

“NOTES AGAINST THE TITLE OF THE EXHIBITION.”

TO JANAINA TSCHÄPE,
FROM RICARDO SARDENBERG

...I wrote this sentence almost as a layer in my thinking. Suddenly, it was there, on the screen: *Contemplating Gaze*. I think it's perfect as everything stays within the 'Gaze'. There's an apparent redundancy this way - just as the eye seems to result in a play of mirrors and lenses. You have to let the landscape speak for itself, since it's present in practically the whole work. The landscape is a fixed icon in the drawings, paintings, sculptures, videos and photographs. Yet, the gaze you propose takes its time; there's no hurry, no stress, that is, it's contemplative. We have to soak up the landscape proposed. That's why your drawings, like your canvases, always seem to have micro details of points, colours, repetitive waves or lines, rather. There's also this macro field, where great areas of planes structure the works by creating a sort of synthesis between those points, lines and colours. They are pliant, twisted and unstable; they are organic planes.

This point of view is a geometric one: something that doesn't exist in real life, just in our minds. At the same time, geometry helps us give meaning to the world, so it's a fundamental aspect of our lives. I think a mathematician would disagree with me on this but we have ambiguous ideas of what a point, or a line, or a plane, are. That is, we have no way to prove that what I imagine to be a square is the same thing you imagine in your mind. This is because it's an idea or a concept. Of course, the square is a form with four equal sides. But this idea only rests in our minds; it's something we were taught. In this sense, it's like a fundament, something that's been drawn from gazing at the landscape for centuries (the word to be used here is specifically *gazing*, instead of *contemplating*, for it refers to sight that goes beyond feeling - the sight that thinks and reflects), and as such it's the landscape that allows us to formulate these geometries.

Indeed, it was the landscape that allowed us to conceptualise and digest geometry so as to incorporate it in our gaze; it was like creating a fundament so one could give some sort of meaning to the gaze. The only thing this fundament is good for though, is the gaze - but that's totally dry. After all, we also look with our ears, our sense of smell and touch, as well as our mouths, and that's why in your work, Janaina, you don't stick to paintings and drawings. It's fundamental to make sculptures and to work with volume, because volume is where points, lines and planes have their most sensorially complex relationship. It has to do with our body: how we view things in the world essentially depends on how our body registers the place it's in and how it relates to everything around it. This is because it's in volume that points, lines and planes disappear and become one. (I hope this makes sense to the poet.)

How could you not make sculptures? It's obvious that it's urgent to make them. And preferably make sculptures you can grab, touch, squeeze and mix like plastilin bars. Then you, or rather your "volume body", would give birth to a sculpture and necessarily create a new "thing body" – that

is, a new volume inside our "space body", which is, so to speak, the great volume where we live in and interact with — space.

(And therein lies the rub. Over there in Bocaina de Minas, where the hills outline the sky.)

Because it's in this place, which is a totalising volume, where everything happens, where it's impossible to control all the points and lines and planes, that time unwinds to create a bundle that is our experience. The experience of everything doesn't make geometry disappear though, quite the contrary: it is through it that we reach geometry. The paradox (are we going the opposite way?) is that it's from experience that we infer the existence of points, lines and planes - that it becomes easier to build an image of these in our minds.

As I have said before though, the image we make is individual and inexplicable; to conceptualise a square, I have to look at the experience my body has had in the world. From that moment on, however, the process of conceptualising the phenomenon begins. Rather than our identifying the thing called "square", we are creating a concept of the notion of a square relative to our body, or relative to the fact that it's so other to our body. We have to believe in our bodies! This bag of water, fat and proteins, contained within our skin. We also have to believe in its relationship with space, but that only happens when we feel the whole space, and many parts of it; this must be the process of experience through which we get to a concept. Do we have to do it by fighting against the world though, just because we're animals? No, the world of ideas, in sculpture, is still the barbarian's fight, where understanding is wholly inside the body as meaning. It's an individual expression in the sense that it's internal, in a place where it's no longer just physical but also mental. And we project this internal fight outwards, and through it we understand the world.

So it's inside this body-place, it's in the internalisation of space that our feelings are born, as are our ideas and our sense of the very limit of our body, which is truly so fragile and will perish, but which also feels the pleasure of living, that is, of being in time, for time is the only thing that's imposed on space.

The landscape is the framework, the anchor that allows your work to be formalised in space and in time. It's in it that we find all formal, sensorial and intellectual situations. In it I can gaze with hedonistic pleasure and watch it with an attentive mind.

「與是次展覽標題相反的隨筆」

列卡度·山迪伯格

寫給賈奈娜·查普

……寫下這一句時，它停留在我思維的一層。忽然間，它出現了，就在螢幕上：思索視線景觀。我覺得很完美，因為一切根本就是存在於「視線景觀」當中。表面看似是不由衷的——就像眼睛所看的似是鏡子與鏡面擺弄出的畫面一樣。你要讓景觀自行表達其涵義，所以它其實遍佈整幅作品。這個景觀是素描、油畫、雕塑、影片和照片中的固定圖像。但，你提出的視線景觀慢慢地出現；它不趕，不急，就這樣，在沉思。我們要浸淫於畫面呈現的景觀。就是這個原因，你的素描跟你的畫布一樣，總是似有細微的點和顏色細節，以及不斷重複的波浪或線。當中也有宏觀的視野，大範圍的面與這些點、線和顏色合成，形成這些作品的結構。它們柔軟、扭曲、不穩定，它們是自然而生的。

這些作品的觀點是幾何的：一些不存在於真實生活的東西，它只存在於我們的思想中。與此同時，幾何形態幫助我們尋找世界的意義，所以它是我們生活的基本概念。數學家或許不會同意，但我們對點或線或者面是甚麼，定義很模糊。即是說，我們沒辦法證明我想像的四方形跟你腦裡想像的是一樣的。那是因為它只是一個想法或一個概念。當然，四方形即是有四條等邊的形狀。但這個想法只存在於我們的思想中；是別人教我們的。如此說來，它就像是一個基礎，是多個世紀以來我們憑著視線景觀而畫出來的東西（特此用「視線景觀」而不是「思索」是因為它意味著超越感覺的視覺——有思想和反思的視覺），就是這樣的景觀使我們構思出這些幾何理念。

的確，是景觀使我們形成和理解幾何概念，繼而將它納入我們的視線景觀當中；這個基礎的形成就像是要使人能夠尋找視線景觀的意義。可是這個基礎只是有利於一樣東西，那就是視線景觀——但那是何其的乏味。畢竟我們亦會用我們的耳朵、嗅覺和觸覺，以及味覺去感受，也就是這個原因，你，賈奈娜，你的作品不只是油畫和素描。它是創造雕塑和營造層次的基礎，因為層次感讓點、線和面展開感官上最複雜的關係。這與我們的身體有關：我們怎樣觀察世界上的一切，終歸都視乎我們的身體怎樣審視身處的環境，以及身體怎樣與周遭的一切共處。正是這個原因，層次感使點、線和面消失且融合為一。（希望詩人會認為合理吧。）

你怎可以不做雕塑呢？很明顯你急需要創造雕塑，最好是創造一些可以抓、碰、擠和像紙黏土般混合的雕塑，然後你——或者你的「層次體」——就會為雕塑賦予生命，你一定要創造出新的「東西體」——即是存在於我們「空間體」內的新層次，也是我們活在與之互動的巨大層次，即是空間。

（這一點頗難。就在波凱那米納斯那處，那裡的山丘勾勒出天空的線。）

因為它存在於這個空間，而這是一個整體的層次，是萬物所發生的地方，是無法控制所有點、線和面的地方，時間放慢了步伐，形成我們的體驗。一切的體驗都不會令幾何消失，反之，它們使我們接觸到幾何。矛盾點（我們是否逆路行了？）是我們推斷出點、線和面的存在——那麼我們的思想就更容易建立出它們的影像。

但如上所說，我們製造的影像是獨一無二和無法解釋的；要構思出一個四方形的概念，需要深入身體在世的體驗。將那個現象概念化的過程，也就從那一刻開始了。事實上，不是我們懂得識別那個稱為「四方形」的東西，而是我們會根據身體，或者根據身體對它的印象，建立出四方形的概念。我們要相信我們的身體！那個藏於我們皮膚內的一養水、脂肪和蛋白質。我們也要相信它與空間的關係，但這種關係要我們感應到整個空間——還有當中很多的部分——才可以建立；要形成概念就一定要體驗的過程。但是不是因為我們都是動物，所以我們就要與世界對抗？不是，概念的世界、存在於雕塑的世



Untitled (2004)

界，那仍然是一場蠻夷之爭，理解就是活在身體內的意義。它是個內在的個人表達，當到達內在層次時，它不再是存在於外，而是一種精神狀態。而我們會向外投射這場內在的鬥爭，從而建立我們對世界的認知。

換言之，它存在於身體這個地方內，將我們產生感覺的空間內在化，而我們的理念和體內的有限感官亦然——我們的身體真的很脆弱，而且會殞滅，但仍然能感受活著的樂趣，即是存在於時間當中的樂趣，因為時間是唯一強加於空間內的東西。

景觀是一個框架，是使你的作品能夠在空間和時間中形成的錨。在那裡，我們會找到所有正規、感官和知性的情況。在這個層次當中，我會懷著享樂主義者的心境去凝望，本著專注的思想去觀看。