

Images

01. Model of "intrepid" lander from Apollo 12 and chip (original, right angle) with signature from Forrest Myers. Exhibition *The Moon Museum* en: E.A.T. Experiments in Art and Technology, Museum der Moderne Salzburg

02. *The Moon Museum*, MoMA Files, NY, 1969 (Code: 0156592)

03. Telegram from "John F". a Forrest Myers (12/November/1969) announcing the successful setting of the chip in the lander module (Wikimedia commons/ Wikipedia)

04. *The New York Times*, *The Moon Museum*, 22 de noviembre de 1969 (fragment), *The New York Times* - files

05. The Moon Museum, Artworks (Author, on n. 2)

06. *Moon art scale fingers*, http://www.forevergeek.com/2010/06/nasa_astronauts_smuggled_artwork_onto_the_moon/

07. Claes Oldenburg: *Mouse Museum/Ray Gun Wing* at The Museum of Modern Art, New York (April 14–August 5, 2013). Photo: Jason Mandella. © 2013 The Museum of Modern Art.

08. *Instant City*, Jhoana Mayer, Archigram, 1955-1968

09. 2001 An Space Odyssey (Kubrick, 1968), Scene on the moon. (Matthew J. Cotter / Flickr2Commons).

10

Oteiza and Oíza: the Exhibition Space as temporal Perception

Jorge Ramos
Fernando Zaparaín
Pablo Llamazares

There are not many examples in the architectural panorama of museums built to house the visual artwork of a single artist. Even less when the artist actively collaborates in the architectural conception of the space that should receive his legacy. This research establishes a relational reading to understand the connections between the way in which Jorge Oteiza (1908-2003) proposes that his sculptures should be exhibited, exemplified in the exhibition montage suggested for his participation in the IV São Paulo Modern Art Biennial in 1957, and the project for the Foundation and Museum in Alzuza, Navarra, the work of his good friend Francisco Javier Sáenz de Oíza (1918-2000). In both cases, the use of time as an instrument for controlling perception will be essential to achieve greater coherence between the museum space and the displayed work.



The very concept of a museum revolves around the dialectic relationship between the works it houses and the exhibition container. In the last few decades, the focus seems to have shifted towards architecture, which has tried to share the importance of the collection it should represent and has sought the expression of the exhibition itself¹. The *Khunsthall* in Rotterdam (Koolhaas), the *Museo de Arte Contemporáneo de Helsinki* (Steven Holl) or the *Guggenheim* in Bilbao (Gehry) could illustrate this assumption.

Although fewer in number, there are also buildings that are intended to be built according to the institution they house. This is the case of the *Fundación Museo Jorge Oteiza* in Alzuza, Navarra (1992-2003), the latest project by Sáenz de Oíza, carried out in active complicity with the sculptor, as on previous occasions² (fig. 01). The itinerary through the museum, the concatenation of exhibition areas and the museographic project itself are indebted to a specific way of understanding the relationship between pieces, space and spectator that Jorge Oteiza established throughout his artistic career.

In such a specific museum as Alzuza's, it seems reasonable to expect that the experiences accumulated by Oteiza would have come together when he had to face the exhibition of his works, and even those of other artists³. In his career, the intimate experience of the Chalk Laboratory stands out but, above all, his participation in the

IV São Paulo Modern Art Biennial in 1957, for which he had to propose, even graphically, an arrangement of his sculptures that expressed the *Experimental purpose* that he was trying to carry out with them.

Based on the previous assumptions, this research aims to relate the exhibition montage proposed at the São Paulo biennial, with the project of the *Jorge Oteiza Museum Foundation*, in order to verify to what extent the museum space is adapted to the requirements of temporal control in the perception of the work proposed by the sculptor.

**THE EXHIBITION
MONTAGE OF
OTEIZA IN THE SÃO
PAULO BIENNIAL
IN 1957**

The fourth edition of the São Paulo Modern Art Biennial is the first to be held at the recently inaugurated Industrial Pavilion, now known as the Cecilio Matarazzo Pavilion, in honour of the curator of the fourth centenary of the city of São Paulo.

The architect chosen to design the set of public buildings that would make up the new cultural centre of the city (exhibition centre, auditorium and planetarium) was Oscar Niemeyer (1907-2012)⁴.

The Biennial pavilion highlights for its presence within the complex. It is configured as a great longitudinal prism of about 250x50m, organised around a structural mesh of 10x12m, with circular pillars. The volume is divided into two sections: a ground floor with three corridors and a glass enclosure that leaves the structural rhythm visible, on which rests a volume distributed over two other levels suspended above the longitudinal façades to protect the accesses along them. These façades, also with glass enclosure, are protected with a skin of mobile aluminium sheets that conceal the free plant distribution. By means of the inclusion of intermediate *mezzanines* with sinuous shapes on each of the two main floors, spaces are created at various heights that thus configure an interior enclosure of great dynamic expressiveness.

In this area, the works of the Spanish representation were to be distributed, composed mainly by the painters and sculptors José Planes (1891-1974) as figurative and Jorge Oteiza from abstraction⁵. We do not know if the latter had previous information on the characteristics of the space where his pieces were to be exhibited, but his idea of how they should be shown has been documented. According to a premeditated classification strategy reflected in the corresponding catalogue, the 28 sculptures he sent to the contest must have looked like 10 (maximum limit according to the Biennial's bases), without losing their presence inside the room. He wrote several years after his participation:

"If I limit myself to the ten sculptures that I was asked for, the country that represents me does not give the impression [of] doing so as a candidate for the international prize [...] In addition, our mixed works appeared and, as soon as I arrived, I organised with my works a coherent, independent whole"⁶.

But this idea of exhibiting his works with his own organization was developed even before the shipment to Brazil, as evidenced by a page belonging to the preparatory documents in which he draws a floor on a scale of 1:50, marking on it the exact position and type of support on which each and every one of the 28 pieces should be placed. The use of a specific graphic scale, as well as the type of drawing (schematic but precise) with which he built the floor, indicate the importance for Oteiza of the way in which his sculptures should be observed in order to better understand his message, controlling therefore the exhibition space (fig. 02).

In this montage plan, a 10x7m space is drawn with a straightedge, completely closed on three of its four sides. The remaining long side is left open, through which access to the room will take place, partially closing it at its ends, as some hand-drawn features seem to express that would represent panels in accordance with the layout of the sculptures that exist in those areas. Two discontinuous lines, perpendicular to the main axes of the room divide the space into four virtual sectors of similar size. One of these auxiliary lines, also by hand, serves to indicate a dividing wall in the central area of the room,

but advanced over the access. Another perpendicular wall rests on it, and a third one comes out of it diagonally. Thanks to this mechanism, the interior of the space is divided into three sectors that will serve to sequentially discover the sculptures, according to Oteiza's wishes.

As a collage, black and white cardboards are glued onto the drawing, which, according to the legend, represent the sizes and heights of the supports of the sculptures. In black, the high bases, 14 with a square shape and the highest 4 with rectangular bases; in white, the lower bases, 4 with square shape and a large rectangular table⁷ (fig. 03).

Two aspects are outlined in this proposed layout. Firstly, most of the pieces are placed close to a wall, so that they cannot be surrounded and their perception is restricted to a preferential point of view. On the other hand, the bases are not orthogonal regarding the walls that serve as their backdrop, except for number 1, in the central axis of the room. This enhances the diagonal vision of the prismatic supports.

As for the order of the sculptures, their number on the plan corresponds to the grouping by families of the catalogue of the *Experimental purpose*⁸. Along with the numbering, circular lines with arrows indicate the planned route, along the perimeter walls, in a quick side scan of the works, until returning to the starting point. It is as if an explosion had pushed all the sculptures against the perimeter, without apparent order, leaving a wide central space free for circulation. As it can be seen in the drawing, after having colonised three of the four sectors into which the floor plan is divided, the spiral path leads to the third wall of the room. The arrows collide with the empty canvas, a visual rest on the route, before closing the circle towards the fourth sector, devoted to the last category of the catalogue dedicated to the *Funerary stela*.

This initial project favoured a rather linear temporality, limited to a sequence of predefined views of each piece. The variable perception around each sculpture was not allowed and a static spatiality resulting from the unique point of view was chosen. The *active void* that Oteiza was pursuing would not come so much from the movement of the gaze as from the dynamic relations between the contours through the internal relational space.

But the meticulousness with which Oteiza managed all the details of the exhibition was not free from those contradictions so frequent in him. Firstly, he was in conflict with his prevention regarding exhibitions, even more so at the intermediate moment of his artistic research. Several years after his participation in the Biennial, he still abided by the famous *Quousque Tandem!*

"Not until the artist completes his inquiry about his work of art, does this one belong to others. It belongs to his preparation; the artist is inside his laboratory. That is why we should consider art exhibitions stupid for people"⁹.

Secondly, when Oteiza arrived to São Paulo, he had to face important changes in the final exhibition montage, because he shared a room with the paintings of Millares, Tápies or Feito, and his works were placed indistinctly next to a clear wall in case there were no paintings, or in front of a dark dividing wall in which the paintings were hung.

What is paradoxical is that Oteiza, always jealous and controversial, acknowledged having participated in this redistribution, as we have seen above, and did not show much concern for such a notorious change over what had been planned. Their statements did not mention the issue and focused more on congratulating each other on participating in the Biennial¹⁰. In contrast to their initial idea, as the period photographs (fig. 04) show, the pieces were arranged with their orthogonal bases to the divisions and without following the classification by families of the catalogue, so that they could be completely surrounded. It seems as if the display finally adopted had allowed him to confirm the values brought by another vision different from the one he had. The possibility of surrounding each piece made evident another type of dynamism by superim-

position of plans broken down temporarily, which until then he had self-denied, although it was inherent to the cubist inheritance that beat in the suprematism of its *Unidades Malevich*¹¹.

TIME IN THE PERCEPTION OF THE OBJECT

Through the observed dialectic, the importance that Oteiza gave to visual perception in the construction and reading of his works is sensed. The relationship between spectator and object introduced a phenomenological component that placed

the time factor at the centre of the creative act. The need to exhibit removed the sculptor from his solitude before the work and raised new time-space relations that forced him to reflect on how to control perception. His search for a formally stable object, without expression, had to fight against the temporary activation in the process of contemplation, caused by the spectator's freedom of movement around the exhibited work.

This dichotomy of stability and dynamism was present since the end of the 19th century in the distinction made by Fiedler and then Hildebrand between 'kinematic and distant perception' as structuring elements of the two fundamental ways of experiencing space¹². On the one hand, 'near perception', the kinematic, scientific, positivist, dynamic, analytical and three-dimensional perception, runs through the work with a constant ocular movement characteristic of the scholar, equivalent to a tectonic and tactile vision. On the other hand, the 'distant perception', the visual, typical of the artist, synthesises the shapes in two-dimensional languages, then drifting towards the concept of *pure visibility*¹³.

Hildebrand, for example, distinguishes various types of visions of form and appearance: the 'distant vision', of a timeless character, will be the one that presents the object to us in a two-dimensional way, capturing its unity and the relations between the parts. In front of it, the 'near vision' fails to perceive the totality and needs to form a temporal image created by the succession of visual fragments resulting from the ocular movement. Finally, the 'tactile vision' is achieved by experiencing the spatial relationship of the various points perceived in the near vision by means of movement or quick visual scan. Oteiza uses these concepts for his aesthetic justification as follows:

"S [space] with T [time] becomes F [force], in an external property of S [space], the near vision appears, advances towards H [horizon].

F [force], without T [time] is an internal property of S [space], it is the peculiarity of the receptive art, inherent to the distant vision.

I return to the distant, where it is silent and immobilised, where the absence of T [time] is produced. It is necessary to return this image, to the near vision without losing its properties of the distant. What the distant image has inside is what the next image does not have outside: S [space] only"¹⁴.

Thus, in the search for stillness, containment or spatial receptiveness of his sculpture, Oteiza forces us to get distance from the object in order to maintain a coherent contemplative staidity that does not alter the predominantly spatial properties that he has defined. This explains why in the exhibition proposal for the Biennial he wanted to place his sculptures close to a limit, preventing movement around them. But he also ended up being aware that the spectator seeks closeness to the work and for this he will try a route with which to understand it from different points of view, from different moments.

Oteiza's sculpture is sensitive to both types of vision, static and dynamic, but because of its scale it prevents us from entering it and its observation is always external. We can surround it, cross with our gaze the empty spaces it captures, but we will not be able to experience that space in its entirety and we will have to settle for a subjective reconstruction of a transcendent nature. In order to

do this, Oteiza imposes a mental perception on us, in which we manage to maintain the receptive properties that distant vision offers us in spite of a position closer to the sculpture.

The reduced scale of his pieces ensures this double vision. Thanks to their small size we are able to stand very close to them, but perceiving them in their totality, without hardly needing to surround them to understand all their spatial expansion. In short, the intention is to place ourselves 'inside' the inner void of the sculpture, but we cannot do it personally as in architecture, but through an experience of mental and static contemplation.

THE JORGE OTEIZA MUSEUM FOUNDATION. ROUTES OF RECEPTIVE PERCEPTION

In both sculptural and architectural perception, time is a parameter referred to the duration of the object's aesthetic experience and, therefore, dependent on the spectator's movement. Architecture, due to its nature, allows a physical

movement through its space and thus generates a succession of perceptions around, through and within the object that, nevertheless, remains stable as a three-dimensional reality. On the other hand, it does not belong to the essence of sculpture to have a scale of use, nor to create an internal void, although Oteiza pursues the latter. In sculpture, the course of time depends more on the movement of the gaze than on real displacement. In the case of Oteiza, moreover, dynamism is achieved by taking advantage of the capacity of the void created to establish relationships.

The building for the *Jorge Oteiza Museum Foundation of Alzuza* was particularly devoted to dialogue with the two modes of spatial experimentation announced by the harmony between its author and the strong spatiality of the sculptor whose work it would house.

The idea behind the project is based on the creation of a pure container. It is Oteiza himself who demands Oiza that it be a box, an unequivocal empty concrete cube reflecting his own sculptural conclusion. This is how Oiza explains it:

"The box that we propose for the Oteiza Foundation, annexed to the Alzuza house-workshop, wants to be an experimental deposit of his work, stone or word, which will bring us closer to discovering his greatness as a creator. Because of that *Sator opera tenet opera Sator* (the creator contains the work, the work contains the creator), according to the classic saying, Architecture as spatial experience, which becomes such, like poetry or music, with time. As a corbusierian *promenade architecturale*. Related successive spaces, governed by light, substantial protagonist of form. From the memory of the tunnel-workshop of Aránzazu, where we had the opportunity to admire him as a teacher or father of all"¹⁵.

This declaration of intentions announces the double spatial characterisation that is intended: a static cube combined with movement systems that allow a dynamic experience.

On the one hand, a receptive spatial container, a stable deposit tailored to the artistic experimentation of the Oteiza's production, where everything is space, pure void. The dominant tunnel-like space' is presented isolated, protected by side aisles, and being mysterious¹⁶, full of a thick light that arrives from the roof crossing the openings in the structural walls that separate it from the lateral enclosures. As a complement, at the back of the aisle, the combination of the interior space with the exterior is obtained, thanks to a large hole at ground level that relates the spectator to the natural landscape and produces a backlight effect that enhances the contours of the works placed there. This vision comes closer to the way Oteiza himself had so many times photographed his small sculptures.

Following Renato Bocchi's interpretation, the encapsulated space in this central aisle would be put in parallel with the research on the idea of the 'wall-light', developed from various essays by Oteiza applying light in scale models of glass sheets, straight or curved, in which he inserts small pieces of paper as collages in reference to Malevich's paintings¹⁷. For Bocchi, the 'wall-light' proposes the void as a gelatinous material, capable of incorporating fragments

of matter itself, in a kind of inversion of terms. According to this thesis, we would find ourselves before a *solid empty space* capable of containing forms, such as empty space in zero gravity¹⁸. In this way, the main space of the museum would resemble the system tried out by Oteiza in his models: a viscous body that incorporates in its interior three-dimensional and floating elements, which in this case would be the sculptures exhibited there¹⁹ (fig. 05).

On the other hand, the aim is an architecture that provides a dynamic spatial experience, where displacement is used as one other material. The circulations are designed in such a way as to allow both the sequentially guided route and the free movement through the exhibition spaces (fig. 06). The guided *promenade* is articulated with a battery of ramps placed at the opposite end to the opening of the container to the landscape. Its cross-sectional display to the rooms allows the three levels of the building to be interwoven: two floors above ground for permanent exhibition (tunnel-like space and side aisles) and a lower level for temporary exhibitions, conference room and documentation and archive centre (fig. 07).

On the route through the ramp, the space is compressed due to the low free height between each section. An atmosphere in semi-darkness simulates that of a tunnel-like space. The light falls indirectly from the roof of the open shaft at all levels where the ramps go up laterally. Cutting off the thick density of this light, horizontal holes are opened in the wall at ground level of the ramp, which again extend the look towards the landscape.

The system of circulation through this broken route offers different perspectives of the central *space-tunnel*, forcing changes in the direction of the gaze towards lateral visions that broaden the constricted perception that we suffer between the sloping planes of the ramps. The well-known effect of the *promenade architecturale* of the Villa Savoye is resorted to, whose ramp forces the eye to behave like a camera that accumulates different perceptions of space along the path. The cubist objective of sliding objects with each other is reached by superposition and transparency of fragments, but this is achieved not by moving the objects, but by moving the observer²⁰ (fig. 08).

Not only does the displacement of the gaze occur when moving along the ramps. The arrival at the spatial heart of the museum takes place laterally through a 'filter space' that locks the volume of the museum with the *house-workshop* in which Oteiza spent his last years. The diagonal view through the lateral courtyard that serves as an articulation between the two buildings allows us to guess what is yet to come.

But without a doubt, the greatest depth of perception occurs when we are on the upper level of the side aisles facing the main tunnel-like space'. Through the holes in the concrete walls that separate the different areas, we can look out over the central void and build again the diagonal visions that greatly enlarge the interior depth. To this, it was added the expressive dynamism, produced by the proximity of the three skylights that roundly cut the box in its upper plan and make the substantial light the protagonist of the form (fig. 09).

Finally, it is possible to analyse the perceptive capacities of the Museum, understood as an object prepared to be discovered in the landscape. The dialectic between distant (spatial) and near (temporal) vision, which Oteiza detected when reflecting on how to perceive his sculptures, can also be appreciated from the outside.

Thanks to its position in front of the small urban centre of Alzuza, from the beginning of the access road, the museum appears as a firm massive container, in which the large size of the skylights expresses a first state of tension. From this distant viewpoint, the original *house-workshop* is not appreciated, so the new concrete box emerges as the only protagonist of the whole. Like the Parthenon in the Acropolis, the building rises on successive platforms seated on the slope, which serve as a transition and connection with the lower levels of the building. The path through the terraces up to the access level progressively dissolves the initial power of the box

until it completely disappears. From a frontal position to the access, only the old farmhouse is appreciated and, floating perceptively on its roof, the dramatic skylights appear before the gaze (fig. 10).

The entire inner path is directed towards them, conceived as a spatial route that allows Oteiza's knowledge to be advanced through a succession of perceptive experiences. A single architectural and exhibition project that attempts to combine the spatial, Oteiza's metaphysical stillness of the container space with the dynamic fluidity of a phenomenological or narrative character typical of a museum.

Jorge Oteiza would sum it up by stating:

"WHAT WE SEE IN S [space]: structure of the image. WHAT WE UNDERSTAND IN T [time]: structure of the story"²¹.

Jorge Ramos Jular

PhD in Architecture and is an Assistant Professor of Architectural Projects at the ETSA in Valladolid. He has been a Visiting Professor at the IUAV di Venezia (2018) and professor of Architecture Theory and Projects at the Universidade da Beira Interior (Portugal). Author of several publications on architectural categories in other media, especially in Oteiza, to which he dedicated his thesis with international mention, published by his Foundation with the title: *Hoyo, agujero y vacío. Conclusiones espaciales en Jorge Oteiza*. He has been a researcher in a national R&D project on the subject, has collaborated in audiovisual creations and has curated exhibitions, seminars and workshops about Oteiza in Italy, Portugal and Spain.

Orcid ID 0000-0002-4213-0060

Fernando Zaparaín

PhD in Architecture and is an Associate Professor of Architectural Projects at the ETSA in Valladolid. Concerning the space in the plastic arts, he has published books such as *Cruces de caminos: álbumes ilustrados, construcción y lectura*, chapters such as *Off-Screen: The Importance of Blank Space (Routledge)* or articles in indexed journals such as *Las Meninas, perspectiva, luz y tiempo*, in the magazine *Goya*, and several others in *Ra*, *A&V*, *Disegnare*, *EGA*, *Rita*, *Zarch*, *PPA* o *En Blanco*. He has been a researcher in a national R&D project on the subject, has coordinated a conference about Oteiza in the Patio Herreriano in Valladolid and has directed Jorge Ramos' thesis.

Orcid ID 0000-0002-9659-2906

Pablo Llamazares Blanco

Architect, holds a Master's degree in Research in Architecture by the University of Valladolid and is a PhD student of the same, where he has also enjoyed a Collaboration Fellowship in the Department of Architecture Theory and Architectural Projects. He has published research articles focused on the study of space as an architectural concept in indexed journals such as *PPA*, *Zarch*, *Rita* or *En Blanco*. He is currently working on his doctoral thesis about the spatial categories in the work of Donald Judd, directed by the two previous professors.

Orcid ID 0000-0002-5159-3817

The authors create the ESPACIAR Research Group for the study of space in different artistic disciplines. They are currently developing the R&D Project "Planimetric, spatial and photographic analysis of pioneering audiovisual installations in the Iberian Peninsula since 1975", ref. PGC2018-095359-B-I00, of the National Research Plan.

Notes

01. FERNÁNDEZ-GALIANO, Luis, "El Arte del Museo", in *AV Monografías* Museos de Arte, 1998, n. 71, p. 5.

02. Francisco Javier Sáenz de Oiza and Jorge Oteiza begin their collaborations on the occasion of the election of this one to execute the monumental set for the façade of the *Santuario de Nuestra Señora de Arantzazu* (1950-54), project won in a contest by Oiza and Luis Laorga. Oteiza also participates as a member of the team, together with Oiza and José Luis Romany, for the project of a Chapel in the Way of Saint James (*Camino de Santiago*), with which they won the National Architecture Prize in 1954. A third collaboration between both is the housing project in Irún for themselves and Néstor Basterretxea, begun in 1955. Finally, Oiza decides to stay in Madrid and the definitive project for Basque artists will be commissioned in 1956 to Luis Vallet. Many years later, between 1988 and 1989, they collaborate again, together with Juan Daniel Fullaondo and his team, in the contest for the Alhóndiga Cultural Centre in Bilbao.

03. Another of the collaborations between Oiza and Oteiza, this time together with a large cast of architects, artists and academics, is in the project for the exhibition montage of the *Spanish Pavilion for the Universal Exhibition in Brussels in 1958*, a building designed by José Antonio Corrales and Ramón Vázquez Molezún. For further information about the work process and the characteristics of the exhibition montage project, see RAMOS, Jorge; ZAPARÁIN, Fernando, "De la valencia química a la geometría espacial. El Berlanguian montage of the *Spanish Pavilion of Brussels in 1958*", AA.VV. in *Las exposiciones de arquitectura y la arquitectura de las exposiciones*. T6) Ediciones. Pamplona, 2014 559-566.

04. These projects were located in the Ibirapuera Park, the true green lung of the city of São

Paulo, designed in turn by the landscape architect Roberto Burle Marx (1909-1994). In an interview that Oteiza offered to the journal *Manchette*, once awarded his prize at the Biennial, he referred to the Niemeyer's project: "Niemeyer is a genius. He broke everything, putting everything upside down. See his pyramids: they are always inverted", quoted in MANZANOS, Javier, "Viaje a São Paulo", AA.VV. in *IV São Paulo Modern Art Biennial. 1957, São Paulo, Brasil*. Museum Foundation Jorge Oteiza, Alzuza, 2007, p. 67.

05. As for the Spanish delegation, see DE LA TORRE, Alfonso, "La contradictoria presencia del arte español en la IV Bienal de São Paulo (1957)", in *Ibid* pp. 129-193.

06. PELAY, Miguel, *Oteiza. Su vida, su obra, su pensamiento, su palabra*. La gran enciclopedia vasca, Bilbao, 1978, p. 475.

07. According to other preparatory documents with dimensioned measurements of these bases, the square ones would have a size of 35x35cm and a height of 120cm, while the rectangular ones would be of 120x75cm and with a height of 70cm. In the case of the lower bases, they would be cubes of 35x35x35cm. The large-format low table is not represented in these documents. As an annotation concerning the floor indicates, this table would have a height of 55cm, and if we analyse its measures in the drawing, quite reliable as verified with the pieces of cardboard, would have dimensions of 180x105cm.

08. First of all, one of the most characteristic pieces sent to the Biennial appears, *Homenaje a Malévich* (Homage to Malévich). From there, its two companions from the first family follow each other in a diagonal line creating a recognisable group. Opposite, marking the access to the exhibition, there is a table with the two sculptures of the family II. One of them, *Expansión espiral vacía*, is elevated on a cube in relation to its solid referent. The

sculptures of the third family are placed in a correlative position on high pedestals, following the table of the family II, following a line marked on the floor which, next to the diagonal of the first family, directs the perspective towards one of the vertices of the room, where *Poliedro abierto en flotación* is located. On the back wall, the rest of the pieces of family IV (in a single table) and family V are displayed then in high and low pedestals, except for *Permeabilidad del poliedro*, which is the strangest in this series and is placed in front of the rest of its companions, next to one of the central walls. Next to the second corner of the room, in the large-format low table, it is planned to bring together the circular sculptures of the series *Desocupación de la esfera* (family VI), *Desocupación del cilindro* (family VIII) and two of the pieces of family IX. In front of the table, the *Estela funeraria para unas monjitas* appears on a high pedestal, although due to its dimensions it would be very complicated to place it on this 35x35cm base.

09. OTEIZA, Jorge, *Quousque Tandem...! Ensayo de interpretación estética del alma vasca*, 6ªed., Paimela, Pamplona, 2009, p.172. In the short compared critical dictionary, the term: *craftwork and exhibitions*.

10. In a text that is being prepared for publication in the National Journal of Architecture (*Revista Nacional de Arquitectura*) after the Biennial, it stands out, for example, that it is found an artistic coherence in the abstract tendency of the Spanish artists present. OTEIZA, Jorge, *Archivo Fundación Museo Jorge Oteiza Reg.* 3:197.

11. Based on Malevich's influence on his work, Oteiza takes the unstable geometric figures used by the painter as a basic element of his formal vocabulary. The *Unidades Malevich* will be the geometric modules that he uses as a combinatorial system to relate them in multiple forms (straight or incurved plans, as faces of three-dimensional volumes or as empty spaces

conceived as a negative tra-peze) in his sculptures. Oteiza defines them as "small surfaces of a light, dynamic, unstable and floating formal nature". See in OTEIZA, Jorge, *Escultura de Oteiza. Catálogo. IV São Paulo Modern Art Biennial, 1957. Propósito Experimental* (Experimental purpose), 1956-57, Madrid, 1957.

12. MONTANER, Josep Mª., *Arquitectura y crítica*, Gustavo Gili, Barcelona, 2002, p. 24 y ss.

13. The so-called modernity has used these two ways of observing reality. The architectural avant-gardes, for example, mixed the typical isolation of the *visual* object with a kinetic approach to the buildings. This is the case of Le Corbusier, who from the outside generates autonomous objectual buildings although he proposes the interiors as a succession of dynamic stimuli. All these disquisitions about our way of observing the artistic object led it to stop interpreting itself as something static, in the way classicism did it. Since the beginning of the 20th century, the object has been seen from a *relative* perspective, not being based on itself but on the position of the *subject*. The work of art depends on the point of view of the observer, who moves within space and time. See ZAPARAIN, Fernando, "Imagen y espacio", teaching guide of the PhD *Modernidad, contemporaneidad en la arquitectura*, Department of Architecture Theory and Architectural Projects of the E.T.S. Architecture of Valladolid, University of Valladolid. Available in the documentary Repository of the University of Valladolid. <http://uvadoc.uva.es/handle/10324/11525>.

14. OTEIZA, Jorge, *File Jorge Oteiza Museum Foundation Reg.* 10.084.

15. Quoted in QUETGLAS, J., ZUAZNABAR, G., MARZÁ, F., *Oiza, Oteiza. Línea de defensa en Alzuza*. Honourable Association of Architects of Catalonia, Barcelona, 2004.

16. HERNANDEZ, Joaquín, "Jorge Oteiza Foundation in Alzuza (Navarra)", AA. VV. in *Revista Anales de Arquitectura*, 2000 n. 8, Department of Architecture Theory and Architectural Projects, University of Valladolid, Valladolid, p. 135.

17. Oteiza writes along with photographs of the models: "Glass model used in research concerning the new hyperspace nature of the plane in painting and the void in the statue. This cut in the light, which is the flat glass that corresponds to the physical plane of the Wall, is an unoccupied transparent plate, which is alert as to all spatial events... the Wall provides the formal physical reference, but nothing else. The plan is empty and due to its sensitive dynamics, it concentrates or weakens communicating in the formal game of its light and open language... Cf. AA.VV., *Oteiza, 1933-68*; in *Revista Nueva Forma, Biblioteca de Arte*, n. 1, 1968, Madrid, p. 38.

18. Interpretation developed in the conference "La construcción del vacío. Desde la escultura espacialista de Oteiza a la arquitectura del Museo de Sáenz de Oiza", at the Jorge Oteiza Foundation Museum, held on 22 November 2012. The conference has been reproduced in: BOCCHI, Renato, *La costruzione del vuoto. Dalla scultura spazialista di Oteiza all'architettura di Saez de Oiza*, L'Espresso S.p.A., Roma, 2015. Another research that refers to the relationship between Oteiza's experiences on the 'wall-light' and the Jorge Oteiza Museum, with the *Ronchamp Chapel* by Le Corbusier as a bridge between both ideas, is that developed by Emma López-Bahut in the article LÓPEZ-BAHUT, Emma, "De los collages y maquetas de vidrio de Oteiza al hormigón de Sáenz de Oiza", in AA.VV. *VLC arquitectura. Research Journal*, 2016, Vol. 3 n. 1, pp. 55-83.

19. The Museum's original museographic installation is the work of Madrid architects Concha Lapayese and Darío Gazapo, great connoisseurs of the relations between Jorge Oteiza and architecture, as evidenced by their activity as curators of the exhibitions "*Oteiza y la arquitectura. Múltiple reflejo*"...., developed at the COAM Foundation in Madrid in 1996, and which resulted in the catalogue of his authorship entitled *Oteiza, el arquitecto*, co-published by the COAM Foundation and Pamiela that same year; or the exhibition "*Oteiza: paisajes, dimensiones*", organised by the Eduardo Capa Foundation in Alicante in 2000. However, the current exhibition montage (since 2014) is the work of the Navarrese artist Javier Balba. As stated in the information offered by the Jorge Oteiza Museum, in the exhibition project called *mus Tz 10*, Balda proposes a reflection on the elements that mediate the contemplation of Oteiza's work and the mechanisms involved in his museum exhibition. This installation, carried out on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the centre, questions the spectator's mechanisms of perception and the way in which the use of supports and bases (many of them used in previous temporary exhibitions in the history of the museum), lights, texts and images condition and articulate the interpretation of Oteiza's work, introducing new codes and languages involved in its public dimension. In the case of the room devoted to the works presented at the São Paulo Biennial, Balda proposes the reconstruction of the bases designed by Oteiza for their permanent exhibition.

20. ZAPARAÍN, Fernando, *Le Corbusier, Sistemas de movimiento y profundidad*, COACYL, Valladolid, 2001, p. 34.

21. OTEIZA, Oteiza, File from Jorge Oteiza Museum Foundation Reg. 6.498.

Images

01. Jorge Oteiza with Fco. Javier Sáenz de Oiza drawing. Behind Javier Sáenz Guerra, son of Oiza. 1990. Source: Archivo Fundación Museo Jorge Oteiza (AFMJO) Reg. 22453.

02a. Collage for distribution study of the works presented IV Biennial of São Paulo, 1957, Jorge Oteiza (AFMJO Reg. 3183). Published in AA.VV. *IV Bienal del Museo de Arte Moderno. 1957, São Paulo, Brasil*. Fundación Museo Jorge Oteiza, Alzuza, 2007.

02b. Assembly with photographs of the sculptures made by the authors.

03. Drawings and indications of the bases for the sculptures of the IV Biennial of Art of São Paulo. (1957), Jorge Oteiza (AFMJO Reg. 3198). Published in AA.VV. *IV Bienal del Museo de Arte Moderno. 1957, São Paulo, Brasil*. Fundación Museo Jorge Oteiza, Alzuza, 2007.

04a. Images of the Spanish pavilion of the IV São Paulo Biennial, 1957 (AFMJO Reg. 19831 a 19840). Publicado en AA.VV. *IV Bienal del Museo de Arte Moderno. 1957, São Paulo, Brasil*. Fundación Museo Jorge Oteiza, Alzuza, 2007.

04b. Distribution plant of the works presented IV Biennial of São Paulo, 1957. Graphic survey by authors.

04c. Oteiza Museum room dedicated to the São Paulo Biennial. Photography by Elena Martín.

05a. Model of light, 1956, Jorge Oteiza (AFMJO Reg. 3024). Published in OTEIZA, J., *Escultura de Oteiza. Catálogo. IV Bienal de São Paulo, 1957. Propósito experimental, 1956-57*, Madrid, 1957 (Facsimil, *Propósito Experimental 1956-1957*, Alzuza, Fundación Museo Jorge Oteiza, 2007).

05b. View of the central space 'space-tunnel' of the Jorge Oteiza Foundation Museum. Photography Jorge Ramos.

06. Sketches of system of routes in plant. *Fundación Museo Jorge Oteiza*, Alzuza (1992-2003), Francisco Javier Sáenz de Oiza. Published in QUETGLAS, J., ZUAZNABAR, G., MARZÁ, F., *Oiza, Oteiza. Línea de defensa en Alzuza*. Colegio de Arquitectos de Cataluña, Barcelona, 2004.

07a. Floor plans of the project process. Published in HERNANDEZ, J., "Fundación Jorge Oteiza en Alzuza (Navarra)", AA. VV. in *Revista Anales de Arquitectura*, 2000 n. 8, Departamento de Teoría de la Arquitectura y Proyectos Arquitectónicos, Universidad de Valladolid.

07b. Definitive floor plans Jorge Oteiza Foundation Museum. Survey graphic by authors.

08a-08b. *Fundación Museo Jorge Oteiza*, Alzuza (1992-2003), Francisco Javier Sáenz de Oiza. Views of the communication ramp. Photographs by Jorge Ramos.

09. *Fundación Museo Jorge Oteiza*, Alzuza (1992-2003), Francisco Javier Sáenz de Oiza. Views of the side wall. 09a) Views of the first floor side room under skylights (Fig. 9b). Photographs by Jorge Ramos.

10a-10b. *Fundación Museo Jorge Oteiza*, Alzuza (1992-2003), Francisco Javier Sáenz de Oiza. View from the access road and from the village, access to the house-workshop. Photographs by Jorge Ramos.