

# VEDA

STEPHEN LICHTY INTERVIEWED BY MICHELE D'AURIZIO

MICHELE D'AURIZIO: Are you familiar with the theory of the mirror stage?

STEPHEN LICHTY: Lacan's?

MD: Yes, Lacan's mirror stage. I ask in regard to your process behind this sculpture [*Leaning Figure*, 2020], the fact that you replicated your body into a clay shape, first, and carved that in wood, later. That process seems to me almost a way of getting to know one's own anatomy. I think that it should have been like enacting a second mirror stage. You know, before the mirror stage, children only understand themselves as fragmented bodies. But, staring at themselves in the mirror, they are able to form an image of their body as a whole. I wonder, then, if during the making process you discovered something about your body that you didn't know before.

SL: Twelve years ago or so, I saw someone leaning in a semi-contrapposto and made a rough sketch of them. So, the first step was moving from an experience to an image. Then, in October of 2019, I embodied that image myself, after having repeatedly sketched it, and I photographed it. I took measurements, generated a reference figure in foam and clay; and, then, carved that figure from a wooden block, again with myself as a reference.

One simple realization was that there are no actual facets on a body because everything is in contour. There are no straight lines and very few edges, It's interesting to try to maintain a sense of where you're at without any facets. So it becomes proprioceptive. If you can engage with your full perception, rather than just by measuring A to B, you can articulate movement differently. That's one thing I learned. There are a lot of concepts we could talk over: expression, integration, alienation, body ownership. I've explored these questions in performance and in dance previously. Embodiment is central to sculpture in any case, and I certainly thought about those abstractions during the phases of production as opportunities to render qualities and relations that became part of the material. That was my path, rather than working with a more technically accurate transposition of form, like 3D scanning and milling.

MD: When did the choice of this specific material enter the picture? It's walnut, right?

SL: Yes, it's walnut, *juglans nigra*. Initially, when I thought about the form and where the show would be—Firenze—I thought about trying to work with marble. But given the installation constraints and design I was working with at the time, the weight of the stone would have deflected the pole more than was tolerable. Moving to wood, I was able to bring all of the production in-house into the studio, and give the work the time it required. There are options for working wood. I'm familiar with wood and I like the deep tones of walnut.

MD: I have several questions about the genre of self-portraiture. You mentioned that the sculpture is born out of a figure that you had encountered in real life. I wonder if you could speak about how you

# VEDA

came to appropriate that occurrence: how did you recognize that that figure had a meaning for you and how did you develop it into an image of yourself.

SL: Well, the person was on a C train between 23rd and West 4th in Manhattan leaning against a central stanchion pole. They had a tote bag typical of someone coming downtown from a Chelsea gallery in that era. One foot was on point, kind of behind the other. The counterpoint wasn't in the shoulders; it was in the bag that draped parallel to the pole.

At the time I was taking dance classes with Barbara Mahler, and I was really attuned to how weight reached the ground.

I think of myself as the reference for the sculpture, but I don't think of the sculpture as self-portraiture. Since I was always at hand, I made the clay reference in the studio naked, with mirrors, so I could stand shoulder to shoulder with it and consider shape and dimensions.

Occupying my body while trying to both measure and sculpt from it was challenging. So, distortions and complications happened through that process. It would be a really different thing to sculpt from a life model, someone who isn't me. Also, working with myself as a reference, I knew that I could be accountable to myself. Involving another person would be a really different matter, a different challenge.

MD: I really like that. When you said...

SL: Which part?

MD: I like when you said that you're a referent for the work. So, would you say that the sculpture is more appropriately a study in a specific iconographic tradition—the tradition of the contrapposto, or that of the male nude, for example—in a way that doesn't necessarily touch on your identity or the time-space in which the sculpture was realized?

SL: Yes, in part. I like that the work is situated within genre and art-historical discourse: to be alongside—atemporally—other similar works.

In terms of personal history, certainly my lived experiences enter the way I work and make decisions. Life affects the work. However, I think I ended up representing interiority.

MD: Yes, I know. And that's interesting to me because it circles back to my question on the work's iconography. Think about the contrapposto. At one point, in the history of sculpture, somebody thought that they could convey not only a higher degree of naturalism but also psychological complexity with a little trick...

SL: A technology.

MD: Exactly. In some way, by introducing the pole, you almost went a step further. The figure is not just leaning on the pole, it relies on it. In the contrapposto, the figure is still free-standing and self-supported. In that sense, your figure moves further towards an image of human fragility.

SL: I might say interdependence. The materials do the work. The life of a contrapposto figure or the

# VEDA

life of a highly animated figure—that's a lot of emotional labor for a figure to sustain over years and years, and it's supported by the ongoing structural labor of the materials.

So, the representational scheme is developed with a sensitivity for the emotional implications of the structure. Because this figure is at rest, it might appear better prepared to comfortably sustain the pose, for the actual lifespan of the sculpture.

MD: I guess it's intriguing to ask oneself if the figure is freestanding. I mean the sculpture is: it is freestanding.

SL: With the pole integrated.

MD: Yes, exactly. But the figure might not be. I guess there's a tension in that question because, of course, the work is not a wooden shape that needs a pole in order to stand. It's a complex of the two, in which one supports the other.

SL: Well, the pole doesn't extend to the ceiling, so the sculpture accepts a primary relation to the ground as a condition of its mass and gravity. That may or may not complicate the impression of fragility.

MD: If the pole had reached the ceiling, then, it would have been an architectural element and the sculpture would have absorbed the surrounding space along with the latter's qualities. It would have been a figure in a space.

SL: In some ways, the length of pole above where it fastens to the figure, is purely ornamental. The load of the figure moves from the chest and lower belly both to the pole and down through the legs.

MD: How did you decide the final height of the pole?

SL: It matches the height of the original one in the R32 C train. Although, I don't know how much of that reference carries through, the relation to the train scene.

MD: You mean that the final work lost altogether the anecdotal aspect of, let's say, the first sketches?

SL: Yes, I think it did; but I'm not sure. There were going to be textile garments on the sculpture as well. I thought about a bag and a sort of cloak. But as the work developed, they just weren't necessary. In tests, the work became a mannequin very fast. Usually, people don't have to make a mannequin. They use a mannequin.

MD: How would you situate this work within canonical representations of the male nude? Did stereotypical images of masculinity and manhood—the Greek kouros, for example—enter at one point the process of dealing with this figure?

SL: I knew, if I was going to make a figurative sculpture, that I would use myself as a reference, because I was available to myself, and the process would become more than an objective task. There were a lot of choices to be made: aside from selecting a sustainable pose, closing the eyes of the figure and

# VEDA

having heavy eyes, for example. In terms of making a male nude, right now, with myself as a reference, letting the eyes hang heavy feeds the image of self-concept back into the figure's interiority so that the surface becomes available. You're not being looked at when you move around the sculpture.

MD: You also made some stylistic choices. For example, with the hair: you render it in an almost cartoonish style, deviating from a hyper-realist mode of representation.

SL: Some aspects are quite illustrative, yes.

MD: Using your body as a referent, I wonder if you had some thoughts about what it means to represent the body of a person in his prime.

SL: You mean that it's not aging?

MD: Yes, it's not a decaying body. At the same time, it's not the body of a child nor that of a teenager. I wonder if the making process maps onto a sort of coming of age, a transition from youth into adulthood.

SL: Well, that's the nature of the kouros, that it wasn't a particular person but a generic figure. I titled my work in a generic way, *Leaning Figure*, with the intent of generalizing the particular and contextualizing it within a genre.

A friend of mine mentioned, 'this sculpture is going to stay the same age and you're not.' The image won't change. However basic, that thought hadn't occurred to me. What do you mean I'm going to change and the sculpture is not? In the end, though, it does and it doesn't look like me. And I won't be at the opening [because of Covid-19], I won't be standing around there next to it.

MD: Let's say that it really doesn't look like you—would you be okay with that or do you feel that's a sign of your limited skills as a sculptor?

SL: There are a number of abstractions—at a certain point the mirror, as a reference, became untenable. In general, there are different resolutions of likeness to me throughout and the way relations move in and out of proportion is relatively distributed.

I'm not so interested in deskilling. Let's just say that I'm not a figurative sculptor. I think it's great to develop one's craft to a place of refinement. But the question of if I'll carve like this again, that's still an open question. Making the work has been a rite of passage.

MD: For the little I know about your previous works, it seems to me that many of them put forth—I don't know if illusion is the right word—but definitely a tension between the status of the object and its visual manifestation. I am thinking here about your use of taxidermy or the Branch series.

SL: Some animation?

MD: Yes. But I don't mean that these objects are uncanny. At the same time, they evade descriptions and anecdotal accounts. Think about the taxidermied cat [in *Untitled*, 2014]. That's a very surreal

# VEDA

image. It's not something that...

SL: Would just happen.

MD: Yes. Even if the starting point for the sculpture is something that's borrowed from the real world, the final output is highly abstracted, right?

SL: Yes.

MD: My question is then: if you had to inscribe this "figurative" work [*Leaning Figure*] within a constellation of your previous works, what would you say is the one closest to it?

SL: Well, sometimes artists just make the same work over and over. Things look different, but it's the same thing—or, at least, that's the joke.

I'm relatively consistent in that way. Sometimes the easiest way to find a through line between works is structural. An artist friend joked that if I kept working on this piece, it was going to just be a block of wood next to a pole. That's where it would end up, if I had enough time.

MD: By removing and removing material?

SL: Yes. Or just if I worked the options long enough.

The compositional and structural relations between parts of the works—many times, those relationships are dictated by the materials. If you're using dimensional materials, sometimes moving around the work is less interesting because there's less subtle difference and variation. The pleasure of moving around *Untitled* (the work with the basalt and cat), *Leaning Figure*, and *Branch*, is a common quality. Moving around *Leaning Figure*, you really get more information—the weight distribution, the tone of how the arms hang, how the planes of the back and buttocks line up from different angles. *Leaning Figure* is aligned with those two other works in that way: revealed by circling.

Most of my sculptures deal with how something is going to stand up—which is always a problem I can work with. The solution I developed for this work is new to me; instead of dowelling into the floor, it works as a tripod. It's a response to—how would you say it?—the presumption of a ground being level. That's an ideological assumption that I held for too long, and a tripod can address that.

MD: Would you say that you better factor in gravity as a force that cannot be alienated from the realm of sculpture?

SL: Well, in this instance, an internal mechanism that's not visible connects the body and the pole. Once calibrated on-site, it erases the problem of the ground, of its unevenness. Simply put, it can be leveled.

The figure leans on the adjusted pole and appears to articulate a perpendicular relation to the ground—whether it is perpendicular or not. I'm not certain that the work's independence from site condition is a more liberated position than entangling with the architecture. I'm not sure.

MD: I've been reading a French philosopher, Simondon. He says that the most perfect machine would

# VEDA

assimilate the surrounding environment in its internal functioning. It's not that the two—the machine and the environment—work in concert. It's the machine that...

SL: Integrates?

MD: Yes, it's able to integrate the environment. I thought about Simondon's machine because you designed a mechanism that works in a similar sense.

SL: That's interesting.

MD: It's not a matter of adapting—I guess that's the point. It's not that that work is adapting to the environment, but it has been conceived in a way that integrates the environment.

SL: You actually could show this work on a sloped floor. It's probably best not to introduce a biological metaphor, but sometimes site-specificity nurtures relations that are quite parasitic rather than mutual. But all work has needs. I wouldn't put a kouros up against and facing a wall because a kouros implies forward movement. The piece I made, however, doesn't have the same sort of velocity. The pole distributes the load to a narrow footprint that keeps the work from tipping.

MD: I would welcome an organic metaphor, though. What you're describing sounds precisely like an organism co-existing with its environment. What I am trying to say is that, even if this discussion of the pole mechanism might seem to divert the work towards a technological dimension, its mode of being is very much that of a biological organism—a quality that would reconnect this whole conversation to the figure of the human body.

SL: Let me play that back: are you suggesting the engineering aspect, as a development to the sculptural practice and its reintegration of site conditions, is on par with biological metaphors?

MD: Yes. The body is a biological organism, and your sculpture, which in part represents a body, itself functions like an organism. It's not plopped into the space, but tries to incorporate its surroundings. I mean, even a Barnett Newman painting needs to be hung in one way or another. Art always requires a mode of grounding itself in space.

SL: That can be so central to sculpture, to art.

The pole was rolled and seam-welded, so not extruded. However, I've refinished the surface radially, graining it parallel to the circumference, so it has a very subtle pulse but remains abstract. It's focal. The pole stabilizes and takes the weight of the composition as you move around the figure. It makes contact with the ear, the breast, the penis, the leg. Whatever narrative you want to hang on there, I think the pole helps ground the projections.

If you took away the pole and had a freestanding sculpture, I might ask what it was doing in there? It might charge the space in a different way. The pole does some of that work of metabolizing. It helps metabolize projections.

MD: I like to think about the pole as a display element. It immediately creates a triangulation and

# VEDA

mediates the relationship between the viewer and the sculpture.

SL: The pressure comes off a little bit.

MD: Yeah.

SL: A vertical pole appears as a different thing when adjacent to a nude figure—at least, compared to some of the more charged formal poetics of more abstract works I have made. The figurative genre doesn't demand that the pole be perceived as elemental. By elemental, I mean essential and non-allegorical.

Do you have any thoughts about, or a reading, in relation to the male nude or representations of masculinity?

MD: No. Not really. I can say, though, that this is not a figure that speaks to me about toxic masculinity. It relies on an external element of support; it has some illustrative features to it... Of course, in the present cultural landscape, approaching the same iconographic program like Michelangelo did with his David, that would be...

SL: That's a tough one.

It would be really different working on representing a body that isn't like yours, you know? Of course plenty of people do this. That's a really complex terrain—so many decisions to make. So in the process of representing myself or using myself as a reference, a lot of questions fell away. For better, or worse.

MD: Still thinking in the line of self-portraiture, there's a whole tradition of artists portraying themselves within a context—be it their working space or their community. In this case, because of its relation with the space, the work becomes a situated representation of yourself. Do you agree?

SL: Is it made to seem casual?

MD: Yes, but in a good way. It sets the stage for an encounter between you—the artist—and the viewer.

SL: Rather than couching it in an extended tableau or a scene?

MD: Yes. You all belong together in the moment of beholding. If a painted self-portrait is a window into somebody's world, this work seems to me a self-portrait that's more "extroverted."

SL: Right. Although, I do feel that the figure looks back to itself. Do you think there's any other territory you'd like to discuss?

MD: I don't, really. Do you? Do you want to say something on the mic for the records?

SL: I prepared a manifesto! No, I'm joking. I like discussing the mechanism, the technological aspects,

# VEDA

the structural aspects.

MD: Yes. I found that very fascinating.

I almost pictured, in the exhibition, a technical drawing of the pole mechanism. That would be fantastic. Almost like an X-ray of the sculpture.

SL: I almost prepared one. I thought about making, for the exhibition booklet, an illustrated outline view of all my past sculptures and their fastening mechanisms—because that's something I would want to look at and compare.

MD: I would want to look at that too. It would be truly enriching for the work.

SL: I wish I had something dynamic to say about how I've dealt with or approached the masculinity of the figure, because I think that it is an interesting question and something that's central to doing a carved nude. Maybe the answer to that question is the sculpture itself. The sculpture answers that question more than my words could.

We already discussed that there used to be a cloak on this thing? My mother was actually the one who said, "Stephen, you can't have these things on the sculpture. Don't cover the work."