

Drawing by Other Means: Thierry De Duve and Robert Morris
Francis Halsall

ROUGH DRAFT (MARCH 2009)

To be presented at:

- (i) Creative Practice/Creative Research Materiality, Process, Performativity Faculty of Arts, York St John University (April 15-17 2009)
- (ii) IAPL (International Association for Philosophy and Literature) Brunel University, London, (1-7 June, 2009)

Abstract

This paper is a response to Thierry de Duve's recent account and accompanying pencil drawing of Robert Morris' *3 L-Beams*¹. My argument is that de Duve shows that even though Morris' Minimalist work is a 3-dimensional sculpture it approaches the *style* of drawing.

Drawing is the process of inscribing the phenomenological experience of objects in space onto a material support. Further, because the practice of drawing is immediate in the sense that there is a lack of intervention by some specific and historically configured medium with its own protocols and conventions (as we find in painting, for example) it can be performed by different processes with different materials.

De Duve argues that: "Morris' minimalist pieces need to be seen, perceived, experienced in real time and space. They even emphasize the 'reality' or literalness of this time and space, presenting, as it were, time as duration and space as a function of gravity." One reason for this is that they are 3 identical shapes arranged, "to look and feel different," which position the viewer to actively account for their similarity and difference.

In this paper I explore three implications of this. First, I consider the relationship between *3 L-Beams* and Morris' *Blind Time Drawings* (1973– 2000); I do so to demonstrate how Morris' drawing and sculptural works are isomorphic. Second, I discuss how because *3 L-Beams* presents the delineation or tracing of forms in space it approaches the style of drawing. Third, I conclude by claiming that *3 L-Beams* situates the perceiving viewer into relation to its shapes. It thus draws that viewer into a *style* of phenomenological observation that one adopts when drawing. Thus, as is illustrated by De Duve's drawing of the sculpture, *3 L-Beams* puts the viewer into the position of *one who is drawing*.

¹ Thierry de Duve, "Kant's 'Free- Play' in the Light of Minimal Art," in Halsall, Jansen, O'Connor, (eds.), *Rediscovering Aesthetics*, (Stanford University Press, 2008)

1 - Introduction

The impetus for this paper came from a pencil drawing by the art historian Thierry de Duve of a sculptural work by Robert Morris: *Untitled, 3 L-Beams* (1965). De Duve produced the drawing from a well known photograph of an installation view of Morris' work at the Green Gallery in New York [check, see also Eindhoven installation]. In order to produce the drawing de Duve needed to apprehend the shapes of the sculpture (in its photographic representation) and re-present this apprehension according to: the materials he had to hand; a technical schema; and his own aptitude. In short there were four co-ordinates within which de Duve produced his drawing: (i) what he saw; (ii) the pencil and paper he used; (iii) the learnt techniques by which he drew; (iv) his bodily actions.

I argue here that de Duve's drawing reveals that drawing as a process and practice provides a means by which to approach Morris' minimalist sculpture. There are three main claims that emerge from this line of thought. First, that the simple forms of *Untitled, 3 L-Beams* embody a style of drawing which is to say that they define, by means of outline. In other words they delineate forms in space. Second, that the work positions the viewer in such a way that an interrogation into how the forms delineate forms in space becomes part of the meaning of the work. Third, *Untitled 3 L-Beams* puts the viewer into the position of someone who is drawing it; that of someone who must apprehend its forms and, in turn, reflect upon that apprehension.

2 - *Untitled, 3 L-Beams*

Morris' *Untitled, 3 L-Beams* is comprised of 3 identical L-shaped fibre-glass forms (243.8 x 243.8 x 61 cm) with a 90 degree angle in the middle. The forms are simple. And they are painted white. Morris had planned to make nine forms although only three were built and this is the way the work is now exhibited (there are several versions).

Typical for works of Minimalism the forms are non-representational, have no surface ornament and no apparent expressive content. In her description of minimalism ABC Art (1965) Barbara Rose noted:

“That these young artists [of which Morris was one] attempt to suppress or withdraw content from their works is undeniable. That they wish to make art that is as bland, neutral and as redundant as possible also seems clear. The content, then, if we are to take the work at face value, should be nothing more than the total of the series of assertions that it is this or that shape and takes up so much space and is painted such a colour and made of such a material.”²

The effect of this simplicity is that in the absence of iconographic or expressive content to the work the conditions under which they are experienced is what the work is about. This is the way that Morris talks about such work: “I want to provide a situation where people can become more aware of themselves and their own experience rather than more aware of some version of my experience”³

² Barbara Rose, ABC Art, (1965) in Meyer ed. *Minimalism*, (Phaidon, ...) pg. 214

³ Robert Morris, Letter to Michael Compton, 5 March, 1971, quoted in Jon Bird, 'Minding the Body' in Newman and Bird (eds.) *Rewriting Conceptual Art*, (Reaktion, 1999) pg. 97

[Expand here, Minimalism is about the conditions of experience, and aesthetics becomes a privileged site to carry this out because it is disinterested (Kant); that is certain (interested) aspects of experience can be bracketed...]

The 3 L-Beams are identical but arranged differently to one another. Even though the objects have the same dimensions and shape, the work confuses this apparently easy interpretation so that their similarity is hard to grasp, at least initially, as Rose acknowledges:

“For the spectator this is often all very bewildering. In the face of so much nothing he is still experiencing something, and usually a rather unhappy something at that. I have often thought one had a sense of loss looking at these big, blank empty things, so anxious to cloak their art identity that they were masquerading as objects. Perhaps what one senses is that, as opposed to the florid baroque fullness of the *angst*-ridden older generation, the hollow barrenness of the void has a certain poignant if strangled expressiveness.”⁴

There are 3 main reasons for this bewilderment. First their size; standing at 8 feet by 8 feet, they are simultaneously bigger than human dimensions, whilst being smaller than traditionally monumental sculptural or architectural forms. Second the forms are arranged in a deliberately confusing way. They are re-iterated in 3 different positions and are rotated around 3 different axes which makes the similarity between them difficult to perceive. Third both of these effects are exacerbated when coupled with a small and cramped exhibition space that hinders the easy apprehension of the forms in the round and at once. As Krauss argued it is precisely the position of the forms in space that creates the effect of confusion because they “suspend the axiomatic coordinates of an ideal space.”⁵ Thus, the spatio-temporal positioning of the shapes has a direct consequence upon the experience of those shapes; and this is, in part, what the work is about. A comparison could be made, as de Duve does, with Rodin’s work the Three Shades, the 3 figures that stand on the top of the Gates of Hell, “a work that is also composed of three identical sculptures arranged in such a way that they look and feel different; they manage to sustain that feeling, no matter how long you look at them and how well you know that they are actually identical.”⁶ Similarly, 3 L-Beams is 3 identical shapes arranged, in de Duve’s words “to look and feel different,” which address the viewer and positions them in a relationship that compels them (or “extorts” in Fried’s terms) to actively account for their similarity and difference⁷. De

⁴ Rose, *ibid.*

⁵ Krauss, R. ‘Sense and Sensibility: Reflections on Post 60s Sculpture’, *Artforum*, (November 1973), pg. 50

⁶ De Duve in Halsall et al.

⁷ Fried’s celebrated critique of Minimalism was that it “extorts” a response from the viewer. Thierry de Duve’s response on the anthropomorphism in Fried’s position is discussed at length by Susan Best who wrote: “‘Demands,’ ‘addresses,’ such terms are routinely used in art history to describe the accommodations a receptive viewer makes to the exigencies of different art practices. These terms, and our constant recourse to them, clearly indicate the ingrained and unavoidable nature of anthropomorphism. But Fried’s term ‘extorts’ is in a slightly different register: there is both violence and unwillingness implicit in this term. Indeed, Fried’s response to minimalist works, such as Tony Smith’s *Die*, makes manifest an extreme form of anthropomorphism and a more profound entanglement of spectator and work.” Susan Best, ‘Minimalism, subjectivity, and aesthetics: rethinking the anti-aesthetic

DuVe returns to Kant's account of aesthetic experience in the *Critique of Judgement* to frame his argument and states that: "Morris' minimalist pieces need to be seen, perceived, experienced in real time and space. They even emphasize the 'reality' or literalness of this time and space, presenting, as it were, time as duration and space as a function of gravity."⁸

De DuVe's uses Kant to argue that aesthetic experience is at the very heart of a satisfactory account of Morris' work. There are two things at stake in this engagement in Kantian aesthetics. First the Kantian claim that we become conscious of the free play of our cognitive powers that we experience when making an aesthetic judgement, through sensation (pleasurable) and not intellectually. This, crucially for my argument here, situates aesthetic experience directly within a sensing body. Second, through Kant, de DuVe demonstrates that it is through the power of imagination that the forms of Morris' work as they are sensuously experienced can be properly cognised and understood. As de DuVe argues, imagination "schematizes and synthesises raw sense data; it unifies the manifold of empirical experience into a gestalt, which it presents to the understanding."

It is my claim here that this is also what the drawer does whilst drawing; namely to schematizes and synthesises raw sense data and to unify the manifold of empirical experience into a gestalt which is then presented through the material of the drawing. If this is the case then it would follow that 3 L-Beams provides a diagram of the way in which it is experienced [? Does this work?]

3 - Drawing is a process

I've assumed, then, that drawing is the translation of experience according to the material used in the process of drawing and the procedures used by the drawer. Drawing is before anything else, diagrammatic and non-mimetic. It is the construction of patterns and the making of marks. However, as Gombrich describes, the process of drawing does not sequentially proceed from observation to transcription. Instead the drawer works according to schemata. The artist, Gombrich argues, "begins not with his visual impression but with his idea or concept." They subsequently work according to a process of "making and matching" whereby the image is made and matched to experience. In this account of image making schemata are, Gombrich argues, "the first approximate, loose category which is gradually tightened to fit the form it is to reproduce." Schemata and material thus pre-exist and are conceptually prior to drawing, as Gombrich states, "you cannot create a faithful image out of nothing."⁹ Further, the schemata of drawing will, in turn, frame the way which the drawer perceives the world. For example in discussing Constables copying of the drawing book of Alexander Cozens (an eighteenth-century landscape painter) Gombrich observes: "we know by now what Cozens teaches Constable. Not indeed, what clouds look like, but a series of possibilities, of schemata, which should increase his awareness through visual classification." He continues by further emphasising the relationship between schemata and perception: "It matters little what filing system we adopt. But without some standards of comparison we cannot grasp reality. Having

tradition in late-modern art', *Journal of Visual Art Practice* 5: 3, (2006) pp. 127–142. See also Thierry De DuVe, 'Performance Here and Now: Minimal Art, a Plea for a new Genre of Theatre' (trans. D. Guilbaut), *Open Letter* 5–6, (Summer/Fall 1983) pp. 234–60.

⁸ De DuVe in Halsall et al.

⁹ Gombrich, *Art and Illusion*, ch 2 & 5 (Phaidon) pp.

looked at Constable's creations we may also see clouds in a fresh way. If so we will owe this heightened awareness to the memory of the images created by art."¹⁰

There are limits to Gombrich's account that I don't want to dwell on here; in particular it is predicated on vision and representation and it leans towards an account of art grounded in pictorial illusion. However, what Gombrich's account does offer is an account of image making that is based on it being a physical activity. The schemata by which the drawer operates are the culturally situated parameters for the drawer's physical actions. They make and match by observing and correcting their actions. There are two specific implications I want to take from this and carry forward into the remainder of my discussion. First that the observation that frames making and matching need not be *visual* observation [although the implications of this, and what specifically is meant by observation here need to be more thoroughly teased out.]¹¹ Second, that the correction that accompanies observation, and hence artistic practice in general and drawing in particular, is a manual, embodied practice. As Richard Serra claims, "Drawing is a verb"¹²

4 - Drawing and Medium Specificity

Once drawing has been identified as a process its status or definition as a medium is radically problematized. Even in the now dominant expanded definitions of medium such as we find in Krauss might be too specific.

Krauss, for example, has defended a definition of medium as the 'technical support' for the work of art. The benefit of this expanded definition of medium is that it does not make medium reducible to, "the specific material support for a traditional aesthetic genre." As Krauss argues, such an expanded definition of 'technical support':

"... has the virtue of acknowledging the recent obsolescence of most traditional aesthetic mediums (such as oil on canvas, fresco, and many sculptural materials, including cast bronze or welded metal), while it also welcomes the layered mechanisms of new technologies that make a simple, unitary identification of the work's physical support impossible (is the 'support' of film the celluloid strip, the screen, the splices of the edited footage, the projector's beam of light, the circular reels?) If the traditional

¹⁰ Ernst Gombrich, *Art and Illusion*, (Phaidon, ...) pp. 151-52

¹¹ "To explain how the process of distinction functions Niklas Luhmann introduces his radical concept of *Observation*. Observation is the process by which distinctions are indicated from a position relative to the system in which it takes place. This is a paradigm shift from a more traditional sociological notion of representation to a concept of social meaning that is contingent not only on particular systems but also upon the process of observation itself. Without observation no differentiation would occur. Thus, the economic system observes and differentiates the world in terms of economic value while the art system differentiates what it observes in terms of artistic and aesthetic value. The corollary to observation is the important concept of 2nd order observation. This is the process by which a system observes its own actions and blind-spots. This is a process of self-reflexivity that recalls deconstruction in that it is a process by which a system observes its own observing. Thus, in the process of 2nd order observation, the art system can observe how art itself is constituted by the art system's processes of observation and distinction. And, likewise, systems-theory can observe itself as a discursive system that observes the world from a particular perspective."

¹² Serra, *Collected writings* (interview, check ref.)

medium is supported by a physical substance (and practiced by a specialized guild), the term ‘technical support,’ in distinction, refers to contemporary commercial vehicles, such as cars or television, which contemporary artists exploit, in recognition of the contemporary obsolescence of the traditional mediums, as well as acknowledging their obligation to wrest from that support a new set of aesthetic conventions to which their works can then reflexively gesture, should they want to join those works to the canon of modernism.”¹³

The idea that medium be understood as the ‘technical support’ for a work of art means that its definition is grounded upon a set of practices rather than a particular set of material conditions. Thus painting, for example, is not explicable by the existence of paint, canvas and brushes alone, but instead must be understood as the set of historical conditions that allow for the identification of a set of technical procedures (such as historical precedents and studio practices) to be acknowledged as painting.¹⁴

However, whilst the particular instances of schemata of drawing will be historically and culturally framed there is, I argue, a more general activity of drawing that cannot be so historically situated. As Emma Dexter observes drawing is not weighed down by the baggage of history and no-one has ever declared the end of drawing or that drawing is dead as has been claimed of both painting and sculpture¹⁵. Drawing is immediate in the full sense of the word, meaning the lack of an intervening and historically configured medium with its own protocols and expectations. Drawing is the creation pattern and form. And if the most basic difference between form and non-form is a line, then the most basic form of a line is a drawn one. No matter what material it is drawn in. Drawing is a technologically simple activity in which only the drawn lines mediate between the artist and the viewer. And these lines may be drawn on and with potentially any material means and still be recognised as drawing.

Examples to be discussed: (i) Fred Sandback, drawing 3 dimensionally with wire and string to delineate minimalist forms; (ii) Anthony McCall and the *Solid Light Films*, drawing with light; (iii) Matthew Barney, *Drawing Restraint 1-9*

Perhaps, then, drawing is the lingua franca of art. It is perhaps one that eludes medium (or is it a more basic medium, an ur-medium and a potentially trans-historical one ... ?)

5 – Drawing is a style of practice not a medium

¹³ Krauss, R. (2006) ‘Two Moments from the Post-Medium Condition’ *October*, 116, pp. 55-62

¹⁴ Fried discusses how the definition of painting as a medium is exemplified by Courbet *Painter’s Studio* (1854-55) which Courbet himself identified as a ‘real allegory’ of the technical and historical conditions of the medium of painting at the time at which it was painted. Fried further by argues that the painting is (with *The Wheat Sifters* (1853)) an “allegory of its own production” in which Courbet depicts himself as “already immersed” in his medium and “physically enclosed, one might say subsumed, within the painting he is making, wherever the ultimate limits of that painting are taken to lie.” Fried, M., *Courbet’s Realism*, (University of Chicago Press, 1990)

¹⁵ Emma Dexter, introduction to *Vitamin D*

Question. If Drawing is not a medium what is it? A mode of practice? A style of practice? Style is useful because it offers the way of identifying a coherence according to an organising principle. It is, in Meyer Shapiro's definition, "a system of forms,"¹⁶ and for Gombrich: "Style is any distinctive, and therefore recognizable, way in which an act is performed or an artefact made or ought to be performed and made."¹⁷

[expand]

I speculated above that drawing might be conceived of as a practice or perhaps a certain *style* of process. The reason for suggesting this was to uncouple drawing from any material or medium specificity. The consequence of this uncoupling is that drawing is no longer conceived as a medium; this was because even in expanded definitions of medium such as "technical support" it would need to be too broad to have a meaningful critical or descriptive purchase [formulate more to the point].

Throughout his artistic career Morris has repeatedly engaged in interrogating medium specificity. In *Notes on Sculpture* he explores how sculpture provides the opportunity for this interrogation:

"The primary problematic concerns with which advanced painting has been occupied for about half a century have been structural. The structural element has been gradually revealed to be located within the nature of the literal qualities of the support. It has been a long dialogue with a limit. Sculpture, on the other hand, never having been involved with illusionism, could not possibly have based the efforts of the last fifty years upon the rather pious, if somewhat contradictory, act of giving up this illusionism and approaching the object."¹⁸

Sculpture, and minimalist sculpture in particular, for Morris provides the conditions by which to destabilise medium specificity because it directly addresses mobilises the spectator as an embodied subject:

"Not only the production of objects, but the perception of them as well involves bodily participation in movement in three dimensions. It might be said that the construction of rectilinear objects involves a split between mental and physical activity and a simultaneous underlining of the contrast; on the one hand, the obviousness of the prior plan, and on the other, the extreme reasonableness of the material used to manifest the structure."¹⁹

On the one hand this address to the viewer undermines the modernist assumption of the autonomy of the work of art and hence the specificity of its form and medium. If the forms of the art are forms of the viewers experience then they have lost their medium specificity and are instead conditional to the contingency of the observer's

¹⁶ Shapiro, 'Style' in in Donald Preziosi (ed.) *The Art of Art History*, (Oxford)

¹⁷ Gombrich, 'Style', in Preziosi (ed.) *The Art of Art History*, (Oxford)

¹⁸ Robert Morris, 'Notes on Sculpture, Part One, in *Continuous Project Altered Daily*, (.....) pg. 3

¹⁹ Robert Morris, 'Some Notes on the Phenomenology of Making', *Continuous Project Altered Daily*, pg. 89

subjectivity. [expand... see too Fried's critique of the "theatricality" of Minimalism]. On the other hand this mobilization of the perceiving subject to 'complete' the work [Duchamp the Creative Act] as it is being perceived places a sensuous and, crucially *embodied* human subject at the very heart of the experience of art. It is this embodied human subject that [provides the opportunity for?] the conflation of sculpture and drawing that is my conclusion.

Sculpture shares with drawing the condition of being a sufficiently open medium as to render the question of the conditions of its medium specificity an unanswerable one. And although Morris argues that sculpture is always literal (physical) and three dimensional, I want to argue that it can be enacted in different styles/modes; and that the drawing mode is one such mode. And that this is possible because drawing is also a tactile process.

What *Untitled 3 L-Beams* reveals is that both experiencing sculpture and drawing are embodied processes that take place in particular times and spaces. As Morris acknowledges: "Since Rodin, all modern sculpture has pre-supposed drawing. Especially since the 1960s, nearly all three-dimensional work has proceeded from drawing."²⁰

6 – Morris' *Blind Time Drawings*; Drawing as an embodied practice

In his series of *Blind Time Drawings* Morris explores how drawing is first and foremost an embodied, tactile processes, and is hence comparable to the process of experiencing sculptural forms. *Blind Time Drawings* are a sequence of drawing Morris made between 1973 and 2000. Morris would give himself a set of instructions (in which, he states, the "body addresses the sheet of paper under various constraints"²¹) for the drawing and then in a single session perform them with his eyes closed, he would then estimate the time the task had taken. The instructions and time estimate would then be copied out beneath the drawing.²² For example:

"With eyes closed, graphite on the hands and estimating a lapsed time of three minutes, both hands attempt to descend the page with identical touching motions in an effort to keep to an even vertical column of touches. Time estimation error: + 8 seconds."²³

Morris claimed to have been motivated by a desire to find a "basis for drawing"²⁴ and what they seem to reveal are the structures of process and the structures of perception by showing their limits and the places where they break down.

[question – do they reveal, perhaps the physical limits of Gombrich's schemata? Expand here]

Further, what these drawings show is that drawing is on the one hand clearly not about illusionism and on the other that it is a somatic (bodily) process.

²⁰ Robert Morris, 'The Present Tense of Space', *Continuous Project Altered Daily*, (.../...) pg. 199

²¹ Pg. 204

²² With one exception, in 1976 in the *Blind Time II* sequence when Morris worked with A.A. a woman blind from birth who he met through the American Association for the Blind.

²³ *Blind Time Drawings*, (.../...) Pg. 15

²⁴ (pg. 204)

The process of drawing whilst blind is consistent with the move away from the optical in art after modernism. This was, in part, a move away from Greenberg's prioritization of "eyesight alone"²⁵ as a privileged mode of engaging with painting. Artists such as Johns, Rauschenberg and Morris who reacted against Greenberg's Modernism did so by explicitly returning to the body to disrupt the hygiene of pure visuality and did so by re-mobilising Duchamp's distrust of vision and what he called "retinal art"²⁶.

[see also engagement with Pollock as a bodily, performative painter e.g. Kaprow. Morris on Pollock, 'That interaction of body and materials as they exist in a three-dimensional world'²⁷]

In the *Blind Time Drawings* this is a means by which to move away from the modernist (Greenberg) pre-occupation with the two-dimensional picture plane that presents itself to vision toward a three-dimensional object that presents itself to an the multi-sensory experience of an embodied subject.

The Blind Time Drawings demonstrate this clear bracketing out of vision in the field of artistic production by showing that drawing is a tactile process. In his response to them the philosopher Donald Davidson agreed with Morris that they are illustrations of "forms of human behaviour." Morris also claimed:

"I believe there are 'forms' to be found within the activity of making as much as within the end products. These are forms of behaviour aimed at testing the limits of possibilities involved in that particular interaction between ones actions and the materials of the environment. This amounts to the submerged side of the iceberg."²⁸

Conclusion

In Descartes *Optics* he claims that sight is analogous to a blind man's stick²⁹ that is a way of "feeling" our way through space and around objects. This feeling is what the drawer attempts to make concrete as Emma Dexter says: "Drawing is not a window on the world but a device for understanding our place in the universe." The drawer is

²⁵ Caroline Jones, *Eyesight Alone: Clement Greenberg's Modernism and the Bureaucratization of the Senses* (University of Chicago Press, 2005)

²⁶ REF.

²⁷ Robert Morris, 'Some Notes on the Phenomenology of Making', *Continuous Project Altered Daily*, pg. 78

²⁸ Robert Morris, 'Some Notes on the Phenomenology of Making', *Continuous Project Altered Daily*, pg. 73

²⁹"... For just as our blind man can sense the bodies which are around him, not only through the action of these bodies when they move against his stick, but also through that of his hand, when they are only resisting it, so we must affirm that objects of sight can be felt, not only by means of the action which, being in them, tends toward the eyes, but also by means of that which, being in the eyes, tends towards them. Nevertheless, because this action is nothing other than light, it is only of those who can see in the darkness of the night, such as cats, in whose eyes this action is found; and that, as for the ordinary man, he sees only by the action which comes from the objects. For experience has shown us that these objects must be luminous or illuminated in order to be seen, and not that our eyes must be luminous or illuminated in order to see them. (first discourse)"

a subject struggling to capture their object. They struggle with the material by which they draw, with the means by which they know to draw and with their apprehension of what it is they want to draw.

Untitled 3-L Beams coerces its viewers into a similar struggle to drawing. *3 L-Beams* situates the perceiving viewer into relation to its shapes. It thus draws that viewer into a *style* of phenomenological observation that one adopts when drawing.

As Davidson claims Morris: “put his viewers in a position to triangulate with the location of his creative acts.” He does so presenting by a piece of work that addresses an embodied subject. In Notes on Sculpture written just one year after *3 L-Beams* Morris explained his aspirations for such work: “the better new work takes relationships out of the work and makes them a function of space, light and the viewer’s field of vision. The object is but one of the terms in the newer aesthetic.”³⁰ Or, as De Duve argues: “when the spectator turns around the object and grasps it in its differences, he is attending his own differentiation, a becoming-other which is not the sudden astonishment in front of an alienating mirror, but a passive process resulting from his own actions.”³¹

It is my argument here that if, as De Duve argues, ‘one of the functions of contemporary art is to construct models of the contemporary subject’³² then *Untitled 3-L Beams* constructs the subject *as one who is drawing*.³³ And the best illustration of this is De Duve’s own pencil drawing of the sculpture.

³⁰ Robert Morris, ‘Notes on Sculpture, Part 2’ (1966), *Continuous Project Altered Daily*, Cambridge, MA, 1995, pp. 11–21.

³¹ Thierry De Duve, ‘Performance Here and Now: Minimal Art, a Plea for a new Genre of Theatre’ (trans. D. Guilbaut), *Open Letter* 5–6, (Summer/Fall 1983), pp. 234–60.

³² “To know anything in space (for instance, a line), I must *draw it*, and thus synthetically bring into being a determinate combination of the given manifold, so that the unity of this act is at the same time the unity of consciousness (as in the concept of a line); and it is through this unity of consciousness that an object (a determinate space) is first known. The synthetic unity of consciousness is, therefore, an objective condition of all knowledge. It is not merely a condition that I myself require in knowing an object, but is a condition under which every intuition must stand in order *to become an object for me*. For otherwise, in the absence of this synthesis, the manifold would *not* be united in one consciousness.” (Kant, Critique of Pure Reason, B 138)

³³ Thierry De Duve, ‘Performance Here and Now: Minimal Art, a Plea for a new Genre of Theatre’ (trans. D. Guilbaut), *Open Letter* 5–6, (Summer/Fall 1983), pp. 234–60.