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Jackie Winsor has made fewer than forty works of art in ten years. Within this seemingly sparse production there has been a remarkable achievement extending both traditional and recent innovative sculptural ideas in a very natural and inevitable direction.

Her objects, made of simple materials and through basic processes indicated in the titles of her work, present a self-sufficiency and implicit maturity that impose a "thereness." These autonomous sculptural presences, always within human scale, insist upon a clarity and physicality almost hermetic in character. The rawness and the frequent references to nature ground the work into a remarkable and coherent whole. Her sculpture has an obsessive energy and integrity that are both purposeful and relevant.

On behalf of The Museum of Modern Art I wish to thank, first and foremost, Jackie Winsor. Her kind cooperation and untiring patience with detail have made this exhibition and its accompanying publication possible.

Ellen H. Johnson, the distinguished art historian of Oberlin College, consented to provide this catalog with a considered and perceptive essay on the artist's work. I wish to thank her.

Paula Cooper and Douglas Baxter graciously provided their invaluable knowledge of the artist's work and have, as well, assisted in innumerable other ways.

I especially want to acknowledge the contribution of Laura Rosenstock and Diane Farynyk of the Museum's Department of Painting and Sculpture. They have skillfully carried out the many tasks related to the preparation of this exhibition and of this catalog.

My special thanks to the Museum's Department of Publications for facilitating this catalog, particularly to Francis Kloeppe, who with his customary thoroughness guided it through its editorial phases; to Pat Cunningham, who has designed it; and to Christopher Holme, who oversaw the general production.

There are always problems in the assembly and installation of sculpture, and the Departments of Registrar and of Production have given their able support in overcoming them.

Richard Palmer and Marie Frost have supervised the details of the tour of this exhibition to other institutions in the United States and Canada subsequent to its showing in New York, and we thank them.

I wish to extend my gratitude to a number of others, not individually named here, who both inside and outside the Museum have been very helpful to this exhibition.

A grant from The National Endowment for the Arts has made this exhibition possible.

Finally, on behalf of The Museum of Modern Art, I wish to express our deep appreciation to those who have so willingly lent to the exhibition; their generosity has enabled us to bring together a body of works representative of Jackie Winsor's full accomplishment over the last decade.
Bound Square, 1972
Jackie Winsor’s sculptures are like Cézanne’s apples in their “stubborn existence.” The phrase is Rilke’s: “With Cézanne, fruit ceases entirely to be edible, becoming such real things, so simple, indestructible in their stubborn existence.”1 When the idea of a kinship between the young American sculptor and the great master of modern painting first occurred to me, I tried to put it aside as just another example of my personal inclination to find Cézanne everywhere. But questioning the notion only strengthened its persistence, and I sought to locate those particular elements that had suggested the analogy.

Cézanne’s painted fruits are as indestructible and everlasting as the rock of Mont Sainte-Victoire; and Winsor’s sculpture obstinately proclaims mass, weight, and density, properties she combines with space in such a way that mass and air tend to become one solid substance. Winsor’s sculpture is as stable and as silent as the pyramids; yet it conveys not the awesome silence of death, but rather a living quietude in which multiple opposing forces are held in equilibrium. Jackie Winsor marshals her strands of rope and metal, her 1 x 1 inch sticks and layers of laths and pounds of nails as laboriously as Cézanne organized his countless petites sensations, but she does it like a Yankee pioneer; she struggles through to her own solution to problems in construction by means of a series of diagrams and numerical calculations, which she calls “my little systems.” The decidedly handmade character of all Winsor’s sculpture lends it an immediacy, a look of being in the process of becoming, that belies the stability of the forms. (For example, because the 1 x 1 inch sticks in the grid-cubes are sometimes slightly out of alignment, the edges tend to vibrate—like chalk lines on toothed paper.) Such oppositions are among the many that enliven her art and account in part for its latent energy, which she herself has signalized: “The pieces have a quietness to them, they have their own energy. You relate to them the way you might relate to a sleeping person, to the potential energy that is manifested in a dormant state.”2

Paul Walter’s Piece, a sphere of copper wire bundled around a cluster of twigs, grows out of the ground in the wild part of his garden like the coiled brown ball of a fern resting before it springs up into green spirals in May. Several years ago when Winsor’s sculptures were shown at Oberlin, a student saw Four Corners as “monstrous plant bulbs on the verge of bursting or erupting into some new form of life.”

Another major source of the hidden energy contained in Winsor’s sculpture is the force of the interior space, the core, which becomes a nucleus of energy as it resists and pushes against the insistent inward squeezing, binding, or compressing exerted by layer after layer of tautly applied material. The core of the cluster in Paul Walter’s Piece was actually a live sapling; thus in the beginning wood supported copper, and in the end copper supported wood. Winsor takes special delight in such reversals of function and in metamorphoses like the one that occurred in the Sheet Rock Piece: initially, the material crumpled and tottered, but as layer after layer was stapled and glued, it became increasingly firm and solid. The Burnt Piece, she declared recently, “was planned so that structurally the wood was the support system in the beginning but in such a way that once burned the cement could do that. It was designed sort of negative-positive so that the cement does exactly what the wood did... I wanted it to be a piece about transformation—to change the structure—to change from and/or through one form of energy into another.
To include destruction as a part of completion or being whole." 3 A further tension operating in much of her work arises from the contradiction between its boldly simplified, decisive forms and the complexity and slow deliberation with which the multiple units are put together. "I can fiddle around for days over a sixteenth of an inch," she remarked recently.

The amount of time that Winsor gives to the physical execution of her sculptures is at odds with the more common contemporary practice of farming the work out to a factory. While obviously the latter practice is just as essential to some sculptors' work as Winsor's homemade procedure is to hers, still the old-fashioned criterion "How long did it take to make it?" may not be so invalid as we are accustomed to contend; and it is quite possible that the energy inherent in Winsor's sculptures may be in ratio to the energy expended in their making.

There is, at least, no question that accumulated time is directly related to the density which Winsor's sculpture possesses. That phenomenon functions here in much the way it does in pinhole photography, where the aperture is stopped down to the smallest possible unit admitting light and the exposure time is increased from the usual fraction of a second to many hours. There is a startling similarity in density, in sober, solid presence, between Steichen's photograph and Cézanne's painting of an apple and Winsor's *Four Corners* sculpture. Steichen's apple is one of a series he made with stops as small as f/128 and exposure time up to thirty-six hours. Vollard tells us that when Cézanne was painting his portrait, after 115 sittings the artist declared, "The front of the shirt is not bad." 4 Jackie Winsor spent four days a week for six months at work on *Four Corners*, first unraveling the huge old used ropes to turn them back into the more linear element of twine, which she then wrapped and braided around the wood. The whole slow process Winsor likened to a ritual long before that reference became so hackneyed. The earlier, all-rope series she had executed entirely alone, but the bound-log pieces grew too large and heavy for one person to handle (*Four Corners*, for example, weighs fifteen hundred pounds). In the rope pieces Winsor joins hands, as it were, with the original makers and users of the twisted hemp. Such a notion would not, I think, be scoffed at by Winsor inasmuch as she actually invites spectators to bring their own associations to their understanding of her work. 5

In this respect and many others, beginning with its handmade construction, Winsor's work is steadfastly human. Her natural earth-colored sculpture of fibers, logs, and sticks (even when cut and processed still
redolent of the living forest) offers human warmth, familiarity, and comfort. It is invariably human in scale and in measurements, as she herself has affirmed: “This measurement is hip high, that is shoulder high. One is not as big as you, another is just a bit bigger. The internal measurements are a finger high, and so on. The measurements are meant to seem familiar because they are human measurements.” Occasional reference has been made to the sexual character of some of the forms themselves, as well as the sensuous, repetitive process involved in their making. Such an interpretation is most readily evoked by the organic rope and log pieces, whose configurations sometimes call to mind the more overt sexuality of Motherwell’s Spanish Elegy series. But that analogy is as peripheral as it is fortuitous, and most of her works operate as sexual metaphors only on the most generalized level—of joining two unlikes into an inseparable union or of interpenetration, as in the piece formed by hammering fifty pounds of nails into fifty pounds of wood. Be that as it may, the humble, earthy nature of Winsor’s sculpture and the powerful physicality of its blunt forms, contained, secret, and pregnant, bespeak a kinship with African and other tribal art, a kinship shared by many of her contemporaries.

It is obvious that Jackie Winsor grew up and matured as an artist in the sixties and early seventies: her sculptures are primary structures (spheres, cylinders, cubes, and grids), and the process of their making is revealed in their finished state. But remarking that tells us no more about Winsor’s work than it would about Monet’s and Renoir’s to say that they both used multi-hued, disengaged brushstrokes to record the shifting relationships of light and color. Besides wanting to place artists in their historic and aesthetic milieux, the layman as well as the specialist hopes to discover what is unique in each artist’s work and to assess and define its individuality.

Jackie Winsor emerged as a personal artist in 1970. Her work since then is all of a piece, partly because of its few basic, unequivocal forms, but more because of several constant components and overriding concerns and principles that distinguish it. As already noted, she stresses density, weight, and solidity so forcefully that often air seems to be pushed right out of the enclosed spaces; this is literally the case in Chunk Piece, Solid Lattice, and Nail Piece. At other times, as in Brick Square, the central space is pressed into a solid volume of air (contradiction is fundamental to Winsor); and rope consumes internal space as it is bound and wound around the Four Corners of a log frame. Even the 1 x 1 inch grid-cubes, in which mass and space are equally distributed, appear far more massive than airy (com-
pale them, for example, with Sol LeWitt’s grid structures. The interior space glimpsed through the small windows in the lath-and-cement cubes is tightly squeezed, minuscule and mysterious, becoming, in Roberta Smith’s provocative phrase, “space impacted in material.” However, as I have tried to demonstrate, this enclosed or entrapped space is charged with energy. Such is the case even in the most recent pieces, where she has sought to open up and release the imprisoned space—in one by digging the cement away inside the little round windows as far as the drill would reach, in another by burning the wood laths out of the cement. In a third she superimposes layer after layer of metal mesh on a redwood structure until gradually light is blocked out except for glimmers into the secret center. Her expressed intention remains to open up and enclose at the same time. Of the sheet-rock cube she wrote, “The center of the piece which is in a way nothing (air and light and space) is everything.”

Winsor’s contradictions and balancing of opposites function on several other levels of form and meaning. She combines reduction and accumulation by constructing simple, monumental, holistic forms through the repetition of multiple units. She juxtaposes austerity and sensuousness; hers is not the kind of sculpture in which one expects to find texture playing such a considerable role as it does until one is reminded that she was first a painter: “I came at it as a painter. You never lose that.” While the color as well as texture of her sculpture results directly from material and process, it is her sensibility that selects and controls brown old rope, pale gold hairy twine, pea-green wood from her studio wall, brightly burnished copper, and gray-black charred cement.

In spite of the pronounced constants in Winsor’s sculpture from 1970 to 1978, one can detect, within the groups or series, a kind of logical progression as one piece grows out of another. The wrapped-log series began with a two-dimensional emphasis and gradually increased in volume and density. First came the organic, almost anthropomorphic Bound Grid leaning against the wall; next the more geometric Bound Square, also resting on the wall like a picture; then followed the totally free-standing and solidly sculptural Four Corners; and finally Plywood Square. A comparable progression occurred in the grid-cube series, which began with a shallow square laminated box, on whose top a grid pattern was chiseled out like a drawing. However, in the fully volumetric grid-cubes (Fifty-Fifty, 1 x 1 Piece, and 55 x 55) there is no perceptible development; in this case, one solution or disposition appears to have suggested a variant.
Oddly, it is one of the early pieces in the exhibition, *Cement Sphere* of 1971, the most simple and least handmade-looking, and universal more than personal, that embodies Winsor’s distinctive contribution to contemporary sculpture in the resolution of opposites. It is the essence of both density and energy. What form could be more stable than a sphere, what more restless? In a recent essay on “Rhythm as Form,” Athena Tacha wrote, “The sphere, a classic symbol of equilibrium, is actually the form of minimum surface for maximum volume, and of minimum energy-expenditure—therefore of temporary balance.” Absolutely still, Winsor’s *Cement Sphere* is instinct with eternal motion; it rests “at the still point of the turning world.”

Ellen H. Johnson

NOTES
5. Winsor: “And I think that when people go to view work, they want to relate to it by themselves, tuning into those discoveries of yours, but also each one discovering something for themselves. They are creating, in relating to the pieces, in a way that has as the given premise their experiences as well as yours. They’re creating in their own way an experience for themselves, a discovery.” “A Conversation between Two Sculptors,” p. 10.
7. The term “primary structures,” the title of the historic exhibition organized at the Jewish Museum in 1966, is less negative-sounding than the popularly adopted “minimal art.”
11. “Rhythm as Form,” *Landscape Architecture*, May 1978, p. 197. In responding to my request for her critical comments before publishing this Winsor essay, Tacha wrote, “Another idea that came to me à propos her sphere and her preoccupation with density is that her works (and the sphere in particular) evoke matter in the superdense state that is being speculated by astrophysicists as existing in neutron stars and black holes, wherein matter has reached such tremendous density that its power of gravity does not even allow light—radiation—to escape the surface of the star.” Letter to E. Johnson, May 31, 1978.
Rope Trick, 1967-68
Solid Lattice, 1970

Fence Piece, 1970
Brick Square. 1971

Brick Dome. 1971
Plywood Square. 1973
Laminated Grid. 1974

Laminated Plywood. 1973
#2 Copper. 1976
Sheet Rock Piece. 1976
Green Piece. 1976-77

Cement Piece. 1976-77
"To me, one of the main things about my work habits is that I’m very fussy. I want all the details to be exactly right. Somehow they never are all right. There are always mistakes regardless of how much I oversee everything, always things that are not as perfect as I wanted them to be. Initially I conceive of an idea with an image, and this image seems complete and perfect. It is an overview, and an overview has its own kind of perfection. Realizing a piece, however, is on another level. It is about materials, details, imperfection, correction, etc. Because I don’t remember or visualize things easily, I choose to construct and reconstruct as a way of working with an idea. So the process of making begins with an image, then becomes constructing the piece in my mind, constantly going over it completely to familiarize myself mentally with that construction from beginning to end, slowing down to imagine every detail, to get a clear, clear picture. Maintaining integrity toward the perfection you envisioned in the beginning is a constant concern. I spend an enormous amount of time just trying to imagine if an eighth of an inch at some point is going to make a major difference in the completed construction of the piece. I figure out what is possible. I go through what the qualities of a material are and, because of the sense I have of them, what actually are the capabilities and limitations of that material.

"In Burnt Piece the main unresolved area was what kind of wooden structure would support itself as well as the weight of the cement (1400 lbs.) and also provide for the cement to be one continuous piece after the fire had burned the wood structure out. Somehow the problem didn’t lend itself to a very easy solution, and I spent half a year imagining how to do it. I asked a lot of people about mixing fire and cement together, and the main advice I got was: Don’t do it! I wanted to, so the image I kept in the back of my mind to guide me was that of a house burning. One thing that interested me about a building was the thickness of walls in relation to the possible size of a fire. I figured out a wood frame that fulfilled all the requirements and was strengthened by the five layers of different-grade mesh that were used to reinforce the six-inch-thick concrete and keep it structurally together during the firing. A second big concern was with stressing the cement with fire. Cement is not like ceramic clay that cures with firing. If there was any flaw in the construction, the nature of the cement would cause the piece to explode during burning. Sand, which is usually mixed with cement to make concrete, could have elements in it that might be unstable during firing, so I replaced it with grog, a prefired clay that looks just like sand but can withstand the stress of a lot of heat. Trapped water could also cause stress, so I cured the concrete a long time, let it dry for three months, and burned the piece on a dry summer day. I had no idea how easily it would burn, since a lot of wood was inside the concrete structure without air to aid its burning. As I expected, little pieces of concrete popped off. The popping was probably caused by bubbles of air trapped in the concrete. The air expanded with the heat and finally, when pressure built up, shot the fragments fifteen feet from the piece.

"This piece more than others was filled with uncertainty. I never knew until the very last minute if it would explode during the firing or crack when cooling, and I was never able to see how the piece would look until the moment of completion."
CHECKLIST OF THE EXHIBITION

In the listings below, dimensions are given in inches and centimeters, height preceding width preceding depth.

**Rope Trick.** 1967—68. Hemp with steel rod, 74 x 9 in. diam. (188 x 22.8 cm). Collection of the artist. Ill. p. 14

**Chunk Piece.** 1970. Hemp, 36 x 28 in. diam. (91.5 x 71.1 cm). Collection Albert Alhadeff and Michele Amateau, Boulder and Crested Butte, Colo. Ill. p. 15

**Nail Piece.** 1970. Wood and nails, 7 x 82 x 8 in. (17.8 x 208.3 x 20.3 cm). Collection Mr. and Mrs. Charles H. Carpenter, Jr., New Canaan, Conn. In New York showing only. Ill. p. 16

**Fence Piece.** 1970. Wood and nails, 49 x 49 x 49 in. (124.5 x 124.5 x 124.5 cm). Courtesy Paula Cooper Gallery, New York. Ill. p. 17

**Solid Lattice.** 1970. Wood and nails, 27 x 24 x 22 in. (68.6 x 61 x 55.9 cm). Private collection. Ill. p. 17

**Brick Dome.** 1971. Bricks and cement, 44 x 52 in. diam. (111.8 x 132.1 cm). Courtesy Paula Cooper Gallery, New York. Ill. p. 19

**Brick Square.** 1971. Bricks, 15 x 50 x 50 in. (38.1 x 127 cm). Courtesy Paula Cooper Gallery, New York. Ill. p. 19

**Cement Sphere.** 1971. Cement, 18 in. diam. (45.7 cm). Collection Keith Sonnier, New York. Frontispiece

**Double Circle.** 1970—71. Rope, 21 x 54 in. diam. (53.3 x 137.2 cm). Department of Fine Arts, University of Colorado, Boulder. Carnegie Fund Purchase. Ill. p. 18

**Bound Grid.** 1971—72. Wood and twine, 84 x 84 x 8 in. diam. (213.4 x 213.4 x 20.3 cm). Fonds National d’Art Contemporain, Paris. Ill. p. 18

**Bound Square.** 1972. Wood and twine, 75½ x 76 x 14½ in. (191.8 x 193.1 x 36.8 cm). The Museum of Modern Art, New York. Purchase. Ill. p. 8

**Four Corners.** 1972. Wood and hemp, 27 x 48 x 48 in. (68.6 x 121.9 x 121.9 cm). Allen Memorial Art Museum, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio. Gift of Donald Droll in memory of Eva Hesse. In New York showing only. Ill. p. 20


**Laminated Grid.** 1974. Laminated plywood, 8½ x 47½ x 47½ in. (21.6 x 120.6 x 121.6 cm). Courtesy Paula Cooper Gallery, New York. Ill. p. 23

**55 x 55.** 1975. Wood and nails, 40 x 40 x 40 in. (101.6 x 101.6 x 101.6 cm). Albright-Knox Art Gallery, Buffalo. National Endowment for the Arts Purchase Grant and gift of Mr. and Mrs. Armand J. Castellani. Ill. p. 22

**Fifty-Fifty.** 1975. Wood and nails, 40 x 40 x 40 in. (101.6 x 101.6 x 101.6 cm). Collection Paula Cooper, New York. Ill. pp. 12, 22

**30 to 1 Bound Trees.** 1971—72. Wood and hemp, 20 x 5 ft. diam. (6.1 x 1.5 m). (No longer extant.) Ill. p. 11

**Plywood Square.** 1973. Plywood and hemp, 25 x 53 x 53 in. (63.5 x 134.6 x 134.6 cm). The National Gallery of Australia, Canberra. Ill. p. 21

**1 x 1 Piece.** 1974. Wood and nails, 45 x 45 x 45 in. (114.3 x 114.3 x 114.3 cm). The Detroit Institute of Arts. Gift of the Friends of Modern Art. Ill. p. 12

**Paul Walter’s Piece.** 1974. Copper wire and creosoted wood, 29 x 32 in. diam. (73.7 x 81.3 cm). Collection Paul Walter, Princeton, N.J. Ill. p. 11

**Diagram for Wrapping #2 Copper.** 1976. Colored pencil on paper, 8 x 10 in. (20.3 x 25.4 cm). Collection of the artist. Ill. p. 13
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Born:
Newfoundland, Canada, 1941
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Yale Summer School of Art and Music, 1964
Massachusetts College of Art, B.F.A., 1965
Rutgers University, M.F.A., 1967

Awards:
Creative Artists Public Service (CAPS) Program, 1973
Mather Award, Art Institute of Chicago, 1974
National Endowment for the Arts Grant, 1974 and 1977
Louis Comfort Tiffany Foundation Grant, 1977
John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation Grant, 1978

One-Woman Exhibitions:
1968 Douglass College Gallery, New Brunswick, N.J.
1973 Nova Scotia College of Art and Design, Halifax
1973 Paula Cooper Gallery, New York
1976 Paula Cooper Gallery, New York
The Contemporary Arts Center, Cincinnati
Portland Center for Visual Arts, Portland, Oreg.
1977 San Francisco Museum of Modern Art
1978 "Matrix 38." Wadsworth Atheneum, Hartford, Conn.

Group Exhibitions:
1968 "Soft Sculpture," American Federation of Arts
(traveling exhibition organized by Lucy R. Lippard)
Galerie Ricke, Cologne
1970 Galerie Ricke, Cologne
1971 "Twenty-six by Twenty-six." Vassar College Art Gallery, Poughkeepsie, N.Y.
"26 Contemporary Women Artists." The Aldrich Museum of Contemporary Art, Ridgefield, Conn. (organized by Lucy R. Lippard)
Performance Piece. 112 Greene Street, New York
Group Exhibition. 112 Greene Street, New York
1972 Group Exhibition. Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond (organized by Lucy R. Lippard)
"American Women Artists." GEDOK, Kunsthalle, Hamburg
Paula Cooper Gallery, New York

"Twelve Statements: Beyond the 60s." Detroit Institute of Arts
Invitational. Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J.
"Ten Women Artists." Douglass Library, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J.

"Soft as Art." New York Cultural Center, New York
"Art in Evolution." Xerox Square Exhibit Center, Rochester, N.Y.
"Four Young Americans." Allen Memorial Art Museum, Oberlin, Ohio
"The Emerging Real." Storm King Art Center, Mountainville, N.Y.
8th Biennale de Paris. Musée d’Art Moderne de la Ville de Paris
Paula Cooper Gallery, New York
"Drawings and Other Work." Paula Cooper Gallery, New York

1974 "Questions/Answers." Sarah Lawrence College, Bronxville, N.Y.
"Painting and Sculpture Today; 1974." Indianapolis Museum of Art
71st American Exhibition. The Art Institute of Chicago
Spring Group Exhibition. Paula Cooper Gallery, New York
"Painting and Sculpture Today." Contemporary Art Center, Cincinnati
Fall Group Exhibition. Paula Cooper Gallery, New York
"Recent Acquisitions." The Museum of Modern Art, New York
"Drawings and Other Work." Paula Cooper Gallery, New York

1975 "A Response to the Environment." Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J.
"The Condition of Sculpture." Hayward Gallery, London

"The Liberation: 14 American Artists." Aarhus Kunstmuseum, Denmark (and traveling throughout Europe)
"Four for the Fourth." Albright-Knox Art Gallery, Buffalo, N.Y.

Opening Exhibition. Ellen Johnson Gallery of Contemporary Art, Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio
Group Show. Paula Cooper Gallery, New York
"For the Mind and the Eye: Art Work by Nine Americans." New Jersey State Museum, Trenton
"A View of a Decade." Museum of Contemporary Art, Chicago
"Strata: Nancy Graves, Eva Hesse, Michelle Stuart, Jackie Winsor." The Vancouver Art Gallery, Vancouver, B.C.
"Twelve from Rutgers." Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J.

1978 "Indoor/Outdoor." P.S.1., Long Island City, N.Y.
"Made by Sculptors." Stedelijk Museum, Amsterdam
"Tenth Anniversary Exhibition." Paula Cooper Gallery, New York
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