

## Work Notes

For me art is a mirror of the human. Hence, although sculpture in our century concentrates on space, for me this dimension on its own is insufficient. I find myself making figures and asking what a figure is. Where does the inner space end and the outer space begin.



The subject of the "head" especially interests me. It is difficult to deal with a head severed from the body as an element in motion. In portrait sculpture the head has mostly been treated as a static element and the movement focused on relations within it. Yet the space of the head is not limited within its encompassing volume. The look both stares at us and comes from us, limitless.



What am I attempting when I sculpt a head? What has always been attempted. To "make" a head - not the illusion of a head, or the likeness of a head - but a concrete relationship between mass and space. For me it is a continual dilemma between the view of an aesthetic object and a sensation of life. I start at a certain point, move around the sculpture but cannot return to the initial point. Part of me tries to go back to the starting point; another part of me says no, as in nature motion has neither beginning nor end. If you want **not** to create "art" - not to make a "sculpture" - but to create life, you have to erase the starting point and then you're in trouble, as you have no external point of reference.



The experience of existence as "non-being" or "absence" is primary in my view of reality. What I would like to get at is the feeling of a figure appearing from the absence - the encounter with something which, just appearing, already disappears. What is conceived of as "being" in existence is, in fact, the expression of movement. When this movement is located around a center of gravity, the spectator perceives an illusion of a body, comprised of volume and surface. This illusion has a double effect: the effect of contour which delimits space, and the light/dark effect which defines its structure.



The illusion of bodies sometimes seems to me a psychological need which helps us to cope with the problem of existence. As we are incapable of conceiving a structure which is "absence", we interpret the element of structure by means of projecting a hermetic plastic surface on reality, and by conceiving light/dark as shadows of opaque particles on other opaque plains. As painting is not based on creating physical volume, it can connect with the linear element of light and can thus create a parallel to sight. Sculpture, in contrast, deals with the tangible aspect of reality. The principle of painting is to create a visual illusion, whereas the principle of sculpture is to create an illusion of tactility.



Many painters have struggled with the "disappearance" of the object by choosing an oblique stance relative to the face, which enabled them to spread facial movements into opposite directions, front and back. The convergence of objects into different points of perspective, is difficult in sculpture because unlike painting, here we must take into account the other side of the object. When we try to translate the experience of distancing and convergence in relation to a figure from every point of observation, we suddenly discover that we have to construct an object consisting of sharp angles which serve as converging points. This sharply contrasts with the overall form which we perceive when we stand in front of the former point of convergence. Constructing the head turns into a ceaseless struggle between a concept of form as an elongated, converging element and a concept of its being a complete oval with no angles.



I try to reach the feeling of distance and volume through movement. The size of the head is the expression of an unending motion. By motion I don't mean the head's external movement or position, but the inner structure of an organic form. An extreme manifestation of this phenomenon shows when we take sculpture cast from a real figure. In those casts we do not get the spaces, the size or the depth which exists in reality. The reason is that the process of casting can only copy the plastic shape and this very act freezes motion.



Relations - in reality - are never static. This can be demonstrated using the movement of a fan. When in motion its three blades appear as a full surface. But if our eyes could move at the same speed as the fan's rotating blades, we would see the spaces between them. In moments of intense observation, organic wholes, too, no longer appear to me as full surfaces, but rather as moving elements around a focal point. In such moments the object of observation is no longer static but seems like an open spatial construct on which the movement of tiny particles creates the illusion of a surface. In contrast, all surfaces of matter (clay, plaster, metal, etc.) are static surfaces.



The force of energy in matter motivates my working process. But at the same time I try to include the ever changing relations between perceiving the object as an undefined plastic surface from close up, and perceiving it as a delimited mass, static and monolithic from a distance.



The fact that most living creatures have a clear symmetrical axis determined the basics of sculpture up to the Greek period. Greek sculpture relinquished symmetry in favor of motion. From my own experience, symmetry is an illusion attained at one particular point in relation to the object. When I move from that point in any direction, the illusion disappears. Therefore I seek to connect the symmetrical aspect with the spiral. It is an attempt to reach a stage where the head has a symmetrical axis relative to a specific external point of observation, and at the same time to have this axis disappear completely when you move either to the left or to the right. My view of the head is constructed from the dialogue between the illusion of symmetry and the principle of motion.



In observation we constantly move between the dimensions of space and time. Space I conceive in terms of volume, and time in terms of direction. In the head of "Moshe" my understanding of the figure is based on the principle of time, meaning one external observation point to which all the flow is related. Here I try to reach an integrity of shape in relation to one observing point in space. In my later sculpture I aim at a higher complexity of time and space. I try to incorporate infinite points of view with an autonomous monolithic unit.



I try to come to terms with the tension between human presence and sculpting in space. In contrast to the artists of the turn of the century who abandoned volume for space, I start from space as a limitation I attempt to preserve, but go in the direction of volume. I try to combine the expressiveness of the moment which characterizes Western sculpture, with the permanent element characteristic of ancient sculpture. I am searching for a way to join these two traditions without relinquishing the monolithic surface of the body.



One of the differences between the internal and external world shows in the dimension of time. If in an internal world time exists as a dimension changing images which are projected as if on the same screen, then in the external world time exists in our very movement in space. Both these phenomena involve the difference between what I call "Renaissance - like" and what I think of as "Baroque - like". The "Renaissance - like" I see in terms of *making* the object - being out of nothing - an action resembling the creation. Its dominant dimension is space - the entirety of an object perceived from without. In the "Baroque - like" the subjective perception of the object becomes a factor. Here the dimension of time perception is dominant. The first is characterized by externalization of the world, the latter by its internalization. What characterizes the "Renaissance - like" is the visual tactility. The "Baroque - like" perceives the object through the dimension of light.



The new element supplied to art by our era is the deconstruction of the object by energy. The dominance of this force in modern art is manifested in the cancelling of the boundaries of surface. The fact that atomic science split the nucleus reflects in diverse levels of life, the media, and art. And even on the television screen, characterized by flat shape, artificial light, and speedy change, time is barely noticeable. The visual principle of our era is marked by its diffusion, lack of continuity and a minimalization of the time factor. In other words - chaos. Post-modernism has reacted to this disintegration by "quoting" previous periods or by returning to various artistic traditions.



In my view each period should integrate its characteristic visual principle with those of previous periods. If the new principle functions merely as a weapon against earlier ones, it can only bring destruction. What I attempt in sculpture is to "collect" disjunctive surface forms in order to give a new interpretation to the entire contour of a head or a figure. I attempt to combine the fragmented images of our view of reality with the ancient world's concept of the whole.



The dialogue with the art of the past restrains me in that it weighs me down with the burden of "thou shalt" and "thou shalt not", but it gives one faith in the possibility of continuity.

