

Aspects of Giedion-Welcker's Reception in the English-Speaking World

Dr Christa-Maria Lerm Hayes

This paper cannot, of course, cover all aspects of Carola Giedion-Welcker's reception. Reinhold Hohl, in his introduction to Giedion-Welcker's *Collected Writings* from 1973, alludes to a more enthusiastic initial reception of her work in the English-speaking world than even in the German-speaking one. This clearly had political reasons during the Nazi years. In the post-war period, her strong presence in the US, while her husband was teaching at Harvard from 1983, could have pointed to a much higher and more sustained profile in America. It would not quite be fair to suggest that she was forgotten: the inclusion of one of her texts in the Henry Moore Institute's anthology *Modern Sculpture Reader* is testimony to her (possibly renewed) appreciation in specialist circles, but her achievement has certainly not been valued consistently and equally with the artists whose canonical status she helped to establish.

My aim today is to explore why this may be the case and especially to focus on two seminal books within English-speaking sculptural history that short-change her: one possibly knowingly, the other unknowingly. These two books are Rosalind Krauss' *Passages in Modern Sculpture*, 1977, and Lucy R. Lippard's *Overlay: Contemporary Art and the Art of Prehistory* from 1983.

An intention of this short paper – that is more achievable possibly as an outcome of today's proceedings and no doubt more comprehensive given the capable help of the other speakers here today – is a reconsideration of Carola Giedion-Welcker, which is certainly warranted (at least in the English-speaking world). This is a development that is underway: Iris Bruderer-Oswald has completed a book-length study investigating Giedion-Welcker and her role within Modernist Art Criticism as a research project at the University of Basel.. This eagerly awaited book will include a biographical sketch by her son, Andres Giedion. I hope this paper will add a little chapter to the now sizable compendium of reappraisals of European perspectives on Modernist art that didn't subscribe to American High Modernist formalism but were at one point or other drowned

out by its dominance and subsequently ignored, misunderstood and/or misrepresented by its critics.

Rosalind Krauss, in *Passages in Modern Sculpture*, begins her argument – as one would – by setting her own project apart from previous studies. In the realm of Modernist sculpture, this inevitably meant establishing a relationship with the first standard publication on the subject, Carola Giedion-Welcker's *Modern Plastic Art* from 1937. This was expanded and published under the title *Contemporary Sculpture: An Evolution in Volume and Space* in 1955 and translated from the German in the same year. The way in which Krauss accomplishes this necessary task is to devote to Giedion-Welcker a few short sentences on pages three to four – and never to quote her again. These sentences read:

In *Modern Plastic Art*, the first book to deal seriously with twentieth-century sculpture, its author, Carola Giedion-Welcker, is entirely concerned with the spatial character of the sculptural task. Her enthusiasm for the modern achievements of that art arises from her sense of the increasing purity with which sculpture was concentrated on the spatiality of the medium – to the exclusion of any other concerns. [...] What she observed throughout modern sculpture was the conspicuous forging of a relationship between th[e] inert material and a system of patterning imposed upon [the] static, simultaneous space of the sculptural body [...] Brancusi's work was her example of the capacity of the carver to reduce material toward volumetric simplicity, while Naum Gabo served as the clearest exponent of the constructor's use of light to open matter up to an analysis of its structure. But if we are interested in examining the differences between Brancusi and Gabo, it is not enough to speak simply of the opposing systems they used for deploying matter [...].¹

Krauss can then continue: 'The underlying premise of the following [i.e. her own] study of modern sculpture is that, even in spatial art, space and time cannot be separated.'²

But did Giedion-Welcker separate?

¹ Rosalind Krauss. *Passages in Modern Sculpture*. MIT Press: Cambridge Mass. (1977) 1981, pp. 3, 4.

² *Ibid.*, p. 4.

When considering that Krauss' work's aim at that time can be identified as promoting an anti-formalist stance, to prove Greenberg and his followers in American art history and criticism wrong, her strategic aligning of Giedion-Welcker's work and High Modernist formalism (spatial character of the sculptural task, purity, exclusion of all else) amounts to nothing but an attempt to demolish her colleague as thoroughly and swiftly as possible. This strategy has paid off: Krauss' book has – indeed very deservedly – attracted a vast readership, anti-formalism has become the mainstream, and not many scholars in English-speaking art history would now be tempted to consult or to quote the dethroned, outdated standard *Modern Plastic Art*.

Presenting the case as I have, it is implicit that I do not think that Krauss was right. She is, for example, content to follow her predecessor in the choice of artists and often exactly the same works for scrutiny, thus perpetuating her canon and implicitly honouring her participation in the developments of Modernist art. A further example is the clearly derogatory term Krauss uses: 'patterning', cannot to my knowledge be located as a category, let alone a central one in Giedion-Welcker's writings. More importantly, Carola Giedion-Welcker was not a proto-Greenbergian. Her writings in fact show many of the interests that history and theory in 1960s, not least including Krauss' own, would rediscover. These aspects are what I wish to focus on first.³

In order to redeem Giedion-Welcker from the charge of being a formalist in the American understanding of that term, I need to differentiate my own understanding: Giedion-Welcker, a Cologne merchant's daughter born in 1893 had studied Art History in Munich with Heinrich Wölfflin. He is usually regarded as a champion of 'formal analysis', but wrote in the very last sentence of *Die klassische Kunst* (1899): 'In no way do we want to have pleaded for a formalistic appreciation of art. It certainly needs the light to make the diamond sparkle'. His student went beyond this approach. The diamonds Giedion-Welcker found were Arp, Giacometti, Schwitters, Ernst, Brancusi, Kandinsky, Klee and

others, whose work she does not only appreciate in a formalist way, as will hopefully become evident.

She bought works when the artists needed funds and thus amassed a sizable and representative collection of Modernist works including works by Ernst, Arp and Schwitters. The latter two received practical assistance from her to emigrate. James Joyce and his family would not have escaped the Nazis in the South of France in 1941 without her intervention. This context was so immediate – and the artists so in need of protection – that even the suggestion of viewing their works exclusively in formalist ways appears at least unlikely. She always stressed art's relationship with life and the other arts. I quote: 'Is there a direct analogy between what is happening in modern sculpture and recent developments in other spheres'? ('27, 15) She answers in the affirmative and asserts that in architecture, psychology, music, philosophy and physics such changes have already taken place. Indeed, Reinhold Hohl summarizes that Giedion-Welcker's horizons lie within the two 'poles of "form" and "symbol"'.⁴ The latter is specified as symbolic power as related to mythical meaning. Form and content are thus both encompassed, and in 1937, Carola Giedion-Welcker wrote:

'Concentration of legitimate means of plastic expression will not lead to an 'art for art's sake' introversion so long as plastic art remains an intrinsic part of a much wider cosmic unity. In point of fact the very reverse of what happened at the end of the previous century is now taking place: there is a rearticulation into the comprehensiveness of daily life, accompanied by the awakening of a new sincerity in means of expression.' ('37, p. 7)

We shall return to the 'cosmic unity', as this points more to Lippard's theme.

However, it may be interesting first to compare the different interpretations that e.g. Brancusi receives from both authors, Giedion-Welcker and Krauss. When Krauss, in *Passages in Modern Sculpture*, followed Giedion-Welcker in considering Constantin Brancusi, she once more establishes an underlying antagonism to the earlier author in her argument. Both had observed a purging of shapes towards simple, elemental ovoids, for

⁴ Coll Wri, p.9

example in *The Origin of the World*, 1915. Krauss insists on letting her text come to an abrupt halt with this observation, suggesting that what she calls unitary is beyond interpretation. Giedion-Welcker in 1958 (1959 in English), however, found contexts and linked these shapes with Cycladic culture and much early sculpture in the service of religious rites. In this she is, I believe, closer than Krauss to the culture of the latter's own time of writing, the 1970s.

It is quite remarkable in my view that Krauss, who so eloquently rescued David Smith or Jackson Pollock from having to be read in purely abstract (formalist) terms and who found so much enriching meaning in their works – that this writer of all authors would turn formalist when confronted with Brancusi. This Romanian sculptor, who had walked to Paris from Romania and deplored (in conversation with James Joyce) the speed of modern trains and civilisation in general, is in Krauss' interpretation infatuated with technology; with the surface at the expense of all else.

Giedion-Welcker knew better – partly because she knew the central figures in Modernism. One problem with branding her a formalist is the fact that interdisciplinarity is an important feature of her work, as well as the relative difficulty for English-speaking authors to access her other writings, as they were – and still are – mostly untranslated . She did not only write the first standard text about Modernist sculpture and the first book-length study (another standard work) on Brancusi (1958), predating even Sidney Geist's, and a very popular and long-lived one on Paul Klee. Among her other, overtly non-art-historical outputs are a short book about Alfred Jarry, the French writer, and the excellent, early afterword to James Joyce's *Ulysses* for its first German translation from 1928, which became part of an installation by Joseph Beuys. This is how she had begun her career. From 1926 until the mid-1970s, she was steadily writing for newspapers, contributing to journals and writing books. Her genuine interest in mediating modernist art and literature for the Swiss, German and English-speaking publics and her immediacy through personal involvement in the artists' circles rendered her perhaps too little an Art Historian in her own culture and at her own time, when Art History seemed as much as to be defined by the rule that nothing could be profitably researched that was not at least 50

years in the past. Her Collected Writings are a testimony to her rising acclaim towards the end of her life, but also to her interdisciplinary practice, something that I have (in the *Festschrift* to Antje von Graevenitz) called an expanded Art History.⁵

The reason why I suggested a close proximity to Krauss' culture – as opposed to her writing – is that the late 1960s and 70s saw an extraordinary surge in artists' interest in the primordial, elemental, cosmic, in rites, rites of passage and the like. We can find a great wealth of examples for this in Lucy R. Lippard's *Overlay: Contemporary Art and the Age of Prehistory* from 1983, to which I shall now turn.

Giedion-Welcker needs, I feel, to be recognised as an important – if not the main – example of an art historian in pursuit of such topics as 'Stones; Prehistory; The Forms of Time; Time and Again: Maps and Places and Journeys; Ritual; Homes and Graves and Gardens'. These are quotations from Lippard's table of contents, while the first thematic unit in Giedion-Welcker's own collected writings is entitled 'Prehistory and Epos: Joyce and Brancusi'. The art historian is not mentioned even once in *Overlay*, nor is her 'reader' from ten years prior to that publication listed in its bibliography. On the other hand, a photograph of Giedion-Welcker's beloved stones at Carnac features in *Overlay* as illustration number eight, as do other monuments. Giedion-Welcker had suggested that Joyce visit Carnac as a site where he could witness his own cultural background. She had written about them extensively with regard to contemporary art and maintained that *Finnegans Wake* was re-envisaging a primordial language to accompany such stones, that he did what the sculptors achieved in their medium.

⁵ It was intended as a small token of gratitude when the writer entered her into *Finnegans Wake*. Despite what some people who met her have described as her rather masculine appearance, combined with a sensitive character, Joyce chose to focus on stereotypically female, even girlish qualities, when he formulated in the *Wake*: "A flash in her eyes, a dash in her steps, attractive, but a little Gidi." However doubtful an honour this may appear to be in feminist terms – and however apolitical her philanthropic activities as well as even some of her work may appear, during a meeting between Joyce and Ernst that she had facilitated, one did not only generally agree on the anti-Nazi politics of Ernst's eminently political painting from 1933, *Europe After the Rain I*, which Giedion-Welcker had bought and one enjoyed spinning further word games departing from the title. Joyce invented: "Europe – Pyrée – Pyorrhée". Giedion-Welcker very often contextualises in her work: "Anarchist Tendencies" e.g. is a chapter heading in the Jarry book.

Of course, Lippard deals with a later generation of artists. Her stated aim is a collage, but she does attempt to establish an art history of her theme. While writing as an American in Europe about (largely) prehistoric artefacts on the European continent, the 20th century is in theory and practice almost exclusively American for her. I quote:

‘Overlay is about what we have forgotten about art. It is an attempt to recall the function of art by looking back to times and places where art was inseparable from life. In very different ways and with diverse results, this has been a major impetus in American art since the 1940s, when the Abstract Expressionists sought some sort of subject matter other than that which was around them. Ironically, they were rebelling against social and regional realism, while today many artists using the same mythological sources are doing so to rediscover social roots and communal meaning for their art.

While American artists in the 40s and 50s arrived at mythological themes primarily via classical sources, today’s vanguard tends to be less interested in classical periods and has been primarily attracted by the archaic and prehistoric. These artists are rebelling against reductive purism and an art-for-art’s-sake emphasis on form or image alone’^{4,5}

I already quoted Giedion-Welcker rebelling against art-for-art’s-sake. The awareness that canonical Modernism shared these interests in prehistory and did so also in order to find (as Giedion-Welcker puts it) the ‘basic substance that, despite all cultural difference, temporal and spatial distance, connects us to archaic and primitive art’ would, I feel, have made a difference to Lippard’s expressed feeling of isolation. Perhaps it would have jeopardized claims to originality, although these are not pronounced in her book, as they would have contravened the stress on the universal. Awareness of Giedion-Welcker’s work would have immeasurably strengthened Lippard’s main tenet (which is also Giedion-Welcker’s): that of a continuum within art and creativity through the ages. Suzi Gablik praises Lippard’s ‘dual loyalty to tradition and modernity and her effort to restore the broken connection between them’ on the cover of *Overlay*. These connections were not broken – or rather had been joined earlier. Giedion-Welcker never tired of pointing to her artist friends’ interest in the themes on which *Overlay* focuses – and she needs to be

taken seriously in her interpretations, not least because of her privileged position as friend, facilitator and mediator of the artists.

Similarly, in Carola Giedion Welcker's 1955 essay on 'The Situation Today', she reflects on what she calls the new 'Dematerialization' in and of sculpture and uses that term as a subheading. She elaborates: 'the extreme dematerialization of the once static and compact mass' ('55, XXIV) and gives a history from Cubism to Lehmbruck and Gonzalez. Again, in Lippard's *Six Years: The Dematerialization of the Art Object*, from 1973, Giedion-Welcker is nowhere to be found. I do not wish to set her up as predicting every twist and turn of sculptural history. Dematerialization is probably too generic a term to warrant surprise when noticed in a book on sculpture. She did not anticipate the way in which it would be used in the 1960s, but focused on Modernism. However, in relationship to Lippard, a failed reception remains the charge, where contemporary (English-speaking) sculptural history has lost out on art-historical precedent, on the awareness of tradition and examples of interpretive work that transcends some of the somewhat localised (if hegemonic) historical and theoretical narratives.

What this parallel between Giedion-Welcker and Lippard, as well as the applicability of certain themes in relation to their artists may mean in terms of the relationship between Modernism and Postmodernism is the topic for another investigation. We can guess, however, that this is closer to Zygmunt Bauman than Frederic Jameson. As to the theoretical and art historical position Giedion-Welcker assumes in relation to Modernism and its politics, I am convinced that she would have agreed with Peter Bürger on many counts. The politically leftist nature (anarchic and anti-Nazi politics) of her friends and her subject matter was not only apparent to her but she seems to have shared it and followed it in her engagement for the artists as immigrants. Bürger's reassessment of the Avant-garde and the resulting change in weighting that Modernist styles received is moreover tentatively apparent in her collection and writings, where Surrealism and Dada loom large. The latter is introduced in what is certainly an anti-formalist way: 'Its dethronement of the 'masterpiece' as a snobbish value, like its anarchistic rejection of all

outworn beauties or conventional forms, led art back to the humdrum, but none the less potentially significant, realities it had so long disdained.’ (’37, p. 10).

Her interpretations betray her political allegiances, although they are sometimes even apparent through absence. For example the expanded publication in 1955 of her 1937 book – with many new images and some edits, but merely a seven-page addition to her text on ‘The Situation Today’ – may be viewed as an act of defiance. She did not need to reassess or even mention the Nazis and their vilification of the art that she championed. Her friends and contemporaries – if they survived – had now entered the canon and her interpretations were (or so she could hope) similarly gaining consensus. Not mentioning the intervening period (1937-55) was clearly not an act of amnesia, perpetrated by someone who wrote in German. As a Swiss citizen, she was proficient in many European languages, in which she extensively quoted ‘her’ artists – which may be alienating Anglophone readers – and she had embraced the United States, where she frequently travelled with her husband, who was teaching at Harvard. She in fact commends the leadership of American museums for acquiring Modernist sculpture: ‘The European museums, following the admirable initiative of the United States, and more recently, South America, have opened their doors to it’. It appears that the presence of the works was only contemporaneously and not in a sustained way accompanied by Giedion-Welcker’s insights into so many aspects of their creation.

The predominance of formalism in the United States would have let her interpretations appear less than ‘pure’, because of an insistence in linking literature with art. She writes explicitly in 1937: ‘The danger of literary associations to which Su[...]realism is often exposed seems unimportant in comparison with its vitalizing rehabilitation of forgotten things’ That ‘purity’ – of which Krauss had nevertheless accused her – is something she would have loathed. On a figurative level, she reflected on ‘purity’, when she conveyed that the last thing of which she heard Joyce speak, only hours before his death, was an ode to impurity: he was praising dirt in tidy Switzerland. In her own words from a 1928 essay on Joyce: ‘We are inclined today to view art as an Erkenntnisorgan (organ of cognition) of our world and our being, rather than turn it into an ideal muse, whose ‘ray

of grace' is supposed to lift us up into 'purer' spheres.' (CGW CW, 24 Der Frühe Joyce)
The irony is clearly perceptible.⁶

Giedion-Welcker is now arguably situated between two stools – a mediator between form and anti-form. Only recently have we come to appreciate such more complex modes of seeing. Georges Didi-Huberman in particular seems to have reached similar insights. When he writes about Sol LeWitt, Tony Smith and other Minimalist artists' cubes, he does not protest unitary uninterpretability in the way Krauss did, but seems to follow Giedion-Welcker in both seeing formal 'whatness' *and* interpreting the works in terms of heightened, timeless meaning (in the case of the boxes as coffins) which touches the viewers. Both ways of seeing cannot co-exist in one viewing but require oscillation. (This is merely to hint at Didi-Huberman's arguments in *Ce que nous voyons, ce qui nous regarde*.) As a 'fable' for this oscillation, Didi-Huberman had departed in this book from James Joyce's *Ulysses* (the 'Proteus' episode set at Dublin's Sandymount strand). In *Joyce in Art*, I could prove that – far from just establishing that link as a fable – the minimalist artists on whom he focuses, did in fact read Joyce and consciously embraced the writer as a source of inspiration and precedent, as somebody who had already occupied a position between formalism and content.

The reference to Joyce highlights the importance of literature and time for Giedion-Welcker. The anti-literary stance of American critics like Greenberg and Fried is well known. Krauss wrote steadfastly against this, citing Raymond Roussel from examples as a source of inspiration for Duchamp. Carola Giedion-Welcker can be criticised for merely mentioning, but which I mean not really including Marcel Duchamp in her early surveys of twentieth-century sculpture. This is especially remarkable, since Duchamp had supported Brancusi in such a sustained and fundamental way – and Giedion-Welcker

⁶ Both CGW and Lippard also equally refute what Lippard calls the "'genius' notion" (Overlay p.6) CGW: "In direct contradiction to the pathos, heroics, or 'inspiration of genius' of Art with a capital A, the first prerequisite for this [the modern] kind of plastic exteriorisation is an unbiased concentration on the most elementary demands of expression." '37, 15 Can some of the noted parallels be that here, women were writing?

apparently occupies a similar position to Duchamp in relation to Brancusi's work.⁷ However, she sees the boundaries between the arts collapsing and the kind of narrative she champions is of the disjointed type, one that generates its own poetics, rather than a story. She is loath to simply find stories told in the works she interprets. In fact, the artistic experience that she encountered as 'life-changing', was reading James Joyce's *Ulysses*, a book that famously sidelines a story for both formal innovation AND heightened, universal meanings. Literature of a disjointed, poetics-generating kind is what prompted Giedion-Welcker to her first major publications. But that is precisely *the* aspect of her output that has remained un-translated.

I have dwelled on Carola Giedion-Welcker's specific interest in literature, because this is the context, that of the time-based medium, which Krauss denies her or of which she did not know, despite publication in 1973 of the collected writings (in German), edited by Reinhold Hohl. He was at that time (from 1972 to 76) teaching at the City University of New York, where Krauss would become professor by 1977, when *Passages* was published.

I would like to return to the quotation from this book at the beginning of this paper. Preceding the lines quoted above (from page 3 of *Passages in Modern Sculpture*), Krauss wrote,

'By the 1930s this sense [i.e. Lessing's] of a natural opposition between an art of time and an art of space had become a basic starting point from which to assess the unique accomplishments of sculpture. In *Modern Plastic Art*, the first book to deal seriously with twentieth-century sculpture, its author, Carola Giedion-Welcker, is entirely concerned with the spatial character of the sculptural task.'

⁷ She was thus better equipped than most to gain access to Duchamp's cosmos – like the artists did who are mainly responsible for his re-discovery. I have argued in *Joyce in Art* that artists like Joseph Kosuth and Richard Hamilton only knew what to look out for in Duchamp's notes when they turned to them in the 1960s because of their familiarity with Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*. Giedion-Welcker chose not to apply her insights to Duchamp, but to cross over persistently between the literature of Joyce (as well as Jarry) and artists like Brancusi or Klee. Doing so inspired at least one artist, Joseph Beuys, to explore in detail Joyce's work.

In her introduction to *Ulysses*, Carola Giedion-Welcker already elaborated on the parallels in Joyce (as well as the art of Paul Klee e.g.) between modern life and ancient cultures. Joyce employed the *Odyssey* as scaffolding for the book that is set on a single day, the 16 June 1904, in Dublin. Joyce features strongly in the Brancusi book and concludes *Modern Plastic Arts*.

Apart from the fact that among several artists, Kandinsky had issued a rebuttal of Lessing's narrow views – and another one can be found in Joyce's *Stephen Hero* – it should now be evident that Giedion-Welcker mediated between art and literature, space and time throughout her writing, which began as literary criticism and led her – like several of today's most esteemed writers on art (Tom Mitchell and Mieke Bal) – to a career of writing on art (with the difference that she had studied art history originally).

It is also unlikely that Siegfried Giedion would have disagreed with his wife so profoundly and added time as purely his concern when he presented lectures at Harvard in which he broke with the German materialist tradition of 19th-century art history and described history in terms of constancy and change. These lectures were collected in *Space, Time, and Architecture* (1941). He also concerned himself with the prehistoric origins of architecture in often the same artefacts that his wife addressed from the sculptural angle. Constancy and change is what can be considered the tenor of Joyce's oeuvre, especially in *Finnegans Wake*, where the 'recirculation' of time (after Giambattista Vico), its passing, the transitory nature of any political or other power arrangement, are paramount. Carola Giedion-Welcker did not just appreciate this, she herself became interested in 'Prehistory, Vico and Modernist Art', and found in Vico a pioneer of the appreciation of 'poetic creativity as phenomenon at the basis of our culture', ending her 1938 essay with Joyce's *Finnegans Wake*: 'Vico goes round and round...'. Another one of Giedion-Welcker's titles is 'Ancient Elements and Present in Hans Arp's Art'.

Lucy Lippard's remarks about the form of *Overlay* draws attention also to how current and 'artistic' Giedion-Welcker's major publications are – as photo essays. She obviously thought in a visual way. Lippard: 'My internal method is that of a collage – the juxtaposition of two unlike realities combined to form an unexpected new reality. I have tried to weave together the ideas and images of very different cultures by making one a metaphor for the other, and vice versa. Primal peoples made sense of the universe through visual metaphors that linked their experiences [...] The external structure of the

book is also borrowed from nature – its physical layers, its generative function and spiralling returns.’ This could equally describe Giedion-Welcker’s approach. The essay accompanied by photos/or photo essay is common to both authors’ time and culture. Andre Breton and John Heartfield on the one hand and Marshall McLuhan, WG Sebald and Tacita Dean on the other, to name but a few. This genre bridges space, time, visual art and narrative, as well as art theory and practice.

Interdisciplinarity is always present in Giedion-Welcker’s work – even in the sense that she created at least one sculpture of her own: When I visited her beautiful house, her son showed me a found object, a bent fork, which she had mounted on a wooden panel and displayed in the dining room. Andres Giedion maintains that it was more of a humorous comment on the ways in which ‘her’ artists worked, rather than a ‘sculpture’ in its own right. Nevertheless, she was apparently prepared to show it to these artists in her house when they visited. She also proved to be a proficient photographer, taking several pictures of Joyce in Zurich. These are some of the best-known images of the writer today – aided by the fact that her children kindly donated them (along with other Joyceana from her estate) to the Zurich James Joyce Foundation.

In conclusion, it is more than ironic that it is a book that bears the word ‘passage’ in its title – Krauss’ *Passages in Modern Sculpture* – and one that has as its topic the contemporary legacy of prehistoric passage tombs – Lucy Lippard’s *Overlay* – would fail to locate Carola Giedion-Welcker where she wished to be and where she rightly belongs. Both the art historians Antje von Graevenitz and Friedrich Teja Bach have told me about their encounter in the 1975 with Giedion-Welcker in the modern-day site par excellence of a rite of passage. This is Brancusi’s *Tirgu Jiu* in Romania created in 1936/37. At *Tirgu Jiu*, Giedion-Welcker led the way to a viewing in both space **and** in time. She had especially appreciated Joyce’s ‘museyroom’ passage-tomb in *Finnegans Wake* (a museum space storing the relics of time in literature) and suggested, as I said, the stone alignments at Carnac for the writer to visit as inspiration for his projects of combining ancient and modern ages. At *Tirgu Jiu*, she was walking slowly from the table of silence, through the gate of the kiss to the endless column. With her reportedly inimitable

enthusiasm, openness and seriousness, she hugged it and insisted that it should be bronzed, shimmering as a sign of hope (as it now is). Form, meaning, space and time, Carola Giedion-Welcker **did** consider them all and appears at the other end of the ‘passage’ of 20th century art history’s at times reductive modes of interpretation to ‘overlay’ these with a more rounded view of art that, I hope, will again in the 21st century be read, and exercise the influence that it ought to have.⁸

⁸ I acknowledge the assistance of the Research Institute Art and Design, University of Ulster, in funding my journeys to Leeds to plan and convene the symposium.