

Specific Objects

Half or more of the best new work in the last few years has been neither painting nor sculpture. Usually it has been related, closely or distantly, to one or the other. The work is diverse, and much in it that is not in painting and sculpture is also diverse. But there are some things that occur nearly in common.

The new three-dimensional work doesn't constitute a movement, school or style. The common aspects are too general and too little common to define a movement. The differences are greater than the similarities. The similarities are selected from the work; they aren't a movement's first principles or delimiting rules. Three-dimensionality is not as near being simply a container as painting and sculpture have seemed to be, but it tends to that. But now painting and sculpture are less neutral, less containers, more defined, not undeniable and unavoidable. They are particular forms circumscribed after all, producing fairly definite qualities. Much of the motivation in the new work is to get clear of these forms. The use of three dimensions is an obvious alternative. It opens to anything. Many of the reasons for this use are negative points against painting and sculpture, and since both are common sources, the negative reasons are those nearest commonage. "The motive to change is always some uneasiness: nothing setting us upon the change of state, or upon any new action, but some uneasiness."¹ The positive reasons are more particular. Another reason for listing the insufficiencies of painting and sculpture first is that both are familiar and their elements and qualities more easily located.

The objections to painting and sculpture are going to sound more intolerant than they are. There are qualifications. The disinterest in painting and sculpture is a disinterest in doing it again, not in it as it is being done by those who developed the last advanced versions. New work always involves objections to the old, but these objections are really relevant only to the new. They are part of it. If the earlier work is first-rate it is complete. New inconsistencies and limitations aren't retroactive; they concern only work that is being developed. Obviously, three-dimensional work will not cleanly succeed painting and sculpture. It's not like a movement; anyway, movements no longer work; also, linear history has unraveled somewhat. The new work exceeds painting in plain power, but power isn't the only consideration, though the difference between it and expression can't be too great either. There are other ways than power and form in which one kind of art can be more or less than another. Finally, a flat and rectangular surface is too handy to give up. Some things can be done only on a flat surface. Lichtenstein's representation of a representation is a good instance. But this work which is neither painting nor sculpture challenges both. It will have to be taken into account by new artists. It will probably change painting and sculpture.

The main thing wrong with painting is that it is a rectangular plane placed flat against the wall. A rectangle is a shape itself; it is obviously the whole shape; it determines and limits the arrangement of whatever is on or inside of it. In work before 1946 the edges of the rectangle are a boundary, the end of the picture. The composition must react to the edges and the rectangle must be unified, but the shape of the rectangle is not stressed; the parts are more important, and the relationships of color and form occur among them. In the paintings of Pollock, Rothko, Still and Newman, and more recently of Reinhardt and Noland, the rectangle is emphasized.

The elements inside the rectangle are broad and simple and correspond closely to the rectangle. The shapes and surface are only those which can occur plausibly within and on a rectangular plane. The parts are few and so subordinate to the unity as not to be parts in an ordinary sense. A painting is nearly an entity, one thing, and not the indefinable sum of a group of entities and references. The one thing overpowers the earlier painting. It also establishes the rectangle as a definite form; it is no longer a fairly neutral limit. A form can be used only in so many ways. The rectangular plane is given a life span. The simplicity required to emphasize the rectangle limits the arrangements possible within it. The sense of singleness also has a duration, but it is only beginning and has a better future outside of painting. Its occurrence in painting now looks like a beginning, in which new forms are often made from earlier schemes and materials.

JUDD

The plane is also emphasized and nearly single. It is clearly a plane one or two inches in front of another plane, the wall, and parallel to it. The relationship of the two planes is specific; it is a form. Everything on or slightly in the plane of the painting must be arranged laterally.

Almost all paintings are spatial in one way or another. Yves Klein's blue paintings are the only ones that are unspatial, and there is little that is nearly unspatial, mainly Stella's work. It's possible that not much can be done with both an upright rectangular plane and an absence of space. Anything on a surface has space behind it. Two colors on the same surface almost always lie on different depths. An even color, especially in oil paint, covering all or much of a painting is almost always both flat and infinitely spatial. The space is shallow in all of the work in which the rectangular plane is stressed. Rothko's space is shallow and the soft rectangles are parallel to the plane, but the space is almost traditionally illusionistic. In Reinhardt's paintings, just back from the plane of the canvas, there is a flat plane and this seems in turn indefinitely deep. Pollock's paint is obviously on the canvas, and the space is mainly that made by any marks on a surface, so that it is not very descriptive and illusionistic. Noland's concentric bands are not as specifically paint-on-a-surface as Pollock's paint, but the bands flatten the literal space more. As flat and unillusionistic as Noland's paintings are, the bands do advance and recede. Even a single circle will warp the surface to it, will have a little space behind it.

Except for a complete and unvaried field of color or marks, anything spaced in a rectangle and on a plane suggests something in and on something else, something in its surround, which suggests an object or figure in its space, in which these are clearer instances of a similar world – that's the main purpose of painting. The recent paintings aren't completely single. There are a few dominant areas, Rothko's rectangles or Noland's circles, and there is the area around them. There is a gap between the main forms, the most expressive parts, and the rest of the canvas, the plane and the rectangle. The central forms still occur in a wider and indefinite context, although the singleness of the paintings abridges the general and solipsistic quality of earlier work. Fields are also usually not limited, and they give the appearance of sections cut from something indefinitely larger.

Oil paint and canvas aren't as strong as commercial paints and as the colors and surfaces of materials, especially if the materials are used in three dimensions. Oil and canvas are familiar and, like the rectangular plane, have a certain quality and have limits. The quality is especially identified with art.

The new work obviously resembles sculpture more than it does painting, but it is nearer to painting. Most sculpture is like the painting which preceded Pollock, Rothko, Still and Newman. The newest thing about it is its broad scale. Its materials are somewhat more emphasized than before. The imagery involves a couple of salient resemblances to other visible things and a number of more oblique references, everything generalized to compatibility. The parts and the space are allusive, descriptive and somewhat naturalistic. Higgins' sculpture is an example, and, dissimilarly, di Suvero's. Higgins' sculpture mainly suggests machines and truncated bodies. Its combination of plaster and metal is more specific. Di Suvero uses beams as if they were brush strokes, imitating movement, as Kline did. The material never has its own movement. A beam thrusts, a piece of iron follows a gesture; together they form a naturalistic and anthropomorphic image. The space corresponds.

Most sculpture is made part by part, by addition, composed. The main parts remain fairly discrete. They and the small parts are a collection of variations, slight through great. There are hierarchies of clarity and strength and of proximity to one or two main ideas. Wood and metal are the usual materials, either alone or together, and if together it is without much of a contrast. There is seldom any color. The middling contrast and the natural monochrome are general and help to unify the parts.

There is little of any of this in the new three-dimensional work. So far the most obvious difference within this diverse work is between that which is something of an object, a single thing, and that which is open and extended, more or less environmental. There isn't as great a difference in their nature as in their appearance, though. Oldenburg and others have done both. There are precedents for some of the characteristics of the new work. The parts are usually subordinate and not separate in Arp's sculpture and often in Brancusi's. Duchamp's ready-mades and other Dada objects are also seen at once and not part by part. Cornell's boxes have too many parts to seem at first to be structured. Part-by-part structure can't be too simple or too complicated. It has to seem orderly.

JUDD

JUDD

The degree of Arp's abstraction, the moderate extent of his reference to the human body, neither imitative nor very oblique, is unlike the imagery of most of the new three-dimensional work. Duchamp's bottle-drying rack is close to some of it. The work of Johns and Rauschenberg and assemblage and low-relief generally, Ortman's reliefs for example, are preliminaries. Johns' few cast objects and a few of Rauschenberg's works, such as the goat with the tire, are beginnings.

Some European paintings are related to objects, Klein's for instance, and Castellani's, which have unvaried fields of low-relief elements. Arman and a few others work in three dimensions. Dick Smith did some large pieces in London with canvas stretched over cockeyed parallelepiped frames and with the surfaces painted as if the pieces were paintings. Philip King, also in London, seems to be making objects. Some of the work on the West Coast seems to be along this line, that of Larry Bell, Kenneth Price, Tony Delap, Sven Lukin, Bruce Conner, Kienholz of course, and others. Some of the work in New York having some or most of the characteristics is that by George Brecht, Ronald Bladen, John Willenbecher, Ralph Ortiz, Anne Truitt, Paul Harris, Barry McDowell, John Chamberlain, Robert Tanner, Aaron Kuriloff, Robert Morris, Nathan Raisen, Tony Smith, Richard Navin, Claes Oldenburg, Robert Watts, Yoshimura, John Anderson, Harry Soviak, Yayoi Kusama, Frank Stella, Salvatore Scarpitta, Neil Williams, George Segal, Michael Snow, Richard Artschwager, Arakawa, Lucas Samaras, Lee Bontecou, Dan Flavin and Robert Whitman. H.C. Westermann works in Connecticut. Some of these artists do both three-dimensional work and paintings. A small amount of the work of others, Warhol and Rosenquist for instance, is three-dimensional.

The composition and imagery of Chamberlain's work is primarily the same as that of earlier painting, but these are secondary to an appearance of disorder and are at first concealed by the material. The crumpled tin tends to stay that way. It is neutral at first, not artistic, and later seems objective. When the structure and imagery become apparent, there seems to be too much tin and space, more chance and casualness than order. The aspects of neutrality, redundancy and form and imagery could not be coextensive without three dimensions and without the particular material. The color is also both neutral and sensitive and, unlike oil colors, has a wide range. Most color that is integral, other than in painting, has been used in three-dimensional work. Color is never unimportant, as it usually is in sculpture.

Stella's shaped paintings involve several important characteristics of three-dimensional work. The periphery of a piece and the lines inside correspond. The stripes are nowhere near being discrete parts. The surface is farther from the wall than usual, though it remains parallel to it. Since the surface is exceptionally unified and involves little or no space, the parallel plane is unusually distinct. The order is not rationalistic and underlying but is simply order, like that of continuity, one thing after another. A painting isn't an image. The shapes, the unity, projection, order and color are specific, aggressive and powerful.

Painting and sculpture have become set forms. A fair amount of their meaning isn't credible. The use of three dimensions isn't the use of a given form. There hasn't been enough time and work to see limits. So far, considered most widely, three dimensions are mostly a space to move into. The characteristics of three dimensions are those of only a small amount of work, little compared to painting and sculpture. A few of the more general aspects may persist, such as the work's being like an object or being specific, but other characteristics are bound to develop. Since its range is so wide, three-dimensional work will probably divide into a number of forms. At any rate, it will be larger than painting and much larger than sculpture, which, compared to painting, is fairly particular, much nearer to what is usually called a form, having a certain kind of form. Because the nature of three dimensions isn't set, given beforehand, something credible can be made, almost anything. Of course something can be done within a given form, such as painting, but with some narrowness and less strength and variation. Since sculpture isn't so general a form, it can probably be only what it is now – which means that if it changes a great deal it will be something else; so it is finished.

Three dimensions are real space. That gets rid of the problem of illusionism and of literal space, space in and around marks and colors – which is riddance of one of the salient and most objectionable relics of European art. The several limits of painting are no longer present. A work can be as powerful as it can be thought to be. Actual space is intrinsically more powerful and specific than paint on a flat surface. Obviously, anything in three dimensions can be any shape, regular or irregular, and can have any relation to the wall, floor, ceiling, room, rooms or exterior or none at all. Any material can be used, as is or painted.

JUDD

A work needs only to be interesting. Most works finally have one quality. In earlier art the complexity was displayed and built the quality. In recent painting the complexity was in the format and the few main shapes, which had been made according to various interests and problems. A painting by Newman is finally no simpler than one by Cézanne. In the three-dimensional work the whole thing is made according to complex purposes, and these are not scattered but asserted by one form. It isn't necessary for a work to have a lot of things to look at, to compare, to analyze one by one, to contemplate. The thing as a whole, its quality as a whole, is what is interesting. The main things are alone and are more intense, clear and powerful. They are not diluted by an inherited format, variations of a form, mild contrasts and connecting parts and areas. European art had to represent a space and its contents as well as have sufficient unity and aesthetic interest. Abstract painting before 1946 and most subsequent painting kept the representational subordination of the whole to its parts. Sculpture still does. In the new work the shape, image, color and surface are single and not partial and scattered. There aren't any neutral or moderate areas or parts, any connections or transitional areas. The difference between the new work and earlier painting and present sculpture is like that between one of Brunelleschi's windows in the Badia di Fiesole and the facade of the Palazzo Rucellai, which is only an undeveloped rectangle as a whole and is mainly a collection of highly ordered parts.

The use of three dimensions makes it possible to use all sorts of materials and colors. Most of the work involves new materials, either recent inventions or things not used before in art. Little was done until lately with the wide range of industrial products. Almost nothing has been done with industrial techniques and, because of the cost, probably won't be for some time. Art could be mass-produced, and possibilities otherwise unavailable, such as stamping, could be used. Dan Flavin, who uses fluorescent lights, has appropriated the results of industrial production. Materials vary greatly and are, simply materials – formica, aluminum, cold-rolled steel, Plexiglass, red and common brass, and so forth. They are specific. If they are used directly, they are more specific.

Also, they are usually aggressive. There is an objectivity to the obdurate identity of a material. Also, of course, the qualities of materials – hard mass, soft mass, thickness of 1/32, 1/16, 1/8 inch, pliability, slickness, translucency, dullness – have unobjective uses. The vinyl of Oldenburg's soft objects looks the same as ever, slick, flaccid and a little disagreeable, and is objective, but it is pliable and can be sewn and stuffed with air and kapok and hung or set down, sagging or collapsing. Most of the new materials are not as accessible as oil on canvas and are hard to relate to one another. They aren't obviously art. The form of a work and its materials are closely related. In earlier work the structure and the imagery were executed in some neutral and homogeneous material. Since not many things are lumps, there are problems in combining the different surfaces and colors, and in relating the parts so as not to weaken the unity. Three-dimensional work usually doesn't involve ordinary anthropomorphic imagery. If there is a reference, it is single and explicit. In any case the chief interests are obvious. Each of Bontecou's reliefs is an image. The image, all of the parts and the whole shape are coextensive. The parts are either part of the hole or part of the mound which forms the hole. The hole and the mound are only two things, which, after all, are the same thing. The parts and divisions are either radial or concentric in regard to the hole, leading in and out and enclosing. The radial and concentric parts meet more or less at right angles and in detail are structure in the old sense, but collectively are subordinate to the single form. Most of the new work has no structure in the usual sense, especially the work of Oldenburg and Stella. Chamberlain's work does involve composition. The nature of Bontecou's single image is not so different from that of images which occurred in a small way in semi-abstract painting. The image is primarily a single emotive one, which alone wouldn't resemble the old imagery so much, but to which internal and external references, such as violence and war, have been added. The additions are somewhat pictorial, but the image is essentially new and surprising; an image has never before been the whole work, been so large, been so explicit and aggressive. The abatised orifice is like a strange and dangerous object. The quality is intense and narrow and obsessive. The boat and the furniture that Kusama covered with white protuberances have a related intensity and obsessiveness and are also strange objects. Kusama is interested in obsessive repetition, which is a single interest. Yves Klein's blue paintings are also narrow and intense.

The trees, figures, food or furniture in a painting have a shape or contain shapes that are emotive. Oldenburg has taken this anthropomorphism to an extreme and made the emotive form, with him basic and biopsychological, the same as the shape of an object, and by blatancy subverted the idea of the natural presence of human qualities in all things. And further, Oldenburg avoids trees and

people. All of Oldenburg's grossly anthropomorphized objects are man-made – which right away is an empirical matter. Someone or many made these things and incorporated their preferences. As practical as an ice-cream cone is, a lot of people made a choice, and more agreed, as to its appearance and existence. This interest shows more in the recent appliances and fixtures from the home and especially in the bedroom suite, where the choice is flagrant. Oldenburg exaggerates the accepted or chosen form and turns it into one of his own. Nothing made is completely objective, purely practical or merely present. Oldenburg gets along very well without anything that would ordinarily be called structure. The ball and cone of the large ice-cream cone are enough. The whole thing is a profound form, such as sometimes occurs in primitive art. Three fat layers with a small one on top are enough. So is a flaccid, flamingo switch draped from two points. Simple form and one or two colors are considered less by old standards. If changes in art are compared backwards, there always seems to be a reduction, since only old attributes are counted and these are always fewer. But obviously new things are more, such as Oldenburg's techniques and materials. Oldenburg needs three dimensions in order to simulate and enlarge a real object and to equate it and an emotive form. If a hamburger were painted it would retain something of the traditional anthropomorphism. George Brecht and Robert Morris use real objects and depend on the viewer's knowledge of these objects.

Donald Judd, 1965

JUDD

具体物件

过去几年来最好的新创作中,有半数甚至更多的作品都并非绘画或雕塑。通常,无论紧密或疏远,它们都彼此关联。这些新创作是多元的,其中那些并非绘画也非雕塑的作品同样是多元的,但有些东西几乎是它们都共有的。

这些新的三维的作品还未形成一种运动、学派或风格。它们共性的方面太过笼统又太过细小,还无法定义一个运动。它们的差异性要远远大过相似性。这些相似性来自于作品,但它们并不是一场运动的首要原则或划分规定。三维这一点也远非一种类似绘画和雕塑的容器,但它似乎又倾向于此。不过今天的绘画和雕塑已经不再中立、不再像容器,而是更加具体,它们不是不可否认及不可避免的。毕竟它们是受到制约的特殊形式,产生的是相当确切的特质。这样的新作品中的主要动力是要让这些形式变得清晰。用三维作为形式也是显而易见的一种替代性选择。它能向任何事物保持开放性。采用这种形式的许多理由是消极的,它们针对绘画和雕塑,有鉴于这两者均为普遍的媒介素材,消极的理由就是那些最相近的共同点。“要做出改变的动机总是带着些不安:让我们对状态或是新举动采取改变的是一些不安的感受,别无他物。”【1】而积极的理由更为具体。把绘画和雕塑首先列举出来的另一个原因在于,两者都为人熟知并且它们的元素和特质也更容易被定位。

针对绘画和雕塑的反对之声会比实际情况听起来更不宽容。其中存在资质的问题。对绘画和雕塑的漠不关心是对再次创作它们的漠不关心,而不是针对其本身,而且绘画和雕塑经由那些创作者们的发展,已经在此前达到了高度先进的阶段。新创作总是会牵扯到对老旧创作的反对,但是这些反对确实只与新创作有关。反对是新创作的一部分。如果早前的创作是第一流的,那它也是已经完成了的。新的矛盾与限制并不是追溯性的,它们只关心正要被发展出来的创作。显然,三维的作品并不会干干净净地继承绘画和雕塑。它不像是一场运动;再说运动早已不再起作用;还有,线性历史也已经有些松散了。新的创作用朴素的力量超越了绘画,但是力量并不是唯一的考量,尽管在它与表达之间的差异也不会太过巨大。除了力量和形式之外还有许多方面会使得一种艺术与另一种相比是多了或者少了。最后,一块矩形平坦的表面很容易被放弃。有些事只能在平坦的表面进行。利希滕斯坦(Lichtenstein)对具象表征的表达就是一个绝佳的例子。但是这既非绘画也非雕塑的创作对两者都做出了挑战。新艺术家们必须对此予以考虑。它或许会改变绘画和雕塑。

绘画的一个主要问题在于,它是一块平坦地靠墙放置的矩形平面。矩形本身就是一种形状;它显然也是整件作品的形状;它决定并且限制了在其上或其中的内容的安排。1946年之前的作品中矩形的边缘就是界限,是图像的尽头。【2】构图必须回应这些边界而且矩形也必须得到统一,但是矩形的形状本身并未被突出强调;其中的组成部分更为重要,而且颜色与形式的关系就在这些组成部分之间发生。在波洛克(Pollock)、罗斯科(Rothko)、斯蒂尔(Still)和纽曼(Newman)以及更近期的莱因哈特(Reinhardt)和诺兰(Noland)的绘画中,矩形本身得到了强调。在矩形之内的元素是开阔且简单的,并且与矩形产生紧密的对应。形状和表面仅仅是会在一个矩形表面其中及其上合理发生的那些。画面的构成部分很少并且都从属于整个统一体,而不是普通意义上的画面局部。一幅绘画几乎就是一个实体、一事物,而不是一群实体及参照物的难于明确定义的总和。有一件事在早前的绘画中是压倒性的。矩形作为一个明确的形式得到了确立,它不再是一种相对中立的限制。一种形式只能以那么些方式来被采用。矩形的平面也有自己的生命周期。对矩形做出强调所需要的简单性限制了在矩形中可能的内容排布。单一性同样也有其可持续的时间阶段,但还仅仅是开始,而且它在绘画之外会有更好的未来。它在绘画内部的发生现在看来像是一个起点,其中的新形式通常来自于早前的制式和材料。

平面也同样得到了强调,并且几乎是单一的。它显然是一个摆放在另一个平面,即墙,之前一两英寸(约三五厘米)的平面,而且与之平行。两个平面之间的关系是具体的;它是一种形式。所有在绘画的平面上或稍稍进入平面之内的东西都必须侧向排布的。

几乎所有绘画都是空间性的,以这样或那样的方式。伊夫·克莱因(Yves Klein)的蓝色绘画是唯一并非空间性的绘画,几乎非空间性的绘画也少之又少,其中主要的一个是斯特拉(Stella)的作品。可能无法同时对一个垂直的矩形平面和一处缺席的空间这两者都做些什么。任何在表面的东西在其背后也有一片空间。在同一平面上的两个颜色几乎总是各自具有不同的深度。一个均匀的颜色,尤其是在油画颜料中,完整或大面积地覆盖着一幅绘画时,它几乎同时是既平坦又有无限空间性的。空间在所有强调了矩形平面的作品中都是浅的。罗斯科的空间是浅的,其中柔软的矩形与画面平行,但他的空间几乎就是那种传统的视幻觉性的(illusionistic)。在莱因哈特的绘画中,就在从油画布的平面返回过来的地方,创存在着一片平坦的平面并且它反而看起来无限的深邃。波洛克的颜料很显然都在油画布上,而空间主要是由画面上的任何标记所构成的,所以它不太具有描述性和视幻觉性。诺兰的同心圆色块并不像波洛克的绘画那样具体地绘画于表面之上,但是色块对实际的空间进行了更多平坦化的处理。诺兰的绘画是平整且非视幻觉的,那些色块会切实地前进和后退。即使一个简单的圆也会使表面向着它产生弯曲,且圆的背后少有空间。

除了一片完整且无差别的由色彩或标记组成的区域之外,任何在矩形之内或在平面之上的事物都意味着在某些其他事物之中或之上的事物,那些在其周围的事物,它们意味着在其空间之内的物件或图形,在这个空间里所有这些都是一个相似世界的更为明晰的例子——这就是绘画的主要目的。最近的绘画并不全然是单一的。其中有一些占据主导的区域,像是罗斯科的方形或是诺兰的圆,还有围绕在它们周围的区域。在主要的形状(即最具表现力的部分)和画布的其余空间(即平面和矩形)这两者之间存在着间隙。核心的形式仍然发生在一个更宽广且不确定的语境中,尽管绘画的单一性缩减了早期作品中普遍而独我(solipsistic)的特质。区块通常也是不受限制的,它们给予那些从无限庞大的事物中切割出来的部分以外观。

油画颜料和油画布不像商业涂料那样牢固,也同样不如原材料固有的颜色和表面,尤其如果这些材料被用到三维作品之时。颜料和画布是为人熟知的,就像矩形平面那样,它们有着特定的质地和限制。这种特质由艺术进行具体的定义。

相较于绘画,新的作品显然会让人觉得更像雕塑,但它们与绘画更接近。大部分雕塑像是在波洛克、罗斯科、斯蒂尔和纽曼之前的绘画那样。它们最新颖的一点在于其开阔的体量(scale)。它们的材质或多或少地得到了多于此前的强调。这样的图像包括了与其他可见物及一些更为隐晦的参照物的显著的相似,一切都被归拢为兼容性(compatibility)。作品的组成部分和空间是影射性、描述性且带着些自然主义的。希金斯(Higgins)的雕塑是个例子,还有与之不同的,迪·苏沃尔(DiSuvero)的雕塑。希金斯的雕塑主要地提示了机器和截断的身体。其石膏与金属的组合要来得更为具体一些。迪·苏沃尔对梁柱的使用就好像它们是刷子产生的笔触,它们在模仿运动,像是克莱因所做的那样。材料永远不会有自己的运动。一条梁柱猛力刺推,一块铁片遵循某种动势;而放在一起它们又会形成一种自然主义且拟人化的图像。空间据此做出对应。

大多数雕塑是一部分接一部分做出来的,是一种添加、组成。其中的主要部分仍然相当松散。它们和小部件就是各类变体的一种集合,由小及大。在清晰性与强度以及对一两个主要想法的趋近性层面上存在着等级差异。木材和金属是常用的材料,要么单独使用要么放在一起,而放在一起时它们并无太大的反差对比。通常很少用到任何颜色。普遍的情况是中等反差及自然的单色,这有助于将局部统一起来。

在新的三维作品中,上述这些几乎全都没有。到目前为止,在这些多样的创作中最明显的区别存在于某个物件/即单一的事物与开阔延展的/即或多或少环境性的事物这两者之间。不过在它们的本质及外观之间并无巨大的差别。奥登伯格(Oldenburg)和其他一些人这两件事都做了。新创作中的有些特点是有前人先例的。这些部分通常是从属性的并且不可区分的,就像阿尔普(Arp)和不少

布朗库西 (Brancusi) 的雕塑那样。杜尚的现成品和其他达达的物件也都被作为整体来看待,而非一个接一个的局部。康奈尔 (Cornell) 的盒子初看之下似乎有太多的构成部分。局部挨着局部的结构不能过于简单或过于复杂。它必须看起来有序。阿尔普的抽象程度,是他对人体做出的有节制的指涉,既不直接模仿也并不特别晦涩,这一点与大部分新的三维作品的意象很不一样。杜尚的干瓶架与其中某些创作很接近。强斯 (Johns) 和劳申伯格 (Rauschenberg) 的作品以及普遍而言的集合艺术与浅浮雕 (low-relief), 比如欧特曼 (Ortman) 的创作, 都是初步性的基础。强斯少数几件铸造的物件以及一些劳申伯格的作品, 比如套着轮胎的羊, 都是新创作的开端。

一些欧洲绘画与物件相关, 比如克莱因的, 还有卡斯特拉尼 (Castellani) 的, 它们具有满是浅浮雕元素的固定区域。阿曼 (Arman) 和其他几位都以三维进行创作。迪克·史密斯 (Dick Smith) 在伦敦创作了一些大幅作品, 他把油画布绷在歪斜的平行六面体的画框上然后把它们当绘画那样在表面涂画。菲利普·金 (Philip King), 同样在伦敦, 似乎在做物件。一些创作于西海岸的作品似乎也沿着这条线索, 比如拉里·贝尔 (Larry Bell)、肯·普莱斯 (Kenneth Price)、托尼·德拉普 (Tony Delap)、斯文·卢金 (Sven Lukin)、布鲁斯·康纳 (Bruce Conner), 当然还有爱德华·金霍尔茨 (Edward Kienholz) 和其他人。一些创作于纽约的作品也具有一些或大部分上述的特点, 像是乔治·布莱希特 (George Brecht)、罗纳德·布莱登 (Ronald Bladen)、约翰·韦伦贝克尔 (John Willenbecher)、拉尔夫·奥尔蒂斯 (Ralph Ortiz)、安妮·特鲁伊特 (Anne Truitt)、保罗·哈里斯 (Paul Harris)、巴里·麦克道威尔 (Barry McDowell)、约翰·张伯伦 (John Chamberlain)、罗伯特·坦坦纳 (Robert Tanner)、亚伦·库里洛夫 (Aaron Kuriloff)、罗伯特·莫里斯 (Robert Morris)、内森·雷森 (Nathan Raisen)、托尼·史密斯 (Tony Smith)、理查德·纳文 (Richard Navin)、克莱斯·奥登伯格 (Claes Oldenburg)、罗伯特·沃茨 (Robert Watts)、吉村 (Yoshimura)、约翰·安德逊 (John Anderson)、哈里·索维亚克 (Harry Saviak)、草间弥生 (Yayoi Kusama)、弗兰克·斯特拉 (Frank Stella)、萨尔瓦多·斯卡皮塔 (Salvatore Scarpitta)、尼尔·威廉姆斯 (Neil Williams)、乔治·西格尔 (George Segal)、迈克尔·斯诺 (Michael Snow)、理查德·阿茨希瓦格 (Richard Artschwager)、荒川 (Arakawa)、卢卡斯·萨马拉斯 (Lucas Samaras)、莉·邦特科 (Lee Bontecou)、丹·弗莱文 (Dan Flavin) 以及罗伯特·惠特曼 (Robert Whitman)。H·C·韦斯特曼 (H.C. Westermann) 在康涅狄格州做创作。这些艺术家中有些人同时进行三维和绘画的创作。还有其他人的少部分作品, 比如沃霍尔 (Warhol) 和罗森奎特 (Rosenquist), 也是三维的。

张伯伦作品的构图和图像与早期的绘画基本相同, 但这些对于一种无序的外观而言是次要的, 并且起初会被材料所掩盖。皱皱巴巴的锡倾向于保持它皱皱巴巴的状态。它起初是中立的, 非艺术的, 之后看起来就是客观物性的了。当结构与图像变得明显之时, 看起来似乎有太多的锡和空间, 比秩序更多的是偶发和随意。中性、冗余、形式和图像的各个面向, 没有三维也没有特定材料的话, 是无法共同存在的。其中的颜色既自然又敏感, 不像油彩颜色, 它有着宽阔的范围。除了绘画之外, 大部分不可或缺的颜色都被用在了三维的作品上。颜色从来不会不重要, 尽管在雕塑中颜色常常并不重要。

斯特拉有形状的绘画牵涉到三维作品中的几个重要特征。一件作品的边缘会与作品中的线条互相对应。条纹从来不是离散的局部。相比通常的情况, 表面要更远离墙面, 尽管它仍然与之平行。由于表面非常统一并且几乎不涉及到空间, 所以平行的平面是非同寻常的。这样的秩序并不是理性主义的、潜在的, 而是简简单单的秩序, 就像是那种连续性一样, 是一件事接着另一件事。一幅绘画并不是一张图像。它的形状、统一、投射、秩序和颜色都是具体的、强势的、有力的。

绘画和雕塑已经成为了固定的形式。有相当一部分事关它们的含义是不可信的。而使用三维并不是在采用一种既定的形式。还没有足够长的时间和足够多的作品能看到它的限制。目前, 用最广泛的方式来思考, 三维主要是一处可以进入其中的空间。三维创作的特征得来自于那些为数极少的作品, 几乎无法与绘画和雕塑相比。一些更为普遍的方面可能会持续存在, 例如作品像是一个物件或

是作品很具体,但是其他的特征还有待继续发展。由于它的范围如此广泛,三维的作品也许会被分类为好几种形式。无论如何,它会比绘画庞大,也会比雕塑庞大得多,与绘画相比,雕塑相对特定,也更接近于通常所说的形式,它具有一种特定的形式。因为三维的性质还未固定成型,在此之前还能对它做些有望成功的事,几乎任何事。当然,有些事可以在一个既定的形式中做,像是绘画,但是有一定的狭窄性,也少有强度和变化。由于雕塑并不是一种非常普遍的形式,它也许只能是现在的样子——这就意味着,如果它发生了巨大的变化那就会成为其他东西;那样它就完结了。

三维是真实的空间。它摆脱了视幻觉主义和文字空间的问题,空间处于标记与颜色的内部及周围——这总算摆脱了欧洲艺术中最突出也最该反对的诸多遗产之一。绘画的几重限制不复存在。一件作品可以如其被想象的那样强大有力。真实的空间比在平面上绘画要更加的强大且具体。很显然,三维中的事物可以有任何形状,规则的或不规则的,并且可以与任何事物产生关联:墙壁、地板、天花板、房间、多个房间或其外部或全然的无物。任何材料都能被使用,可以被原原本本地用也可以被涂绘。

一件作品只需要有趣。大部分作品最终会有一种特质。在早期的艺术中,复杂性被显示出来并用以建立作品的特质。在近期绘画中,复杂性在于形式及少数的主要形状,它们是依据各种兴趣和问题而产生的。一幅纽曼的绘画并不比塞尚的要来得简单。在三维的作品中,作品的整体都是依据复杂的目的而创作的,并且这些目的并不会彼此分散而是同一种形式产生的主张。一件作品不需要有很多东西以供观看、比较、一个接一个的分析、沉思。有趣的是它作为一个整体,且其特质也作为整体。主要的事物是独立的,并且是更为强烈、清晰和强大的。它们并未被一种承袭的形式、一种形式的衍变、局部与区域间温和的对比及连接等这些东西所削弱。欧洲艺术必须对一处空间及其内容进行再现表征,还必须有足够的统一性和美学趣味。在1946年之前的抽象绘画以及大部分后续的绘画所保持的是将作品整体的再现表征从属于局部。【3】今天的雕塑仍旧如此。而在新作品中,形状、图像、颜色和表面都是单一的并且不是局部的和分散的。不存在任何中立的或适度的区域或局部,不存在任何连接或是过渡性的区域。在新作品与早期绘画及现在的雕塑之间的区别,就像是布鲁内莱斯基(Brunelleschi)为菲耶索莱的巴迪亚修道院(Badiadi Fiesol)做的窗户与他为鲁切拉宫(Palazzo Rucellai)设计的外立面之间的区别,后者只是一个作为整体的、尚未发展成熟的矩形,并且主要是高度有序的局部的集合。

三维的使用使得采用各种材料和颜色成为了可能。许多作品用到了新的材料,或者是新近发明的材料,或者就是此前没有在艺术中被用过。直到最近才有了各种各样的工业产品,此前则很少。几乎没有什么是用工业技术来制作的,而且因为成本原因,可能这种情况还会持续一段时间。艺术可以是大批量生产的,也可以实现其他原本不可能的可能性,例如冲压模锻。丹·费莱文使用荧光灯,他挪用了工业生产的成品。材料的区别很大,但又都仅仅是材料——福米卡贴面塑料、铝、冷轧钢、有机玻璃、红色及普通的黄铜等等。它们具体的。如果直接使用,它们会更为具体。而且,它们通常很强势。对于材料的顽固身份而言存在着一种客观性。而且,当然了,材料的特质——硬质、软质、分别为1/32,1/16,1/8英寸的厚度、柔韧性、光滑度、半透明度、暗度——都具有非客观性的用途。奥登伯格的柔软物件所用到的乙烯基材料看起来和以前一样,光滑、松弛、些许的令人不快,而且是客观的,但它又是柔韧的并且可以被缝制可以充满空气和棉花可以被吊起或倒置,下垂或坍塌。大多数新材料不像布面油画那么容易接近并且很难彼此关联。它们并非一目了然的艺术。一件作品的形式及其材料是紧密相关的。在早期的作品中,结构和图像以较为中立和均质的材料被实现出来。由于不太有什么块状的东西,在组合不同表面及颜色以及连接局部以使得整体不被削弱方面就存在不少问题。三维的作品一般不涉及通常的拟人图像。如果有所指涉那也是单一又明确的。无论如何,主要的趣味是显而易见的。布鲁内莱斯基的每一件浮雕都是一幅图像。这样的图像,它的各个部分及总体形状都是共同延伸的。这些局部要么是孔洞的一部分,要么就是形成孔洞的凸起的一部分。孔洞或凸起只是两样东西,但终究是同一件事。对于孔洞而言,局部与分区要么是辐射状的要么就是同心状的,它们做着向内向外的牵引与闭合。那些或多或少在直角和细节处有辐射状及同心状的局部,是老旧意义上的结构,但它们在总体上从属于单一的形式。大多数新作品并不具有通常意义的结构,尤其是奥登伯格和斯特拉的作品。张伯伦的作品涉及到构成的问题。布鲁内莱斯基的单一图像的本质与那些在半抽象绘画中以细小的方式发生的图像相比并无太大不同。

内莱斯基的单一图像的本质与那些在半抽象绘画中以细小的方式发生的图像相比并无太大不同。图像通常是单一的情感性的一幅，在独自存在时与老旧的图像并不太相像，但是许多内部和外部的参照被附加其上，例如暴力和战争。添加的部分多少是有画面感的，但是图像基本上是崭新而让人惊讶的，一幅图像此前从没有成为过整件作品，也从未如此巨大，从未如此明确而强势。形似鹿角的器口，就像一个古怪而危险的物件。【译注：贾德此处所指的是莉·邦特科的作品】其特质是强烈、狭窄而压迫的。草间弥生用白色突起物覆盖的船只与家具有一种密切相关的强度和迷恋因此也是奇怪的物件。草间弥生对于强制性的重复感兴趣，而且是一种单一的兴趣。伊夫·克莱因的蓝色绘画也同样是狭窄而又强烈的。

一幅绘画中的树木、人物、食物或家具都有一个形状或是包含着富有感情的各种形状。奥登伯格采取这种拟人化，将之发挥到极致并且创作了情绪性的形式，伴随着他自己基本而生物心理学的内容，就像一个物件的形状那样，并且作品通过喧嚣的面目颠覆了所有事物中皆自然地具有人类存在的这种想法。此外，奥登伯格避免树木和人。所有奥登伯格臃肿的拟人的物件都是人造物——这即刻成为了一件经验主义的事。有些人或很多人做出了些东西并且将之纳入他们的偏好。务实得就像一支冰淇淋蛋筒，它是由许多人共同做出的一个选择，而更多的人会认同其外观与存在。这样的趣味在最近的家用设备及装置中有更多体现，尤其是各色卧室套房，那里的选项可谓粗暴。奥登伯格夸大了接受或选择的形式并且将之转化为自己的形式之一。没有任何被制造出来的东西是完全客观的，纯然实用或仅仅作为存在的。没有那些通常被称之为结构的东西，奥登伯格也处理得很好。球体和巨大冰淇淋蛋筒的圆锥体就足够了。整件物体就是一种深刻的形式，就像有时发生在原始艺术中的那样。三个肥腻的层次顶上还有一小层，这样就够了。一个松松垮垮从两个点垂悬下来的火烈鸟色的开关也是如此。【译注：此处指奥登伯格的作品《软灯开关》(Soft Light Switches, 1964)】简单的形式和一两个颜色用老旧的标准看来可能太少了。如果发生在艺术中的变化是反向比较的，那似乎总是存在着一种递减，因为只有老旧的属性被纳入考量而这些总是比较少的。但是新事物显然更多，例如奥登伯格的技术和材料。奥登伯格需要三维来模拟并放大一个真实物件并将之与一种情绪性的形式相等同。如果一个汉堡包被画出来那它只是传统的拟人。乔治·布莱希特和罗伯特·莫里斯采用真实的物件并依赖于观看者对这些物件所具有的知识。

这篇文章受《艺术年鉴》(Arts Yearbook)的委任写作并在完成一年之后发表。

——唐纳德·贾德

卓纳图书(David Zwirner Books)于2016年出版了唐纳德·贾德至今最完整的写作集《Donald Judd Writings》

【1】约翰·洛克(John Locke),《约翰·洛克哲学作品文集》,第一卷,由J. A. St. John编辑(伦敦:George Bell and Sons出版,1908年),第376页。这本贾德的藏书现在是位于德州马尔法的贾德图书馆的一部分。

【2】在1940年代中期,杰克逊·波洛克(Jackson Pollock)创作了他“滴色画”(drippaintings)系列中的第一幅。这些绘画的重要特征是其布满画面的构图以及并无视觉中心的焦点。对贾德而言,这件作品是打破绘画传统的一个重要节点。

【3】波洛克、罗斯科、纽曼和斯蒂尔的作品可被视作例外。

--

文章最初发表于《艺术年鉴8》(Arts Yearbook 8),1965年,第74-82页;此后有数次再版:哈利法克斯(Halifax)版,第181-189页;埃因霍温(Eindhoven)版,第115-124页;巴黎(Paris)版,第9-20页(法语)。

唐纳德·贾德,《具体物件》(Specific Objects, 1964),收录于《唐纳德·贾德的写作》(Donald Judd Writings),由弗莱文·贾德等人共同编辑,(纽约:贾德基金会 & 卓纳图书共同出版,2016年),第134-145页。