critical analysis with us. We thank them most sincerely. Among the latter group, we ought to mention Judy Adam, then director of the Anthony d'Offay Gallery, London; Sue Brown, co-director of the Pentonville Gallery, London; Neil Butler, director of The Zap Club, Brighton; Matthew Collins, editor of *Artscribe*, London; Paul Conran, co-director of Birch and Conran Fine Art, London; Fiona Dunlop, editor of *Artline*, London; Ann Gallagher, documentalist at Nigel Greenwood Books, London; René Gimpel, director, Gimpel Fils Gallery, London; Mark Glazebrook, director, Albermale Gallery, London; Keith Hartley, assistant keeper at The Scottish National Gallery of Modern Art, Edinburgh; Claus Henning, director, Visual Arts, Visiting Arts, London; Victoria Keller, co-director, 369 Gallery, Edinburgh; Robin Klassnik, director, Matt's Gallery, London; Katherine Lacey, assistant keeper of the Modern Collection at The Tate Gallery, London; Catherine Lampert, then exhibitions organizer at the Hayward Gallery, London, and now director of the Whitechapel Art Gallery, London; Jeremy Lewison, curator, head of Prints and Drawings, The Tate Gallery, London; James Lingwood, curator, Institute of Contemporary Arts, London; Fiona McCleod, interim director, Fruitmarket Gallery, Edinburgh; Andrew Nairne, exhibitions organizer, Third Eye Centre, Glasgow; Sandy Nairne, department head, Arts Council of Great Britain, London; Michael Newman,

art critic; William Packer, critic, *The Financial Times*, London; Michael Regan, visual arts officer, Canada House, London; Anthony Reynolds, director, Anthony Reynolds Gallery, London; Nicholas Serota, then director of the Whitechapel Art Gallery, London, and now director of The Tate Gallery, London; Peter Townsend, editor, *Arts Monthly*, London; Helen van de Meij, art critic and gallerist, London; and Alistair Warman, director, Serpentine Gallery, London. Finally, we wish to acknowledge the particular assistance offered by Michael Auping, Chief Curator, Albright-Knox Art Gallery, Buffalo.

A large number of collectors consented to lend one or more works for this Montréal presentation and so made the exhibition possible. We are immeasurably grateful to them. In addition, certain gallerists made indispensable contributions. Special thanks are due to Adriaan van Ravesteijn, Art & Project, Amsterdam; Donald Young and Barbara Mirecki, Donald Young Gallery, Chicago; Nicholas Logsdail and Elisabeth McCrae, Lisson Gallery, Judy Adam and Lorcan O'Neill, Anthony d'Offay Gallery, and Karsten Schubert, Karsten Schubert Ltd., all in London; Burnett Miller and Rachel McCampbell, Burnett Miller Gallery, Los Angeles; and, in New York, Barbara Gladstone, Barbara Gladstone Gallery, Marian Goodman and Jill Sussman-Walla, Marian Goodman Gallery, Carolyn Martin and Jennifer L. Dolt, Salvatore Ala Gallery, and Mathias Rastofer, Hirsch and Adler Galleries. We are greatly obliged, as well, to Bonnie Clearwater of The Lannan Foundation, Los Angeles, Sandra H. Olsen, director, Buscaglia-Castellani Art Gallery, Niagara University, Niagara Falls, New York, and Patrick McCaughey, director, Wadsworth Atheneum, Hartford, Connecticut.

To Edward Allington, Tony Cragg, Richard Deacon, Antony Gormley, Anish Kapoor, Richard Long, David Tremlett, Alison Wilding and Bill Woodrow, we can only say how delighted we are to be exhibiting their work, for the first time for most of them, at the Musée d'art contemporain de Montréal.

Our colleagues here at the Musée showed unflagging dedication throughout the various phases of this project. During our leave of absence, Josée Bélisle, curator, skillfully and energetically took over the job of putting the exhibition in its final form and supervising every aspect; Suzanne Tremblay carried out the biographical and bibliographical research and gathered the visual and factual documentation necessary for the catalogue; at the Documentation Centre, Michelle Gauthier and Johanne Lefebvre readily responded to our countless requests; Christine Bernier diligently coordinated the arrangements for transporting the 70 or so works in the exhibition; Carole Paul discharged all secretarial duties in impeccable fashion; in the Communications Department, Régine Thomasset, Claude Guérin, Manon Guérin and Colette Robitaille ably oversaw production of the catalogue and circulated information on the exhibition; and finally, Pierre Duchesne and the technical staff expertly met the many challenges involved in mounting an exhibition of this kind. To all of them, we reiterate our heartfelt appreciation.

S.G.M.

Foreword

To affirm the importance of the British sculpture produced over the last 10 years may seem like stating the obvious, but we should not let this serve as an excuse to avoid any assessment. This is especially true insofar as, although the work of these artists is known through the media, few Montréal art lovers have ever had the opportunity to experience it directly. The Musée d'art contemporain de Montréal is thus continuing its well established role of assembling, for the exhibition *British Now: Sculpture and Other Drawings*, a collection of works by nine artists who, one way or another, have made a contribution in Britain to recent developments in sculpture. Two questions present themselves here. Given that the museum is focusing attention on British artists, we might ask why it has chosen to show only sculptors? And why favour British artists? The exclusive concern here with artists who practice sculpture does not indicate any lack of interest in other forms of artistic expression in Britain. On the contrary, the presence, alongside the three-dimensional works, of drawings by the same artists demonstrates a broader curiosity. Moreover, we make no assertion that there exists a *school* of British sculpture, as this would bestow an authority on these artists that they never intended to claim. However provocative and disturbing their work may be, they never wished to set themselves up as models for other artists. Rather, they are implicated in the general questioning which neither sculpture nor any other art form has succeeded in escaping, in Britain as much as elsewhere, the question of what is a suitable object for sculpture, what should actually be sculpted. This exhibition does not pretend to solve such a fundamental problem, but illustrates the intensity with which it has appeared to some artists and how they have come to terms with it.

Our thanks are due to the curator, Sandra Grant Marchand, for all the research she carried out for the exhibition she invites us now to view. We also want to express our deep gratitude to the British Council for its generous collaboration with us on this project. To the participating artists and the galleries that represent them, as well as the institutions and collectors that agreed to loan us works, we extend our sincere appreciation.

We would also like to thank all the members of the Musée's staff who contributed directly or indirectly to the organization of this exhibition. Finally, we hope all our visitors understand how much we value their indispensable support.

Marcel Brisebois
Director

Preface

Last June we witnessed a ritual very familiar to the international art community: the opening of the 43rd Venice Biennial. The five pavilions that attracted the most attention were those of Germany, Belgium, Spain, the United States and Britain. A few hours before the jury gave its verdict, rumours were circulating to the effect that the first prize would go to Tony Cragg, who was representing Britain. Even though the experts decided otherwise, the fact remains that, above and beyond all the reasons that might dictate the choice of such a first prize, the public had already made up its mind.

This anecdote, of itself quite innocent, nevertheless illustrates rather well that, in spite of the time that has passed since *Objects and Sculpture* (London, 1981) — the event which was to define the new directions in British sculpture and mark its entry onto the international scene — this sculpture remains absolutely relevant.

There are a number of reasons for this. For those who experience it, the British sculpture of the past decade evokes an atmosphere, a place or a dimension that is strange. The origins and the nature of the objects are familiar and yet the unconventional treatment they are given reveals another world to us. The familiar and the unfamiliar are combined.

It does not much matter whether this sculpture is abstract or figurative, because the techniques used to produce it — whether they are complex or simple — recall some kind of clever handiwork. "Bricolage," assemblage and theatrical presentation are all possible ways of expressing the poetry of an object.

In Québec, Michel Goulet, Gilles Mihalcean, Martha Townsend and, to some extent, Geneviève Cadieux are artists who, in their own way, include familiar objects in their pieces. These artists use objects not for their functions but for their power of evocation, their form or simply as a pretext for subversion. In any case, both British and Québec sculpture focuses special attention on the object or its copy. Once it is removed from the familiar world of the everyday, the object, laden with cultural values and spiritual connotations, becomes metaphorical, even allegorical, all the while preserving its own identity.

In other words, British sculpture remains important because it has not yet totally exhausted the meaning of the object and the meaning of art.

Moreover, this sculpture is both complex in form — following no rigid rules — and in meaning, leaving much of the interpretation up to the viewer. While some works betray a sense of humour, it is not gratuitous humour. Indeed, it occasionally implies a muffled critical discourse which might, at one moment, accuse some era of disdaining the power of the imagination, or, at another moment, an art movement of being too preoccupied with analysis, narration and answers. British sculpture therefore suggests the possibility of personal and artistic freedom and it reinstates the idea of originality as a criterion for the critical assessment of work.

We should therefore not be surprised to discover that British sculpture is a hybrid, a mixture of styles. This mixture is a result of the permissive climate established by the work of these very artists. Their works are precariously balanced, not physically speaking — although most of them do not require bases or any special means of display — but rather in terms of the conceptual dimensions they offer. The British sculptors have, in fact, set themselves the challenge of allowing the coexistence within a single work of different, often contradictory, forms and fundamentally opposed ideas like nature and culture, wholeness and fragmentation, high and low art, presentation and representation. It is this major undertaking that confers on all the work its complexity and fragility of meaning.

Sandra Grant Marchand, the curator of the *British Now: Sculpture and Other Drawings* exhibition, has chosen to focus particularly on the relationship between the drawings and sculpture of nine artists whose artistic practice seems central to critical issues now being debated internationally. Although generalizing from particular cases is always problematic, it remains that this connection between drawing and sculpture is symptomatic of a general attitude among contemporary British artists.

Thus their pieces, images and objects, are the result of a complex interweaving of the image, the materials and the shapes. Drawing and sculpture confront each other or come together in the different permutations examined by Sandra Grant Marchand. The selection here is intended to throw light both on the nature of British sculpture and on the broader goals of contemporary art as a whole.

Manon Blanchette
Chief Curator

Sculpture or Drawing, Drawing and Sculpture

An exhibition of nine British artists who, by and large, have never shown their work in Québec,¹ might seem at first to be an arbitrary gathering, in view of the context which gave rise to these works and the complexity of their interconnections. However, bringing these artists together in a single exhibition in Montréal provides an occasion to display a cross section of recent, contemporary British art. It partially fits in with the enumeration determined by international recognition of a local artistic production, of sculpture for the most part, by artists who belong to the same generation.² The many similar appropriations, in group exhibitions consisting of monolithic collections of works that are actually quite different, have become standard indicators, particularly abroad, of the creative excitement surrounding new developments in sculpture in Britain.³ Likewise, our selection of artists for this exhibition is tailored to meet the needs of a first showing at the Musée d'art contemporain de Montréal. The major body of work highlighted is drawn from the production of some of the British sculptors whose creative mastery of their chosen medium has made an important contribution to its contemporary history.

This exhibition is based partly on certain parallels, which have often been described, between the distinctive characteristics of British sculptural practice over the last decade. Critics have enthusiastically pointed out that the work of many of these artists is linked by common attitudes to the introduction and novel use of commodities from everyday life and from "bricolage." Such criticism has concentrated largely on perceiving some consensus in the diverse issues raised through the different sculptural styles — for example, the resurgence of the object within sculptural practice, or the search for archetypal forms.⁴ Such linkage of individual approaches into something conveniently labelled "New British Sculpture"⁵ gave rise to an amalgam of associations between sculptors whose scope was impressive but who were otherwise far from sharing a common sensibility. While such influences are instantly recognizable (categorization by medium, generation, nationality), our selection of work here scoffs at the idea that some choices are automatic and some absences unjustifiable. More importantly, the collection of pieces exhibited here concentrates on the potential, reciprocal relationship between the practice of sculpture and the notion of drawing⁶ which usually escapes any very specific definition. The prospect of making a survey or an assessment of activities which would be exemplary recedes in favour of the juxtaposition of sculptural work and drawing by these nine artists.

Rather than wishing to contain the various paths followed by these artists within the category narrowly defined and rather perfunctorily described as "New British Sculpture" (a term which, in any case, has exhausted the meaning it initially had in the early eighties when it represented emergence of innovative practices), the exhibition chooses to look

at this sculpture from the sole standpoint of drawing. Without presupposing any specific relationship between sculpture and drawing — their relationship is, in any case, neither always nor necessarily problematic — the selection of pieces explores the inclusion of drawing in sculpture and the many forms this takes. The confrontation between sculpture and drawing, which occurs in distinctly individual ways for each of the artists we meet here, thus calls attention to the strictly sculptural or drawn qualities of their work. The boldness of this point of view — which means at least as many readings as there are viewers — is sustained by spontaneous reflection on the decompartmentalization of artistic disciplines evident in the last two decades in particular. It is quite obvious from the constant reevaluation of the genres traditionally sanctified by art history — like sculpture and drawing — that current aesthetic ideas are characterized by changing hierarchies. For some of these British artists, the activity of sculpture is carried on in eloquent parallel with that of drawing; for others, the practices of sculpture and drawing are closely and significantly allied. For still others the paths of sculpture and drawing may equally be separated or combined.

The sculpture/drawing dichotomy inherent in these artists' reflective activity, as well as in their pragmatic attitude to materials and processes, does not affect the continuity and persistence of the preoccupation which is central for each and every one of them, namely sculpture. These artists are, above all, sculptors. Although they draw, taking advantage of the extensive possibilities of this expressive act, exercising the many ways in which drawing takes on life and materiality, the primary focus of their production is sculpture. It is here that they concentrate their plastic expression and visual syntax. To call oneself a sculptor, and to be recognized as such, in spite of the strength of drawing as a meaningful, parallel activity, reminds us of how easily the boundaries between the genres assert themselves. How is it that drawing, no matter how important its role in the work, usually ends up as no more than a permissible trace of the artist's free expression from his totally subjective point of view.

Perhaps the drawing aesthetic has been undermined over the centuries by a desire to preserve the separate domains of painting, sculpture and architecture and, simultaneously, by a tendency to trivialize drawing's role by defining it in concise but absolute terms. The privileged position that drawing holds in the hierarchy of genres — only drawing has been associated, since the Renaissance, with the neoplatonic idea of pure expression of thought — actually helps maintain the gap between drawing and other artistic modes which are firmly rooted in their materiality and derive their meaning from it. From this confining historical point of view the whole notion of drawing is essentially determined in relation to some other practice — in this case, sculpture. The activity which is drawing — as gesture — occurs freely and autonomously at the heart of the process.

These British sculptors each make this connection between drawing and the work of sculpture differently. The way they see the function of

drawing within their work is not necessarily a matter of the drawn, sculptural or even pictorial shapes the piece takes. This is why we find, in the work of these artists, a particularly varied range of analytical consideration, from the description of sculpture as a form of drawing to one of drawing as sculpture, or from the idea of drawing as subordinate to sculpture to that of sculpture at the service of drawing. At either of these extremes there comes into play a desire to define the work in some all-embracing way, sculptural or pictorial as the case may be. Moreover, the obvious diversity of materials and methods that these artists use to incorporate drawing into the development of such spatial or illusionist shapes provides an angle of interpretation for us. We discover that the means of drawing no longer appear inevitably and solely determined by the fact of a graphic mark on paper. What constitutes drawing in the work, what allows us to identify it as drawing, is also contributed by the actual material of the piece. As sculpture, the material may be altered, assembled or constructed; as painting, it may be applied flat or in relief; as an installation, it may be a composite of different techniques and approaches. The very notion of drawing becomes that of working on the material and is defined through the elements of the medium. It is principally this way of inserting drawing into the sculptural domain that interests us here.

To begin with, Richard Long does not draw. Nonetheless the motifs of circle, line and spiral that are commonly associated with the idea of drawing occur plainly and repeatedly throughout his entire body of work. Both his wall drawings and his floor sculptures continually reproduce these particular configurations, implicitly recalling his interventions in the selected landscapes (the photographs, maps and texts serve as additional, more explicit referents). Long nevertheless rejects a formalist justification for the persistence of linear elements characteristic of his work, and it seems quite obvious that any attempt to define his work reductively would drain his art of its real significance. What he gives us, in the gallery or museum space, by repeating the same formal vocabulary reduced to abstract simplicity, is more an artistic activity which focuses on the gesture inherent in the work and on the nature of the material. The most elementary form of plastic expression, the line, which also becomes the circle or spiral, is a kind of equivalent, within the art piece which is actually exhibited, of the trajectory which Long traces for himself as he passes through a natural site, or, at least, the line is invested with all these connotations.

The line's presence through the work takes on meaning because it refers back to the artist's action, his direct intervention in space and time. "It is the act of walking itself that creates my art,"⁷ says Long, while the visual appearance of the work, here wall drawings and a floor sculpture, is mainly a result of the particular characteristics of the process his work is based on and the importance he attributes to the mark left by the natural elements. His framed drawings (this time produced by his muddy footprints) involving his body and his movements become "flat sculptures on

the wall."⁸ Moreover, the two-dimensional rearrangement here of Niagara sandstone laid out in the perfect form of a circle appears as a relief drawing on the ground — at least we may be justified in reading it this way.

Although Richard Long's work is one of "memory,"⁹ a memory of nature, of physical gesture, it is equally concerned with conceptualization and the formation of ideas. His sculptures are factual, assemblages of stones extracted from the sites he chooses, just as his drawings are projections or marks made with some muddy material (between stone and water); his drawings, like his sculptures, are conceptual, made up of formal signs distributed within a determined pattern of forms.

The characteristics of drawing constantly and visibly recur in Richard Deacon's sculpture. Conceived as a structure that is all-encompassing and in which the linear element, in particular, expresses both gesture and thought, the drawing adds a dimension and in a way defines the process intrinsic to the development of Deacon's sculptural shapes.

We might describe Deacon's three-dimensional work as drawing in space, although the reductive premise of such a statement lacks resonance, given the complexity and range of meaning of his work. Perhaps we should question our critical distance when we indulge in such simplification, and be suspicious of adopting this single formalist point of view. However, these pieces tend towards abstraction and invite us to consider what it is that specifically characterizes them: the repetitive strength of the line, sinuous and free, traces a profile within the space, defining, isolating and emphasizing a structure in the emptiness.

To talk about drawing or abstraction in relation to Deacon's sculpture is not to deny the hint of latent figuration by which the formal features of his work reveal external references. The metaphors with which his pieces are most frequently associated (biomorphic elements suggesting the perception or representation of reality), as well as the way they are made which is clearly exposed by the evidence of the treatment techniques, are also an integral part of the conceptualization of these sculptural drawings.

Richard Deacon has a parallel production of drawings on paper, which serve either as documentation or as autonomous works. In either case they relate to the concerns we find in his sculpture and confirm the importance of his reflection on the formal element generated by the linear structure and also echoed metaphorically in the curvilinear shapes made by the strips of wood or sheets of steel.

Tony Cragg's sculptural work has many affinities with drawing. To begin with, his wall sculptures — literally spreads of various waste objects organized with a predetermined outline — might be described as tracings, kinds of drawings sapped of their expressivity. The definition and precision of the contours which, paradoxically, are meant to emphasize the internal fragmentation of the elements, are actually the result of preconceived formal decisions about the representation, about the meaning of the work as well as the figurative quality of the materials. Outlined in two-dimensional

space and resembling a projection of fragments against the surface, these particles of the everyday create a fictitious image and screen out any reality that might be identified in the fiction. The constant exaggeration of the proportions, the stylization and the relentless repetition of shapes also divert our attention from the identity of the objects. Although these works are essentially sculptures, because they amount to assemblages of shapes in space, they are also drawings. By investing the space of the wall, they suggest a different relationship with the sculptural components and ultimately lend them an archetypal character.

Cragg's floor works, when they also consist of elements scattered within an outline on a surface, like in the one exhibited here, are constructed according to a logical order which uses either the size of the objects, their colour or the material they are made of as a reference. The geometric line which is sometimes dominant — the spiral, for example — refers us directly back to the systematic arrangement of the components and to the pictorial quality which emerges from within the structure. The sculpture becomes a surface where the presence of three-dimensional elements serves to conceal the formal associations that can be read there.

This formal unity is even more explicit in Cragg's work when an extreme calligraphy breaks down the sculpture — which is constructed of juxtaposed volumes — into as many drawn surfaces. The shapes, this time literally situated in the sculptural space, are returned to the drawing space. The sculpture strives to be identified in relation to an overall configuration (which the title points to), while the drawing, because of its condensed abstract content and tension, contradicts the references, even those that are implicit.

When Alison Wilding draws it is from a spontaneous desire to scribble and, for a moment, she seems to escape the restraint that characterizes her use of the expressive gesture. For in her sculpture, which she produces by working directly with the materials and without recourse to preliminary sketches, the outline precisely describes shapes which are literally cut into the material. The space of the work — its physical and psychological boundaries — is that of the configurations which the materials form on the ground, the wall, or in space.

The dichotomies in play in her shapes are as much a result of the materials she chooses and their textural qualities (granite is contrasted with steel, copper confronts bronze, pigment is applied to wood, etc.) as of the structures themselves, which are often binary. These related factors, which Wilding focuses on in the gradual development of her pieces, are governed by her ideas about the language of sculpture: "Slow ideas are generated through carving stone or wood. That in itself is never enough. It is the quick part — which is a response to the slow — more spontaneous, sometimes like drawing, which tells you how to see it, which changes the nature of the sculpture into more than just a carving."¹⁰ The reflective attitude she associates with the process of modelling is complemented by a pragmatics

that has certain affinities with drawing and consists of creating a sculptural "space," of defining its territory. The persistence in Wilding's work of a preoccupation with volumes that surround, enclose or separate interior and exterior space is linked to the elaboration of metaphorical meanings which are suggested within and endow her work with an aura and an ineffable presence. To sum up in Wilding's words, "... whilst firmly placed in our world the sculpture should take us out of it, offering a glimpse of an alternative order. . ."¹¹

For Edward Allington drawing fundamentally provides a "conceptual model"¹² within the practice of art. In itself merely a device that amounts to "a rendering of three-dimensional objects on a two-dimensional plane,"¹³ drawing is for him a strategy which involves a practice and discipline and which sets up relationships between various ideas and questions about art.

In this way, Allington recalls in his drawings the elements of a borrowed vocabulary which is drawn from the general repertory of styles (rococo ornamental motifs, for instance). Through their organization in an exaggerated perspective space, he constructs scenarios of virtual reconstitutions or of reappropriations. These conditions, themselves illusory, force us to re-evaluate the iconographies of art history and hence their current meanings.

In the contemporary context of "a world full of repetitions of things, a world of endless reproducibility,"¹⁴ the question of authenticity is posed with particular acuteness for Allington, as much in terms of everyday objects swallowed up in the cycle of consumption — fossils of the present — as in relation to those "traces" of the past which have been shaped by the nostalgia of an ideal and finally distorted by the subsequent layering of many interpretations.

The display of fragments and their shadows on the sheet of paper, imprinted with a warped linear system or else writings in an old ledger, becomes the premise of their reconstruction in sculptural form. What the disjointed elements seen in the drawing serve to illustrate is basically the idea of the sculpture as it appears to Allington in the course of drawing. The sculpture follows from the drawing, from ideas worked out in the drawing; in this sense, it is the drawing which completes the sculpture, whereas the sculpture is not fully embodied in the drawing.

Inserted in a sculptural or architectural object — as it is here — the drawing completes the ideas underlying the artifice of their presentation in the ideological and cultural context of the museum or gallery.

David Tremlett produces very large wall drawings as well as drawings on paper, but he still calls himself a sculptor. "I am a sculptor, I utilize my hands to do my work, in which there is no illusion, no colour. I model the pastel which is like clay, and the result is flat and it doesn't resemble a sculpture. But what is a sculpture? — that's the question my work poses."¹⁵ Then we should also add: what is a drawing? When all is said and done, Tremlett's sculptural practice fits into forms traditionally defined as drawing

(two-dimensional surface, linear outlines of the volumes, schematic organization). Without attempting to put into words the nature of drawing, or the essence of sculpture, it is nevertheless important to reiterate the questions which Tremlett's work provokes and which seem to be posed by contemporary activity in sculpture and drawing, in the expansion and transformation of art practices and the redefinition of the various media.

Tremlett calls his drawings "sculptures"¹⁶ because he models them with his hands, in the physical substance of the pastel which is applied directly to the wall (or sheet of paper), because he works "with space, not only inside the space"¹⁷ that supports his pieces, and because the forms that result from the treatment of the coloured planes are conceived sculpturally and non-illusionistically (witness his use of a limited range of non-colours and natural tones).

This drawn "sculpture" is also, and primarily, a transposition of the real space that Tremlett works with during his frequent visits to places like Africa, Australia, Alaska, Mexico, etc. From notes in his travel diaries, he reconstructs, in the form of schematic drawings, the geographic and cultural realities that have left their stamp on his memory. The lines, colours, and even the words become vague recollections, in forms bordering on abstraction. The anecdote becomes diluted, overshadowed in the purified drawing on the surface. The drawn space defines the architectural which, in turn, is a receptacle for the idea of three-dimensional forms.

For Bill Woodrow, drawing within sculpture is a matter of cutting into the material and transforming it. Woodrow appropriates the surfaces of objects from our consumer culture and literally extracts shapes from them which he assembles or reconstructs as distinct elements that unleash references and new imagery.

First creating an empty space on the plane surface of the objects he chooses to alter, Woodrow then further emphasizes in various ways the contours of these tears in the material as if to stress their incongruity. His drawings, which violate the object and its mass-produced look and identity, also disrupt its function. Even before it regains meaning as a new object, drawn surface — actually an absence — modifies these industrial artifacts that are trademarks of our society.

The gesture of the drawing, the laceration and cutting away of the material, carries an expressive content which is highlighted by the suggestive form from which there will emerge another product, this time fabricated by the artist's imagination. The tension between the unshakable materiality of the standardized object and the almost whimsical sketch made by the shape which slices through it simultaneously evokes and denies the possibility of recreating dreams in contemporary culture.

Antony Gormley's drawing and sculpture are carried out as parallel activities, independent but complementary: drawing "fixes the world. A drawing is a diagram."¹⁸ Sculpture as a "visual means (...) refers to things that cannot be seen."¹⁹ Although he emphasizes the distinction, Gormley

manages to combine these differences in a vision which transcends the descriptive limitations of the two media. The omnipresent human figure is transformed by his sculpture into an immutable form, in steel (usually), "an expressive whole"²⁰ which his drawing renders as a merged mass without gravitational space. This sculptured, drawn figure represents both interior and exterior space, the imaginary and the real.

In sculpture, the figure is presented as it relates to architecture, with the location of the lines which divide its shape acting as a link with the elements of the architecture. The appearance of this linear element, which cuts across the volumes, strictly and visibly comes to terms with the horizontality or verticality of the space. The sculpture radiates, so to speak, out into space, contains it and is contained by it. The objectively defined lines on these steel bodies anchor the image in place and provide its stability, accentuating the direct interaction between the sculpture and what is outside its boundaries.

In drawing, the figure ruptures this balance, becoming a vehicle for internal space, for oneself, but also for external space, for the other. "A drawing is a lens which can be looked through both ways: out into space and back into the mind."²¹ If "sculpture already exists"²² insofar as it is a transformation of reality by the imagination, drawing, on the other hand, renders real "what could never exist" or, at least, something that only exists in the imagination. For Gormley, you can draw "equivalents to things which you can never make, which have to do with feelings and the way that things internal react."²³

Anish Kapoor is not priorly interested in theoretical distinctions between sculpture and drawing. His three-dimensional work includes sculptures and drawings, and his drawings are sometimes two and sometimes three-dimensional. "All sculpture includes drawing"²⁴ the artist tells us, and yet, drawing does not characterize all his sculpture.

"Impossible to define,"²⁵ drawing tends to reveal itself in terms of the specific relationship it either does or does not maintain with the work. Drawing is "of the mind" and sculpture, "of the body,"²⁶ notions which reflect the way Kapoor sees the difference between his drawn and his sculptural work.

Some of Kapoor's more formal sculptures therefore invite the viewer to experience the real space in which he moves, differentiates himself from the work and confronts its different elements. These composite sculptures, on the floor and/or the wall, involve the body via the dynamics of the connections which are woven between one unit and the next and within each unit in the interaction between surface and colour. Other sculptures, whose effect is pictorial, play more with the suggested two-dimensional space. These pieces, which are equally complex structures of juxtaposed elements or as sole elements, give us an illusion of space by making use of an undefined, unified colour field in which shapes become difficult to distinguish. The sculptures resemble paintings insofar as their surfaces, present

in the materiality of the saturated colour, escape us because of the immateriality of the shapes. They also act as drawings because, by breaking up the effect of volumes in space, they encourage the play of illusions and evoke the autonomous, two-dimensional, illusionist space of painting.

Kapoor's relief drawings, in which gouache and pigment emanate directly from the wall or the sheet of paper, resemble sculptural practice where form intrudes on the plane in a similar way and partakes of the real space or the creation of a spatial illusion.

Combining the sculptural and the drawn, the pieces chosen for this exhibition invite a critical examination of the way the artistic media are interrelated in the context of a contemporary art which has been enriched by the premises of formalist theory and language and nonetheless moving away from an emphasis on the self-referentiality of the art work. Sculpture or drawing, drawing and sculpture, these works deal with content, conceptualization, as well as materiality and the significance of its transformation. The genres and art practices in this exhibition defy the hierarchy of models and compel recognition by creating signs and providing their meanings. The titles which are given here are mostly remarkably eloquent and point, in their own way, to what we are invited to consider in the work, whether it be a drawing or a sculpture: *Feast for the Eye*, *Dying Slave*, *Blue Skies*, *Building with Missing Columns/To Be Seen from the Inside*, *Parrot Fashion*, *Home and the World*, *At the Hub of Things*...

Sandra Grant Marchand

NOTES

1. Edward Allington and Bill Woodrow in the travelling exhibition *Space Invaders* organized by The Mackenzie Art Gallery, University of Regina and shown at the Musée d'art contemporain de Montréal from May 29 to August 31, 1986. Tony Cragg and Bill Woodrow in *Les vingt ans du Musée à travers sa collection*, Musée d'art contemporain de Montréal, January 27 to August 21, 1985.
2. Only Richard Long is considered a member of the generation immediately preceding that of the other artists in this exhibition.
3. The first important gathering of work by British sculptors of this generation was for the *Objects & Sculpture* exhibition which was held jointly in 1981, at the Institute of Contemporary Arts in London and the Arnolfini Gallery in Bristol. A number of exhibitions abroad subsequently reunited the work of these British sculptors: the Venice Biennial, 1982; Documenta 7 at Kassel, 1982; *Leçons de choses* at Berne Kunsthalle, 1982; *British Sculpture Now* at the Lucerne Kunstmuseum, 1982; *Transformations—New Sculpture From Britain*, 17th São Paulo Biennial, 1983...
4. On this subject see Michael Newman's article "New Sculpture in Britain" in *Art in America*, September 1982, pp. 177-178.

5. For example, see Michael Newman's article "New Sculpture in Britain" in *Art in America*, pp. 104-114, 177-178; John Roberts' article "Urban Renewal — New British Sculpture" in *Parachute*, March/April/May 1983, pp. 12-17; also the chapter called "Between Image and Object: The New British Sculpture" by Lynne Cooke, from the catalogue *A Quiet Revolution, British Sculpture Since 1965*, an exhibition organized by the Museum of Contemporary Art, Chicago and the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art, published by Thames and Hudson, 1987.
6. For a study of ideas about drawing since Cézanne, see the chapter called "Une perspective du dessin, aujourd'hui" by Bernice Rose, in *Le dessin*, Skira, 1979.
7. From the Claude Gintz' interview with Richard Long "Richard Long, la vision, le paysage, le temps," *Art Press*, June 1986, pp. 4-8.
8. *Idem*.
9. Rudi H. Fuchs, "Memories of Passing: A Note on Richard Long," in *Studio International*, April 1974, pp. 172-173.
10. Quoted by Jeremy Lewison in "Alison Wilding," *The British Show*, The Art Gallery of New South Wales, The British Council, 1985, p. 118.
11. From the catalogue *Entre el Objeto y la Imágen*, Madrid, 1986, p. 236, quoted by Lynne Cooke in "Alison Wilding: Sailing On," in *Artscribe International*, April/May 1986, pp. 46-47.
12. An expression used by Allington during a conversation on March 8, 1988.
13. *Idem*.
14. From an interview by Shin-ichi Nakazawa with Edward Allington, on January 12, 1988, in the exhibition catalogue *Edward Allington*, edited and published by FACE Gallery, Tokyo, 1988.
15. Quoted by Liliana Albertazzi in the article "David Tremlett: Old Falling Arch — Creel Mexico, 1986-1987" in *Galleries Magazine*, April/May 1987, pp. 62-65.
16. From a conversation with the artist on March 11, 1988.
17. *Idem*.
18. Quoted in *Antony Gormley*, edited by Salvatore Ala, Milan/New York, 1985, p. 7.
19. Quoted in *Antony Gormley*, Städtische Galerie Regensburg and the Frankfurter Kunstverein, 1985, p. 50.
20. *Idem*, p. 54.
21. Quoted in *Antony Gormley*, edited by Salvatore Ala, Milan/New York, 1985, p. 7.
22. Quoted in the catalogue *Documenta 8*, Kassel, 1987, Book 3.
23. From the interview by Mina Roustayi with Antony Gormley, "An Interview with Antony Gormley," in *Arts Magazine*, September 1987, pp. 21-25.
24. From a conversation with the artist on March 14, 1988.
25. *Idem*.
26. *Ibidem*.

CREDITS

British Now: Sculpture and Other Drawings

An exhibition organized by the Musée d'art contemporain de Montréal with the financial assistance of the Canada Council.

Curator: Sandra Grant Marchand

Exhibition organization: Josée Bélisle and Sandra Grant Marchand

Transport coordination: Christine Bernier

Research: Suzanne Tremblay

English translation: Lynn Hughes

English revision: Susan Le Pan

Proofreading: Paul Paiement

Secretariat: Carole Paul

Design: Lumbago

Typography: Zibra Inc.

Photolithography: Contact Couleur

Printing: Imprimerie O'Keefe

Printed in Canada

The Musée d'art contemporain de Montréal is supported by the ministère des Affaires culturelles du Québec and Communications Canada.

© 1988 Musée d'art contemporain de Montréal

Cité du Havre

Montréal (Québec) H3C 3R4

Legal deposit: Bibliothèque nationale du Québec

3rd quarter 1988

Canadian Cataloguing in Publication Data.

Grant Marchand, Sandra

British Now: Sculpture and Other Drawings.

Catalogue of the exhibition held at the Musée d'art contemporain de Montréal, September 21, 1988 – January 8, 1989.

Bibliogr.: p.

ISBN 2-551-12003-9

1. Art moderne – 20^e siècle – Grande-Bretagne – Expositions.
2. Art britannique – Expositions.
3. Sculpture britannique – Expositions.
4. Dessin britannique – Expositions.
- I. Musée d'art contemporain de Montréal.
- II. Titre.

N6768.G72 1988 709'.41'0740114281

C88-096410-3

Catalogue produced under the direction of the Communications Department.



MUSÉE D'ART CONTEMPORAIN DE MONTRÉAL