



TEXTE ZUR KUNST

September 2023 35. Jahrgang Seite 03
€ 16,50 [a] / \$ 26,-

REVIEWS

4

PREFACE

6

VORWORT

30

UNDER REVIEW

Roundtable between Claire Bishop, Jarrett Earnest, Eva Hayward, and Eric Otieno Sumba, moderated by Christian Lictair

31

UNDER REVIEW

Ein Round Table mit Claire Bishop, Jarrett Earnest, Eva Hayward und Eric Otieno Sumba, moderiert von Christian Lictair

70

Peter Geimer

THE FORM OF CRITICISM

71

Peter Geimer

DIE FORM DER KRITIK

80

REVIEWS

86

MIXED SIGNALS

Amin Alsaden on “Signals: How Video Transformed the World” at the Museum of Modern Art, New York

91

“AMEN”

Domenick Ammirati and Paige K. Bradley on Sarah Rapson at Maxwell Graham, New York

98

WIE „NACHHALLIG“ IST EINE REZENSION?

Andreas Beyer über wissenschaftliche Besprechungen allgemein und seine ausgebliebene zur jüngsten Donatello-Ausstellung im Besonderen

102

SAMMELN AUS/ALS SOLIDARITÄT

Sabeth Buchmann und Ana Hoffner ex-Prvulovic* über „No Feeling is Final. The Skopje Solidarity Collection“ in der Kunsthalle Wien

107

REENVISIONING HUMANITY

micha cárdenas on Wangechi Mutu at the New Museum, New York

112

ART CRITICISM AT 422 PPM

Maja and Reuben Fowkes on Kent Chan at Gasworks and Tomás Saraceno at the Serpentine Gallery, London

116

PARABOLIC PARABLES

Nic Guagnini on Fred Eversley at David Kordansky Gallery, New York

120

MOTORBOATING

Bruce Hainley on Richard Hawkins at Reena Spaulings Fine Art, Los Angeles

126

UNBEFRISTETE SCHULDEN

Oliver Hardt über Cameron Rowland im MMK in Frankfurt/M.

132

ON SPIDERS AND NETWORKS OF MEANING

Violaine Huisman on Germaine Richier at the Centre Pompidou, Paris (and on Francis Ponge)

136

LOSING FACE

David Joselit on Josh Kline at the Whitney Museum of American Art, New York

140

SICHTBARKEITSKONFLIKTE

Antonia Kölbl über „Re-Connect. Kunst und Kampf im Bruderland“ im Museum der bildenden Künste Leipzig

147

PERPETUAL CRISIS

Carlos Kong and Genevieve Lipinsky de Orlov on “Art Writing in Crisis,” edited by Brad Haylock and Megan Patty

152

CHEESE ANALOG

Stephanie LaCava on New Translations of Pier Paolo Pasolini’s Books “Ragazzi di vita” and “Teorema”

156

WER VERGISST, WIRD NICHT VERGESSEN

Sonja Lau über Angela Melitopoulos im Museo Reina Sofía, Madrid

161

ASTRO BLACK

Peter L’Official on Lauren Halsey at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York

166

“WHO DOESN’T WANT TO BE FREE?”

Thomas Love on Counterpublic 2023, St. Louis, Missouri

171

THE PROPRIETARY IMPASSE INHERENT IN POSSESSIVE

INDIVIDUALISM: IDENTITY, POLITICS, PROPERTY, AND

THE PURSUIT OF (AESTHETIC) FREEDOM

Jaleh Mansoor on “Art’s Properties” by David Joselit

176

SAPPHO’S VIOLETS

Charlotte Matter on Sarah Bernhardt at the Petit Palais, Paris

182

SIX REFLECTIONS ON WOLFGANG TILLMANS IN 2023

Tom McDonough on Wolfgang Tillmans at the Museum of Modern Art, New York, and the Art Gallery of Ontario, Toronto

187

KORRESPONDENZEN

Isabel Mehl über Gabriele Münter im Bucerius Kunst Forum, Hamburg

192

SEEING SPOTS

John Miller on Bridget Riley at Galerie Max Hetzler, Berlin

196

A DEFINITIONAL IMPULSE

Benjamin O. Murphy on “Signals: How Video Transformed the World” at the Museum of Modern Art, New York

201

FIELDING THE NECROPASTORAL EXCHANGE

Mark Pieteron on Dominique Knowles at Hannah Hoffman Gallery, Los Angeles

205

AGAINST THE WHEELS OF THE TIME-CLOCK

Paulina Pobocho on Robert Smithson at PPK, New York

209

KRITISCHE INFRASTRUKTUREN

Barbara Reisinger über Jenni Tischer in der Galerie Krobath, Wien

214

INSTITUTIONALISIERTE INSTITUTIONSKRITIK

Lynn Rother über „Wege der Kunst“ im Museum Rietberg, Zürich, sowie „Zerrissene Moderne“ und „Der Sammler Curt Glaser“ im Kunstmuseum Basel

220

LIFELINES

Amanda Schmitt on Gertrud Goldschmidt (Gego) at the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York

226

IMPORTUNATE FEMINISM

Caroline Lillian Schopp on “Ophelia’s Got Talent” by Florentina Holzinger

231

SEHEN UND GESEHEN WERDEN

Anna Sinofzik über Julia Scher im Museum Abteiberg, Mönchengladbach

237

TO THE POINT: GG’S PLAKATIVER AKTIVISMUS

Beate Söntgen über die Guerrilla Girls im MK&G Hamburg

242

THE BREATHLESS HAGIOGRAPHY OF

KARL LAGERFELD

Taylor Syfan on Karl Lagerfeld at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York

247

SITUATIONAL TRAGEDY

Ana Teixeira Pinto on Emily Wardill at KW Institute for Contemporary Art, Berlin

250

OBITUARY

251

O. K. WERCKMEISTER (1934–2023)

Keith Holz

252

TEXTE ZUR KUNST – ARTISTS’ EDITIONS

254

WADE GUYTON

256

SARAH MORRIS

258

BACK ISSUES / AUTOR*INNEN,

GESPRÄCHSPARTNER*INNEN / CONTRIBUTORS /

CREDITS / IMPRESSUM / IMPRINT

Art criticism has been said to be in crisis for decades, and that crisis has inevitably also affected one of the practice's mainstays: the review. Both quantitative and qualitative evidence suggest that the genre is in trouble. The number of art reviews published by legacy media has been in continuous decline. An archival survey of the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung's* arts and culture section, for example, reveals that the paper ran an average of over 600 exhibition reviews per year in the 1990s; in the years prior to the Covid-19 pandemic, that number had gone down to just below 400. And in qualitative terms, we find that discussions of works of art – unlike, say, theater reviews – often eschew contentious or controversial judgments, a development that is no doubt in partly due to the increasingly precarious circumstances in which freelance art critics live and work. They don't want to get on the wrong side of potential clients; future dinner invitations are on the line, and perhaps also lucrative commissions to write catalogue essays.

In art magazines and other periodicals for which reviews are part of their core business, the volume of criticism hasn't declined as it has on the pages of newspapers. Yet the structural changes of the past 30 years are palpable here, too: carefully argued critical objections have increasingly yielded to affirmative descriptions. *TEXTE ZUR KUNST* examined this shift previously in its issue dedicated to the "Verriss" or hatchet job, which came out two decades ago, and more recently by shedding light on debates over art-critical methodology in which the questionable nature of universal value judgments has been a point of contention. The observation of critical timidity, of overcaution in judgment, has only become more pronounced since then, at least with

regard to the criticism of art exhibitions: in their apologetic-descriptive style, many reviews more closely resemble the exhibition booklets or press releases available by the gallery door. The genre distinctions between review, catalogue essay, and artist's portrait are rapidly being blurred.

Yet a purely functionalist perspective on the role of art criticism cannot fully explain this insight: it disregards both the instruments of art criticism and the variable and changing maneuvering room within which the review as a journalistic format operates. The transformation of the media landscape in recent years is yet another factor that must be taken into account. With the move from offline to online media, reviews are now more widely and easily accessible, and so professional critics have additional reason to exercise caution before rendering negative or controversial verdicts – not only because they work under economic constraints but also because they fear being cancelled, triggering a shitstorm, or losing their reputation. In the comment sections of social media and on blogs, meanwhile, we observe that rapid-fire evaluation threatens to supersede informed criticism. Polarizing professions of opinion not tempered by theoretical ambitions of any kind thus stand in contrast with a methodologically well-founded criticism that appears to have lost its capacity to initiate and engage in debate.

In light of the review's precarious situation, the present issue is intended to make the case for this historically specific genre and take a closer look at the various parameters that define it. What are the characteristics of a review? What can and should it accomplish, and which methods and language games does it rely on? Most basically speaking, reviews are articulations of critical

contemplation that introduce, examine, appraise, and contextualize a publicly accessible cultural object.

How their value-generating potential has shifted, in no small part due to the rise of new digital media, is the question of a roundtable conversation between Claire Bishop, Jarrett Earnest, Eva Hayward, Christian Liclair, and Eric Otieno Sumba. Acknowledging the current threats to the form as well as its entanglements in the art market, the participants nonetheless underscore the productive influence that less fast-paced publishing processes, the demand for certain word limits, and the presence of a (paid) editorial team can have on reviewers' critical thinking. Moreover, by keeping its distance from clickbait and polarizing thumbs-up/thumbs-down rhetoric, (professional) reviewing provides a space in which prevailing standards of value, questionable aesthetic conventions, and dated art-theoretical paradigms can be subjected to scrutiny. Last but not least, criticism can establish a lasting archive of those creative practices that the conventional historiography of art tends to overlook or marginalize.

Peter Geimer's contribution likewise underscores how writing reviews for publications can be productive for a writer's critical thinking. Each art magazine, he argues, implicitly comes with its own specific audience – which may compel writers to chart an unfamiliar approach to a familiar object. Assumptions about readership can also be an incentive to rethink methods or basic premises that are thought of as generally accepted. For example, Geimer claims that a reader of *TEXTE ZUR KUNST* expects reviews to proffer a theoretically informed discourse that zooms out from the works to inquire into the institutional, ideological, or economic frameworks in which

they're embedded. Yet the review itself, as the contributions to this issue demonstrate, is also entangled in the actions of the art market, and not only because economic considerations often preexist the object under discussion and allow it to become visible in the public sphere in the first place. More saliently, the review helps propel the generation of value: it creates a symbolic worth that, in the right circumstances, can be converted into market value.

To point up the potentials of the review as a literary form, this issue of *TEXTE ZUR KUNST* mostly consists of examples of the genre. But we encouraged authors to use the opportunity to reflect on the status of the review, the methods they employ, and their own role as critics. On the one hand, this brings out the rich stylistic diversity of the review. On the other hand, several writers explicitly note the specific qualities that make the form so vital to (art) criticism.

Ultimately, this issue is intended as a tribute to criticism. Reviews do not only contribute significantly to the formation of the cultural and monetary value of works of art. They also set intellectual standards for conversations within the art world and provide a platform for experimentation with theoretical perspectives, writing practices, and methodological approaches.

SABETH BUCHMANN, ISABELLE GRAW, ANTONIA KÖLBL,
CHRISTIAN LICLAIR, ANNA SINOFZIK, AND BEATE SÖNTGEN

Translation: Gerrit Jackson

Die seit Jahrzehnten diagnostizierte Krise der Kunstkritik betrifft zwangsläufig auch einen ihrer Grundpfeiler, die Rezension. Dass die Rezension in Schwierigkeiten steckt, lässt sich sowohl quantitativ als auch qualitativ beschreiben: So nimmt die Anzahl von Kunstrezensionen auf den Seiten überregionaler Tageszeitungen kontinuierlich ab. Ein Blick ins Archiv des Feuilletons der *Frankfurter Allgemeinen Zeitung* zeigt beispielsweise, dass in den 1990er Jahren im Schnitt jährlich über 600 Ausstellungskritiken erschienen, in den Jahren vor der Pandemie waren es nur noch knapp unter 400. Auch lässt sich auf der qualitativen Ebene konstatieren, dass Besprechungen bildender Kunst, anders als beispielsweise Theaterkritiken, häufig streitbare Werturteile scheuen – was sicherlich auch mit der zunehmenden Prekarisierung des freiberuflichen Kunstkritiker*innenstands im Zusammenhang steht. Man will es sich nicht mit potenziellen Auftraggeber*innen verscherzen, möchte auch weiterhin zu Essen eingeladen werden und möglicherweise Aufträge für lukrativere Katalogbeiträge erhalten.

Als Kerngeschäft der meisten Kunstzeitschriften und Periodika haben sich Rezensionen dort, anders als im Feuilleton, nicht reduziert. Doch die strukturellen Veränderungen der letzten 30 Jahre machen sich auch hier bemerkbar: Gut begründete kritische Einwände treten hinter zunehmend affirmative Beschreibungen zurück. Diese Verschiebung thematisierte *TEXTE ZUR KUNST* bereits vor zwei Jahrzehnten mit einer als „Verriss“ betitelten Ausgabe oder zuletzt mit dem Blick auf kunstkritische Methodendebatten, in denen die Fragwürdigkeit eines universellen Werturteils diskutiert wurde. Seither hat sich der Befund einer gehemmten Urteilslust, zumindest was die Besprechung von Kunstausstellungen

betrifft, konsolidiert: Viele Reviews gleichen in ihrem apologetisch-beschreibenden Duktus eher den in Galerien ausgelegten Ausstellungs- oder Preetexten. Die Gattungsgrenzen zwischen Rezension, Katalogtext oder Künstler*innenporträt verschwimmen zusehends.

Um diesen Befund zu erklären, greift eine rein funktionalistische Perspektive auf die Rolle der Kunstkritik jedoch zu kurz. Denn eine solche Betrachtung lässt sowohl die Instrumente der Kunstkritik als auch die jeweils unterschiedlichen publizistischen Möglichkeitsspielräume der Rezension außer Acht. Auch die geänderte Medienlandschaft der letzten Jahre muss zur Erklärung herangezogen werden. So führt die Verlagerung von Reviews ins Internet und die damit einhergehende Verfügbarkeit dazu, dass professionelle Kritiker*innen vorsichtiger werden, negativ oder kontrovers zu urteilen – und zwar nicht mehr nur aus ökonomischen Zwängen heraus, sondern auch aus Angst vor möglichen Shitstorms und dem Verlust ihrer Reputation. Gleichzeitig lässt sich in den Kommentarspalten Sozialer Medien oder auf Blogs jedoch beobachten, dass schnelle Evaluierungen informierte Kritiken zu ersetzen drohen. Diese polarisierenden Meinungsbekundungen ohne theoretische Ambition stehen also einer methodisch fundierten Kritik gegenüber, die ihr Debattenpotenzial verloren zu haben scheint.

Angesichts der prekären Lage der Rezension ist es das Anliegen dieser Ausgabe, sich für diese historisch-spezifische Gattung starkzumachen und ihre Rahmenbedingungen genauer zu beleuchten. Was sind die Charakteristiken einer Review? Was kann oder soll sie leisten und welcher Methoden und Sprachspiele bedient sie sich? Grundsätzlich handelt es sich bei Rezensionen

um versprachlichte Formen der kritischen Betrachtung, die einen kulturellen, öffentlich zugänglichen Gegenstand vorstellen, wertend behandeln und einordnen.

Wie sich ihr Wert generierendes Potenzial nicht zuletzt aufgrund neuer, digitaler Medien verschoben hat, ist Gegenstand eines Round Table zwischen Claire Bishop, Jarrett Earnest, Eva Hayward, Christian Lclair und Eric Otieno Sumba. Obgleich die Teilnehmenden auf die aktuellen Bedrohungen dieser Publikationsform sowie ihre Verstrickungen in den Kunstmarkt verweisen, betonen sie den produktiven Einfluss, den Entschleunigung, Zeichenvorgaben und die Anwesenheit eines (bezahlten) Redaktionsteams auf das kritische Denken der Rezensent*innen haben können. Abseits von Clickbait und polarisierender Thumps-Up/Thumps-Down-Rhetorik bietet das (professionelle) Rezensionswesen zudem einen Raum, in dem vorherrschende Wertmaßstäbe sowie fragwürdige ästhetische Konventionen und überholte kunsttheoretische Paradigmen auf den Prüfstand gestellt werden können. Zudem kann durch Rezensionen ein nachhaltiges Archiv jener künstlerischen Praktiken geschaffen werden, die von der klassischen Kunstgeschichtsschreibung mitunter übersehen oder marginalisiert werden.

Auch Peter Geimer stellt in seinem Beitrag die Produktivität heraus, die das Rezensieren für Publikationsorgane auf das kritische Denken der Schreibenden haben kann. Unterschiedliche Kunstmagazine implizieren ihm zufolge eine jeweils spezifische Leser*innenschaft – was es den Autor*innen möglicherweise abverlangt, den vertrauten Gegenstand anders zugänglich zu machen. Auch kann die vorausgesetzte Leser*innenschaft dazu anhalten, allgemein angenommene Methoden oder Grundannahmen neu

aufzurollen. Wer etwa, so Geimer, *TEXTE ZUR KUNST* liest, erwartet von der Rezension einen theoretisch informierten Diskurs, der neben den Werken auch ihre institutionelle, ideologische oder ökonomische Einbindung thematisiert. Doch auch die Review selbst ist, so machen es die Beiträge in diesem Heft deutlich, in das Geschehen auf dem Kunstmarkt eingebunden; nicht nur, weil dem zu besprechenden Gegenstand oft ökonomische Überlegungen vorrausgingen, die ihn im öffentlichen Raum erst sichtbar werden ließen. Mehr noch wohnt auch der Rezension ein Wert generierendes Moment inne: Sie schafft einen Symbolwert, der sich unter Umständen in Marktwert transformieren lässt.

Um die Potenziale von Rezensionen als Textgattung aufzuzeigen, setzt sich diese Ausgabe von *TEXTE ZUR KUNST* fast ausschließlich aus Rezensionen zusammen. Wir haben die Autor*innen jedoch angeregt, im Rahmen ihrer Review deren Status, die verwendeten Methoden sowie ihre eigene Rolle als Rezensent*innen zu reflektieren. Auf diese Weise tritt zum einen die stilistische Mannigfaltigkeit der Rezensionen deutlicher hervor. Zum anderen weisen einige Autor*innen selbst auf die Spezifik dieser Textform für die (Kunst-)Kritik hin.

Letztlich wollen wir diese Ausgabe auch als eine Hommage an die Review verstanden wissen. Denn Rezensionen tragen nicht nur maßgeblich zur kulturellen und monetären Wertbildung von Kunstwerken bei. Sie bestimmen auch das Niveau der Diskurse innerhalb der Kunstwelt und bieten zudem ein Experimentierfeld, in dem theoretische, sprachliche oder methodische Verfahren erprobt werden können.

SABETH BUCHMANN, ISABELLE GRAW, ANTONIA KÖLBL, CHRISTIAN LICLAIR, ANNA SINOFZIK UND BEATE SÖNTGEN



Amar Kanwar, "The Torn First Pages," 2004–08

editing or screening equipment. The video thus lacks the type of experimental image distortions or participatory feedback loops that appear so often in the work of Geiger's European and US peers from this same period. Long ignored in canonical histories of video, Geiger's work has enjoyed newfound attention in recent years as museums have pursued more global and inclusive narratives. In "Signals," the tape appears on the exhibition's "Channel," an innovative screening platform offering temporary online access to dozens of videos from around the globe during the show's run. The Channel's digital medium is paradigmatic of the show's rhetorical eschewal of definitions. By gathering a multitude of distinct mediums and technologies onto a single platform, it enables a rich global view of video's plurality. Yet in so doing, it also masks the differences between these various supports by converting them into digitized form. The "Signals" Channel shows how video transformed the world. Yet it can also cause us to forget that "video" was not

the same in all places, and that its spread around the world was not marked by equal access. The review's impulse to insist on a precise definition of video, on a recognition of the unique features that distinguish certain media from others, allows us to see these inequalities, and to trace a different geopolitical arc that accounts for the vast disparities in access that mark the global reach of technology.

"Signals: How Video Transformed the World," Museum of Modern Art, New York, March 5–July 8, 2023.

Notes

- 1 Frederico Morais, "VÍdeo-arte: Revolução cultural ou um título a mais no currículo dos artistas?," *O Globo*, January 29, 1976, 37. My translation.
- 2 Stuart Comer and Michelle Kuo, "Signals: How Video Transformed the World," exh. cat., ed. Stuart Comer and Michelle Kuo (New York: MoMA, 2023), 11.

FIELDING THE NECROPASTORAL EXCHANGE

Mark Pieteron on Dominique Knowles at Hannah Hoffman Gallery, Los Angeles

From the paintings of Rosa Bonheur to those of Théodore Géricault or George Stubbs, the depiction of horses is a staple of Western art history, where the animal primarily represents strength and expressive corporeality. Dominique Knowles's recent exhibition at Hannah Hoffman Gallery – a tribute to the artist's deceased horse – counters such representations and, with them, fundamental fallacies of the Anthropocene, as Mark Pieteron argues in his review. By interweaving his own reflections with words borrowed from the poet and theorist Joyelle McSweeney, whose ecopolitics he employs to explore Knowles's art, Pieteron also hints at the potential the combination of theory and poetry holds for the field of art criticism.

Death is always on the horizon. And despite our attempts to ignore it, it's eternally the elephant in the room. There seems to be more discussion about what "life" offers than the possibilities death proffers. If Toni Morrison's 1987 novel *Beloved*, as scholar and equestrian enthusiast Sharon Patricia Holland would have us believe in her book *Raising the Dead*, is a disruptive "ghost story" that jolts memory "from its moorings in forgetfulness,"¹ then perhaps the story's rhetorical appeal to temporal displacement should not be taken for granted. Holland's interpretive approach to Morrison's text presents an opportunity to unfold the textual fabric of Bahamian artist Dominique Knowles's debut Los Angeles solo show, "My Beloved" at Hannah Hoffman Gallery. An affecting presentation, it articulates an attempt by the artist to contend with the death of his horse, with which he shared a deep bond. It comes together less as a show simply about the relationship between artist and horse, and more about how the event of the horse's death occasions and troubles conceptions of being in the world.

The artist has transformed the space into a mausoleum accented with windows he painted in rich amber and brown colorations to give the effect of stained glass, applications that enact the sense of preservation via a viscous, resin-like simulacrum. The windowpanes provide a visual focal point for visitors as they enter into the main gallery after walking up a flight of stairs. Spread out across the walls here is a series of eight oil-on-linen paintings – all titled *The Solemn and Dignified Burial Befitting My Beloved for All Seasons* (2023) – that feature equine silhouettes in various degrees of legibility. One grouping of works is arranged like a multi-paneled altarpiece, girded by the shifting dramatics of the Baroque and the grammars of the pastoral maintained in the breadth of the presentation. A painting that looks as if made up of two paintings – a smaller rectangular one attached to a larger piece that serves as its rectangular base – is installed at the other end of the room. Interestingly, if one stands in front of the painting, its form becomes transfigured into a crucifix. In a counterclockwise position to the two-canvas piece is a triptych, the only piece to feature a silhouette of a human figure – that of the artist's friend, which he painted from memory after being enthralled by the moment.

The scenes on the surfaces seem to be simultaneously suspended in time and teeming with movement, calling to mind the horse silhouettes and sweeping mark-making of Danish painter Per Kirkeby's *Untitled* (2009). However, Knowles's use of deep, dark hues of brown and an earthy red – reminiscent of the painterly, atmospheric qualities of Mark Rothko's 1957 painting *No. 46 (Black, Ochre, Red over Red)* or his 1958 *No. 16 (Red, Brown, and Black)* – show the artist's formal mastery of light and space and aid in punctuating the



"Dominique Knowles: My Beloved," Hannah Hoffman Gallery, Los Angeles, 2023, installation view

solemn and somber tone of the show. Dissimilar to Rothko's austere, minimalist compositions, Knowles's canvases come alive with vivid spectral activity and transmogrifications achieved through his signature ethereal brushstroke technique. This poetic gesture, with its carefully choreographed application – dubbed "equine care" in the press release – extends care to include the task of capturing the enigmatic texture of memory, creating a strikingly affecting visuality that not only adds a palpable layer of enchantment to the stretched linen but also obliges us to engage the sublime's "soaring flights and subterranean swoons"² – to borrow from poet and theorist Joyelle McSweeney.

A rather salient property of Knowles's visuality – indeed, a property that many writings on his practice have failed to note, perhaps because of the anxiety around addressing death – is visible in how this series uniquely displaces many conventions of traditional equine-themed paintings such as the works of British painter George

Stubbs, notably his *Polyanthus*, a *Favourite Bay Hunter*, in a *Landscape* (ca. 1786). Death, projected as the artist's late horse Tazz in all his majestic glory, is the ever present co-celebrity of Knowles's ungovernable paintings, disavowing separations in favor of what McSweeney refers to as raw, uncanny, "strange meetings."³

Like death itself, Knowles disrupts reality not just to caution us of its vulnerability but to alert us to the contingent moral order and various ethical negotiations we continually make when we are touched by Others – considerations that evoke Martin Heidegger's remark that humans "die" whereas animals "perish."⁴ Knowles's work interrupts and questions this ordering principle by disturbing its groundings in pernicious, humanist pretensions. The instigations death organizes through the paintings fashion a chance to "search for an open door, for [intimate and] critical intervention in the 'space of death.'"⁵

Eschewing the verdant exuberance characteristic of Stubbs and 17th-century Dutch landscape



"Dominique Knowles: My Beloved," Hannah Hoffman Gallery, Los Angeles, 2023, installation view

paintings like Peter Paul Rubens's *The Rainbow Landscape* (1636), the "necropastoral" worlds⁶ portrayed by Knowles champion a pictorial consideration of the biological process of decay while also conveying a willful dedication to cognitive and temporal limits. What sets Knowles's ecopoetics apart from the bucolic rubric that many pastoral renderings are often reduced to is that death is truly dead center! Many of the works in the show, in fact, began as sketches in Joshua Tree National Park in southeastern California: an arid biome that maintains (dis)order and the alluring immminence of decaying organic matter in its fractured landscape.

There is an intentional manipulation of the cordon sanitaire of reality in the suite of works, where the boundaries of purported "urban-strife and wholesome rural peace"⁷ – as McSweeney writes – that traditional pastoral paintings attempt to visually reconcile are then made farcical by tempestuous spectral energy. The works thrive in the suggestive potential of the non-place of

their subjects. Nowhere is this more evident than in the painted windows that immerse Knowles's theater in a special light. The windows are open to let air and sound into the gallery, as light filters through the concentrated amber color of the glass panes – engagements that re/inscribe the body and space as a site of contagion. As McSweeney reminds us, the platitudes of death are exalted from inertness and trite appraisal in the necropastoral, re-marking the "green theme park with the suspicions that the anthropocene epoch is in fact synonymous with ecological end times."⁸ This haunting is the twin possibility of the pastoral, casting a ghostly gaze that's in equal parts an agent of contact and collapse.

What to make of these arrivals and departures activated by this "strange meeting" presented by the artist? We are prompted toward lines of thinking that urge us to confront the historically contingent biopolitical apparatus associated with the horse, provoking subject positions that disarm the fraught history of this relation.

The works throw the material conditions of our ecological anxieties into question – a welcome departure from the untenable rhetoric of green capitalism. Knowles’s entropic ensemble is, in its synesthetic murkiness, rendered responsive rather than simply memorializing Tazz. The horse, like Donna Haraway’s cyborgian mattering, is a creature of Knowles’s and now our distended social reality, resurrected in the courteous abstractions of thought and death. The ontological disturbances reorient the living into the “more-or-less than dead,”⁹ cleaving the fragile distinctions between animal and human into uncategorizable relation and sentience. Death *does* more than meet the eye in this show. Similar to the double inscription of meaning that punctuates Morrison’s *Beloved*, Knowles’s story is “not a story to pass on.”¹⁰

“Dominique Knowles: My Beloved,” Hannah Hoffman Gallery, Los Angeles, June 3–July 22, 2023.

Notes

- 1 Sharon Patricia Holland, *Raising the Dead: Readings of Death and (Black) Subjectivity* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2000), 1.
- 2 Joyelle McSweeney, “What is the Necropastoral?,” Poetry Foundation, April 29, 2014, <https://www.poetryfoundation.org/harriet-books/2014/04/what-is-the-necropastoral>.
- 3 Joyelle McSweeney, *The Necropastoral: Poetry, Media, Occults*, (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2015), 3.
- 4 See Martin Heidegger, *Being and Time*, trans. Joan Stambaugh (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1996), 219–29.
- 5 Holland, *Raising the Dead*, ix.
- 6 McSweeney, *The Necropastoral*.
- 7 *Ibid.*, 3.
- 8 *Ibid.*, 3.
- 9 *Ibid.*, 7.
- 10 Toni Morrison, *Beloved* (New York: Knopf, 1987), 522.

Do exhibition reviews really encourage people to see the show in question? Or do they primarily serve other purposes – perhaps they are a welcome opportunity to engage in intellectual exercise, functioning to position the reviewer within an academic discourse. Would it, then, even matter if the show existed? Thinking about a Robert Smithson exhibition conceived for PPK, Paulina Pobocha contemplates the open-monograph format, which contextualizes the work of any one artist by putting it in dialogue with the art of their peers. Taking a cue from the show’s title, “Allegory,” Pobocha imagines the present through the past and the future, where events are dislodged from continuity, and thus invites us to experience art as a simultaneous entity.

The last and only time Robert Smithson was the subject of a major retrospective exhibition in the United States was in 2004. Organized by Eugenie Tsai for the Museum of Contemporary Art in Los Angeles, I saw it at the Whitney, the last venue of the tour. The show was a comprehensive (and long overdue) dive into the brilliance of Smithson’s mind. Through a chronological presentation of the artist’s writings, drawings, films, photographs, and something we could call sculpture, shown in dialogue with one another, Tsai was convincingly able to demonstrate just how complex and radical Smithson’s art had been. As a result, Smithson, best known for the monumental earthwork *Spiral Jetty* (1970), came across much weirder a figure than the elegant geometries of his sculptures might suggest. The Whitney exhibition is where he and I “met.” Up until that point, I, naively, with horse-blinders on, considered him primarily in relation to Donald Judd, an artist whose work occupied much of my time and to whom I had devoted many words. Not coincidentally, Judd consumes a lot of space in Smithson’s own writings. So much so, in fact, that in 1967 Judd felt compelled to announce in

a one-sentence letter published in *Arts Magazine*, “Smithson isn’t my spokesman.”¹

“Robert Smithson: Allegories,” conceived for the PPK, lingers on this idea. Smithson may not have been Judd’s spokesman, but he wrote extensively and with conviction on the works of his contemporaries, often positioning them within intellectual frameworks then novel to any conventional understanding of art. For instance, he rejects considerations of form and content – which ultimately lead to classifications such as “Pop” or “Minimal” art – and instead argues that time is the central concern of much of the work then being made:

Instead of causing us to remember the past like the old monuments, the new monuments seem to cause us to forget the future. Instead of being made of natural materials, such as marble, granite, or other kinds of rock, the new monuments are made of artificial materials, plastic, chrome, and electric light. They are not built for the ages, but rather against the ages. They are involved in a systematic reduction of time down to fractions of seconds, rather than in representing the long spaces of centuries.²

Reading Smithson’s interpretations of the work of others makes me wonder what they ventriloquize about him, assuming, as I do, that the only person Smithson ever presumed to speak for was himself.

The curators at PPK could have begun to answer this question by carefully punctuating the show with works by artists such as Dan Flavin, Sol LeWitt, Robert Morris, and, less obviously, Paul Thek or Claes Oldenburg (in addition, of course, to Judd) in what is commonly referred to as an

CREDITS

Cover: Sam Farallon / Unsplash; 30: Courtesy of Jarrett Earnest; 39: Courtesy of Molly Vaughan; 46: Courtesy of Aleksandra Mir; 52: © Lorraine O'Grady / VG Bild-Kunst, Bonn 2023; 60: Courtesy of Tuesday Smillie; 62: Courtesy of Catherine McGann; 66: Courtesy of Nubuke Foundation; 70: TZK Archive; 73: © Roland Schappert / VG Bild-Kunst, Bonn 2023; 74: © Wayne Thiebaud Foundation / VG Bild-Kunst, Bonn 2023; 78: Public domain, Musée Carnavalet, Paris; 81: Public domain, Musée Fabre, Montpellier; 86-89: © Museum of Modern Art, New York, photos Robert Gerhardt; 91-97: Courtesy of Sarah Rapson and Maxwell Graham, New York; 98: photo Andreas Beyer; 100: © Victoria and Albert Museum, London; 102+104: © Kunsthalle Wien, photo www.kunst-dokumentation.com; 105: © Elfie Semotan; 107-110: Courtesy of Wangechi Mutu and Vielmetter Los Angeles, photos Robert Wedemeyer; 112: Courtesy of Kent Chan and Gasworks, photo Andy Keate; 114: Produced by the Aerocene Foundation and Studio Tomás Saraceno, supported by Connect, BTS, curated by DaeHyung Lee; 116+118: Courtesy of Fred Eversley and David Kordansky Gallery, photos Tom Powel; 120-124: Courtesy of Richard Hawkins and Gaga & Reena Spaulings LA; 127+128: © Cameron Rowland, courtesy of the artist; 132: © VG Bild-Kunst, Bonn 2023, courtesy of Centre Pompidou; 134: © VG Bild-Kunst, Bonn 2023 / succession Agnès Varda; 136+138: © Josh Kline, courtesy of Josh Kline and Modern Art, London, photos Robert Glowacki; 141: © Minh Duc Pham, courtesy of MdbK Leipzig, photos Alexander Schmidt/PUNCTUM; 142+144: Courtesy of MdbK Leipzig; 147: Courtesy of Printed Matter; 151: Courtesy of W.A.G.E.; 152: © Alamy; 156-160: Courtesy of Angela Melitopoulos and Museo Reina Sofia; 162+164: Courtesy of The Metropolitan Museum of Art; 166+170: Commissioned by Counterpublic, photos Jon Gitchoff; 169: Courtesy of St. Louis CITY SC.; 172: © Torkwase Dyson, courtesy of Pace Gallery; 174: © Senga Nengudi, courtesy of Sprüth Magers and Thomas Erben Gallery, New York, photo Timo Ohler; 175: Public Domain; 176+179: © Collections Comédie-Française; 180: © Daniel Katz Gallery; 182+186: Museum of Modern Art, New York, photo Emile Askey; 185: Art Gallery of Ontario, photo Wolfgang Tillmans; 188+189: © Bucerius Kunst Forum, Hamburg / VG Bild-Kunst, Bonn 2023; 190: © Gabriele Münter and VG Bild-Kunst, Bonn 2023; 192+194: © Bridget Riley, courtesy of Bridget Riley and Galerie Max Hetzler, Berlin, photos def image; 196: © Dara Birnbaum, courtesy of Dana Birnbaum and Marian Goodman Gallery; 199: © Marta Minujín, image courtesy of Marta Minujín Studio and Henrique Faria, New York; 200: © 2023 Amar Kanwar; 202+203: Courtesy of Dominique Knowles and Hannah

Hoffman Gallery, Los Angeles, photos Paul Salveson; 209-211: Courtesy of Jenni Tischer and Krobath Vienna, photos Rudolf Strobl; 214: Photo Prussian Heritage Image Archive; 216-219: © Museum Rietberg, photos Rainer Wolfsberger; 220+224: © Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation, New York, photos David Heald; 223: © Fundación Gego; 226+228: © Nicole Marianna Wytyczak; 231: Photo Achim Kukulies; 232: Courtesy of Drei Köln, photo Andrea Rossetti; 235: Courtesy of Julia Scher and SFMOMA, photo Andrea Rossetti; 237-241: © MK&G, photos Henning Rogge; 242+244: © The Metropolitan Museum of Art; 246: Courtesy of The Metropolitan Museum of Art, photo Annie Leibovitz / Vogue /Trunk Archive; 248: Courtesy of Carlier Gebauer, photo Frank Sperling; 250: © Veronica Werckmeister; 255: Courtesy of Wade Guyton; 257: Courtesy of Sarah Morris

Für die Abbildungen auf Seite 70 und 142 hat sich die Redaktion bemüht, den*die Rechteinhaber*in ausfindig zu machen. Sollten Ansprüche offengeblieben sein, bitten wir darum, Kontakt mit TEXTE ZUR KUNST aufzunehmen.

For the images on page 70 and 142, the editors have made every effort to find the copyright holder. Should any claims remain unresolved, please contact TEXTE ZUR KUNST.

IMPRESSUM / IMPRINT

TEXTE ZUR KUNST GmbH & Co. KG

Strausberger Platz 19

D-10243 Berlin

www.textezurkunst.de

Fon: +49 (0)30 30 10 45 330

VERLAGSLEITUNG / MANAGING DIRECTOR

Silvia Koch

verlag@textezurkunst.de

REDAKTION / EDITORIAL BOARD

Fon: +49 (0)30 30 10 45 340

redaktion@textezurkunst.de

CHEFREDAKTEUR / EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Christian Liclair (V.i.S.d.P.)

REDAKTEURIN / EDITOR

Antonia Kölbl

BILD- UND ONLINEREDAKTEURIN /

IMAGE AND ONLINE EDITOR

Anna Sinofzik

REDAKTIONSASSISTENZ / EDITORIAL ASSISTANT

Johanna Siegler

KONZEPTION DIESER AUSGABE /

THIS ISSUE WAS CONCEIVED BY

Sabeth Buchmann, Isabelle Graw, Antonia Kölbl,
Christian Liclair, Anna Sinofzki, Beate Söntgen

ÜBERSETZUNGEN / TRANSLATIONS

Brian Hanrahan, Sonja Holtz, Gerrit Jackson

LEKTORAT / COPY EDITING

Dr. Antje Taffelt, Erin Troseth

KORREKTORAT / PROOFREADING

Diana Artus, Matthew James Scown

DIRECTOR ABONNEMENTS & DISTRIBUTION /

DIRECTOR SUBSCRIPTIONS & DISTRIBUTION

Susann Kowal

mail@textezurkunst.de

ANZEIGEN / ADVERTISING

Diana Nowak (Anzeigenleitung / Head of Advertising),

Maximilian Klawitter

Fon: +49 (0)30 30 10 45 345

anzeigen@textezurkunst.de

EDITIONEN / ARTISTS' EDITIONS

Diana Nowak

editionen@textezurkunst.de

ART HANDLING

Z. Harris

PRESSE- UND MEDIENASSISTENTIN /

COMMUNICATIONS ASSISTANT

Sophia Lopez Schwarz

GEGRÜNDET VON / FOUNDING EDITORS

Stefan Germer (†), Isabelle Graw

HERAUSGEBERIN UND GESCHÄFTSFÜHRERIN /

PUBLISHER AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Isabelle Graw

BEIRAT / ADVISORY BOARD

Sven Beckstette, Sabeth Buchmann, Helmut Draxler,
Jutta Koether, Mahret Ifeoma Kupka, Dirk von Lowtzow,
Ana Magalhães, Hanna Magauer, Irene V. Small, Beate
Söntgen, Mirjam Thomann, Brigitte Weingart

COVER

Image: Sam Farallon / Unsplash

Design: Anna Sinofzik

GRAFISCHE KONZEPTION / DESIGN CONCEPT

Mathias Poledna in Zusammenarbeit mit /

in collaboration with Bärbel Messmann

LAYOUT

Sebastian Fessel

layout@textezurkunst.de

TEXTE ZUR KUNST

Vierteljahresschrift / quarterly magazine

EINZELVERKAUFSPREIS / SINGLE ISSUE

Euro 16,50

ABONNEMENT FÜR VIER AUSGABEN

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION (FOUR ISSUES)

Euro 50,- (zzgl. Versand / plus shipping)

VORZUGSABONNEMENT FÜR 4 AUSGABEN UND

4 EDITIONEN / SPECIAL ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION

(FOUR ISSUES AND FOUR ARTISTS' EDITIONS)

Euro 1680,- (zzgl. Versand / plus shipping)

ABOSERVICE / SUBSCRIPTIONS

mail@textezurkunst.de

VERTRIEB / DISTRIBUTION

Texte zur Kunst Verlag GmbH & Co. KG

Strausberger Platz 19

D-10243 Berlin

UST-ID-Nr.: DE 122773787

Registergericht: Amtsgericht Charlottenburg /

Registernummer: HRA 32925

Copyright © 2023 FÜR ALLE BEITRÄGE

FOR ALL CONTRIBUTIONS

Texte zur Kunst Verlag GmbH & Co. KG

Alle Rechte vorbehalten. Nachdruck nur mit vorheriger
Genehmigung des Verlags.

Für unverlangt eingesandte Manuskripte und Fotos
wird keine Haftung übernommen. / All rights reserved.

No part of this magazine may be reproduced without
the publisher's permission. "Texte zur Kunst" assumes
no responsibility for unsolicited submissions.

HERSTELLUNG / PRINTED BY

Europrint, Berlin

ISBN 978-3-946564-29-4 / ISSN 0940-9596

DANKSAGUNG / ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Silvia Baltschun, Brit Barton, Paul Buckermann,
Isabelle Bucklow, Jessica Lin Cox, Joel Danilewitz,
Philipp Dochantschi, Max L. Feldman, Hannah Gregory,
J Jan Goeneboer, Wade Guyton, Hans-Jürgen Hafner,
Rose Higham-Stainton, Violaine Huisman, Katayoun
Jalilipour, Jens Kastner, Audra Verona Lambert,
Thomas Locher, Catherine McGann, Luzie Meyer,
Sarah Morris, Jennifer Lynn Peterson, Cybéle Prichett,
Printed Matter, Roland Schappert, Tuesday Smillie,
Soup du Jour, Lise Soskolne, Zach Steinman, Molly
Vaughan, Laura Vielmetter-Diekmann, Julian Volz, Nils
Werckmeister, Veronica Werckmeister