LAURETTA VINCIARELLI

INTO THE LIGHT: HER COLLABORATIONS WITH DONALD JUDD

By Rebecca Siefert

“Making, for Judd, had become a collaborative endeavor, a circuit of production... A work looked more like a Judd when it was not made by Judd – when it was built by someone with superior technique.”

—James Meyer

The luminous, haunting watercolors of Lauretta Vinciarelli (1943–2011), Italian-born artist and architect, have aptly been described as “Not Architecture but Evidence that it Exists.” Vinciarelli’s watercolors are saturated with color, light, and memories, largely autobiographical works recalling her childhood homes in Rome and the small, nearby town of Gradoli, as well as her adopted homes in Southwest Texas and New York City (1988; Figs. 1 and 2 and Pls. 8 and 9). Her early watercolors are representational, obliquely referencing Rome and its “uniquely magnificent spaces” such as the Pantheon and Santa Sabina, which she appreciated for their “magic light” and “simple, powerful shapes.” Although she was indeed a prolific watercolorist, she was first a trained architect, having earned her Ph.D. in architecture from La Sapienza University in Rome. Vinciarelli moved to New York in 1969, where she would live for most of her life, working as an architect, artist, and a teacher at several universities, including Columbia University, Pratt Institute, and the City College of New York.

By the late 1970s, Vinciarelli was established as a trailblazer for women in architecture and design. She was the first woman to have work acquired by the Department of Architecture and Design at MoMA (Museum of Modern Art) (1974); she was among the first women hired to teach architecture studio courses at Columbia University (1978); and she was the first and only woman granted a solo exhibition at Peter Eisenman’s influential Institute of Architecture and Urban Studies in New York (also 1978). Like many of her colleagues, Vinciarelli’s work at this time was rooted in a deep dissatisfaction with the high modernism that had reached a tipping point by the late 1960s. She believed that artists and theorists needed to direct the architectural discourse to counter the corrupting forces of developers and corporate practice. Emphasizing history, theory, and especially drawing were ways to usher in a less exploitative role for architecture. This theoretical turn coincided with the trend of exhibiting architectural drawings, signaled by MoMA’s influential exhibit curated by Arthur Drexler, “The Architecture of the École des Beaux-Arts” (1975); for Vinciarelli, to focus on drawing rather than building was not a nostalgic move but instead a pointed sociopolitical act. Vinciarelli created dozens of abstract, architectonic works on paper in the early 1970s —The Non-Homogenous Grid (1973–74), for example—was her historic series acquired by MoMA in 1974. These early works reflected her background in architecture (she likened them to a “spatial fabric,” a term often used in urban planning), but they also correlated with the ubiquity of the grid in Minimal and Conceptual art. Vinciarelli’s early works on paper would also later interest artist Donald Judd, with whom she was involved both professionally and romantically from about 1976 to 1987.

An icon of Minimalist art, Judd has also been hailed for his architectural interventions in Marfa, Texas, on the abandoned army base that was purchased by the Dia Art Foundation in 1971 to house long-term art installations of his and his contemporaries. Scholarship on Judd’s architectural work began with the publication of Donald Judd: Architektur in 1989, a compilation of his writings on the subject. Since then he has been labeled “Master Judd” by the Dutch art historian Rudi Fuchs, and a real “American original” by Tate Museums director Nicholas Serota, while Marfa has become a pilgrimage site for artists and scholars alike, declared “one of the great aesthetic experiences possible anywhere” and “a perfect model of artistic existence.” More recently, the opening in 2013 of his newly renovated loft at 101 Spring Street in New York as a house-turned-museum brought renewed interest in Judd’s architectural work. With an exhaustive new compilation of his writings published in 2016 and a Judd retrospective slated for MoMA in fall 2017, a reevaluation of his work, in particular the collaborative work by Vinciarelli and Judd, is timely.

During their time together, Vinciarelli had a vital impact on Judd’s work in architecture and design, collaborating on some of his most well known architectural projects, including work in Marfa, Providence, Rhode Island, and Cleveland, Ohio. As late as 1986, an article in Architectural Digest claimed that Judd and Vinciarelli were “starting a firm” together. Although that rumor was unfounded, Vinciarelli confirmed in a 2008 interview with Judd’s daughter, Rainer, that she and Judd did collaborate both “formally” and “informally.” Aside from their architectural work, it can be shown that Vinciarelli also influenced Judd’s furniture design and printmaking. This breadth of collaborative work calls into question the sole authorship of Judd’s architecture, even if the question of
attrition is especially problematic, considering his characteristic use of delegated fabrication.

Judd’s foray into architecture seemed natural. He served as an engineer in the Army during 1946–47, and at that time he considered becoming an architect but claimed that the “business” of it all repelled him. Beginning in the late 1970s (after he became involved with Vinciarelli), scholars identified a new phase of innovation in Judd’s work, particularly in the areas of architecture and design. Fuchs concluded his essay, “Master Judd,” with some telling observations:

For a time, until into the seventies, [Judd’s] approach to [printmaking] was fairly orthodox. Later, as I see it, the work became no less fundamental but certainly less orthodox. This is when it became more colourful, sometimes verging on the gaudy and the painterly. The renunciation of orthodoxy, the artist’s greater “tolerance” towards the principles of his work, undoubtedly gave a fresh impulse to the prints. What has also increased over the past ten or fifteen years is his activity in the fields of architecture and furniture.¹³

That “fresh impulse” was likely a reflection of Vinciarelli’s involvement in the creation of dozens of his prints (discussed later in this article); however, Judd’s renewed force of color—verging on the “painterly”—also coincided with her own foray into the watercolor medium, where color took on a materiality and transparency that Judd often exploited in his own work. Undoubtedly, his increased activity in architecture and furniture design was indebted to Vinciarelli. Considering that her role extended beyond that of a mere technician, as I will demonstrate, the glaring absence of any reference to her role as collaborator is egregious. Since her name is virtually absent from the “Master Judd” narrative, it is imperative to set the record straight.

Judd began spending summers in the remote town of Marfa in 1971, officially moving there in 1975. By 1978, Vinciarelli also was living there with Judd and his children and working on projects in Marfa.¹⁴ As she mused in the 2008 interview with Rainer, “I speak of [the] late ’70s, early ’80s. Then I was very much involved in Marfa, in terms of something that he was building.”¹⁵ Judd’s longtime fabricator Peter Ballantine also acknowledges that “the Lauretta influence in Marfa is huge.”¹⁶

Fig. 1. Lauretta Vinciarelli, Texas Remembered (3 of 3) (1988), watercolor on paper, 30” x 22”. Private collection.

Fig. 2. Lauretta Vinciarelli, The Subway Series (2 of 3) (1988), watercolor on paper, 30” x 22 1/2”. Collection of Peter Rowe.
Besides her proposals for a building that was to contain Judd’s plywood pieces (c. 1978–80), studies of the former airplane hangars at the Mansana de Chinati, a garden at the Walker House (c. 1979) in town, and surveys of the barracks at Fort D.A. Russell (c. 1980) which now house works by Dan Flavin and others, Vinciarelli had a broader, largely conceptual influence on the architecture of Judd’s Marfa compound. In an essay titled “Horti Conclusi” (1989), Judd wrote: “I’ve made my place in Marfa into a courtyard and have considered many other kinds of courtyards, open to closed.” Indeed, the additions of the courtyard, the *hortus conclusus* (Latin, for “enclosed garden”), and the pergola are integral to Judd’s architecture in Marfa and are some of the reasons he has been praised as an innovative architect, especially considering there were few changes made to the existing buildings themselves. The entire Mansana de Chinati, Judd’s living quarters in Marfa, is essentially a large, open courtyard surrounded by a thick adobe wall. Within the compound (often referred to as “The Block” since it occupies an entire city block), there is another open courtyard. Vinciarelli made investigatory studies of these and other courtyards throughout the late 1970s and early 1980s, having proposed, for example, “The Seven Courtyards” and “Hangar and Courtyard” (Figs. 3 and 4).

Vinciarelli’s research on the courtyard building type went beyond Marfa, however, as it allied with her pedagogical and theoretical work in the housing studio at Columbia University, where buildings were taught and studied based on “type”— Vinciarelli, for example, ran the courtyard house studio. The courtyard type dominated her research and drawings, as an extension of her larger social preoccupations that a building should correspond to its particular location rather than exploit its site for economic profit. As she affirmed in a 1981 statement on her work in Marfa, “I do not believe in the validity of a universal building type; in fact the pitched-roof North American house looks defensive and sentimental in Southwest Texas. Its own meaning is debased in its thoughtless repetition by a consumer society that has lost its sense of the specificity of place.” The courtyard is well suited to hot and dry climates throughout the world, including that of Southwest Texas, as it allows both privacy and free circulation of air. The *hortus conclusus*, like a courtyard, offers shade and respite from the heat by incorporating elements of water and greenery. Both have deep roots in Italian building culture extending back to the ancient Roman *domus* (a prototypical residence featuring a central open atrium), or perhaps earlier. As Vinciarelli explained: “The idea of the *hortus conclusus* means a garden that is walled in ... That is something that has been done since humanity started.” More important, Vinciarelli noted that at that time “these sorts of types and archetypes were much studied in Italy.”

Another of Vinciarelli’s preoccupations at the time was the pergola. A columned walkway often covered by vines or other climbing plants, the pergola can be traced back to ancient Roman gardens, where it extended out from the courtyard wall. The pergola is at the heart of Vinciarelli’s unrealized Puglia project of 1975–77 (Fig. 5), an architectural collaboration with Leonardo Fodera commissioned by the Puglia Regional Administration in southern Italy. This typological study of gardens consists of a series of transformations of a given space; each “micro-garden” or “garden of delights,” as she called them, would contain areas of shade, recycled water “in very shallow canals and pools,” vegetation, and architectural elements including small vaults or pergolas. Several of these micro-gardens could be interlocked to form a spatial fabric.
Judd purchased her series of thirteen related drawings in 1977, and Vinciarelli said she was “extremely honored that he bought it, because he bought it because he loved it.... And I think that these drawings influenced him.”

Indeed, several elements of the “micro-garden” are found within the courtyard at the Mansana de Chinati. As in the Puglia project, there is a pergola, which is covered in vegetation and placed next to a water element. Not only are the courtyard, *hortus conclusus*, and pergola connected to the history of Italian building culture, they also exemplify the dynamic between openness and enclosure, which Vinciarelli employed in her designs for a garden at the Walker House in Marfa in 1979 (the drawings for which Judd also purchased). Although the Walker House garden and the Puglia project were never realized, Vinciarelli believed that they were influential in Judd’s incorporation of the pergola, pool, and garden at the Mansana de Chinati, and his inclusion of a pergola at the Casa Perez (located on the ranches on the south side of the Chinati mountains). When renovations at the Arena building in Marfa began in 1981, the original exterior courtyard was preserved, as was a smaller, covered courtyard within. The smaller courtyard’s roof was removed, essentially producing a courtyard within a courtyard. The exterior courtyard, which has a pool, a pergola, places to sit in the shade, a vegetable garden, and a greenhouse certainly seems to echo Vinciarelli’s take on the “garden of delights.”

Curator Marianne Stockebrand described the courtyard at the Arena building as “all in all a microcosm that satisfied the demands of the intellect as well as the senses,” while Melissa Susan Gaido Allen painted Judd as a kind of “social ecologist,” claiming that his incorporation of the pergola and pool are “further examples of his environmental awareness.” Vinciarelli’s preoccupation with the courtyard type, *hortus conclusus*, and pergola in her architectural designs and teaching, her interest in simultaneously open and enclosed spaces; the connections to Italian building culture, and her sensitivity to site and ecology all contributed to what is now understood as Judd’s Marfa.

Vinciarelli also collaborated with Judd on two unrealized projects, for Providence (1984) and Cleveland (1986), on which his architectural reputation also rests. The Providence project developed out of a grant competition, set up by the office of the mayor, to create a monumental sculpture to be installed in front of City Hall. Judd later explained, “Since the project was close to being architecture, I asked a friend, Lauretta Vinciarelli, an architect, to be partners.” Their proposal began as a large-scale sculpture and developed into an architectural project. Vinciarelli recalled: “[I]t became evident that it was more appropriate to intervene ... using architecture instead of placing a sculpture. So we discussed— he proposed [that we] do it together, which was not that unusual, because we had an ongoing discussion on architecture that started since we met.” They also brought on Vinciarelli’s former student Claude Armstrong and his partner Donna Cohen, who had lived and worked with them in Marfa. Armstrong later explained, “Lauretta was consistently helping Don translate his ideas of space, form and number into architectural and landscape scale.” Their proposal consisted of a series of concentric circles in concrete, each with a different function (Fig. 6). The main circle would serve as a platform for residents of the city, in an attempt to initiate a dialogue with City Hall, the stairs of which would act as the “stage” for public discussion. In many ways the proposal resembled an ancient Roman amphitheater, and as such it acknowledged the history of the site, which was formerly occupied by a theater. This consideration comes as no surprise to those who know Vinciarelli’s work, in which memory and history always played a central role.

The Cleveland project was a proposal for a large complex for the Progressive insurance company, and once again, Judd called upon Vinciarelli, Cohen, and Armstrong for architectural support. The site, whose original Beaux-Arts
geometry was retained on the water’s edge, was on a bluff on the shore of Lake Erie, next to a set of railroad tracks and the Cleveland Browns stadium. A lengthwise axis ran across the grid, resulting in a plan composed of a series of interior, open volumes—perhaps Juddian boxes, but more likely courtyards, recalling Vinciarelli’s architectural concerns (Fig. 7). Since the site was long and narrow, they devised a plan for what would resemble a skyscraper lying on its side, so as not to obscure the city or the lake view. Judd in fact described it as such, calling the project a “prone skyscraper,” a description reminiscent of the Tuscolano housing project in Rome by Adolfo Libera, an important early project of the postwar rebuilding effort. Vinciarelli was no doubt aware of Tuscolano, and was perhaps even aware of its nickname coined by Bruno Zevi (professor of architecture at Vinciarelli’s alma mater, La Sapienza University): “grattacielo sdraiato” (reclining skyscraper). Although ultimately neither the Cleveland nor Providence project was built, these collaborations provided Vinciarelli and Judd with another opportunity to refine their shared concerns about architecture, urban planning, and site specificity.

While Judd’s first attempts at making furniture came in the late 1950s, with the help of his father, aside from a few stainless steel and aluminum coffee tables from the early 1970s, his return to furniture making did not come until 1978, after becoming involved with Vinciarelli. In the accompanying catalogue to the 2010 exhibition of Judd’s furniture, critic Alex Coles declared that Judd’s decision to return to furniture design was based on an internal struggle between art and design: “Only later, when he accepted this distance between the two, and found a way to approach the furniture on its own terms and not through his art, did he successfully enter into the field of furniture design and production.”

Here again, Vinciarelli’s influence is apparent. In 1977, she designed a desk constructed in plywood, repurposed from a Judd piece that had been damaged in transit from Melbourne, Australia. Peter Ballantine constructed the desk according to Vinciarelli’s design: a large desk with a flat top, supported on one side by a thin bookshelf, and on the other by a wider rectangular box that contained bookshelves, horizontal slots to lay architectural drawings flat, and square slots to store rolled drawings (Fig. 8). Her desk was housed on the third floor of Judd’s Spring Street loft during the time they were together. Judd liked its formal clarity and functionality and designed a comparable desk for his two children that followed Vinciarelli’s design closely (Fig. 9). This design appears to be a prototype for Judd’s subsequent desks, distinct from his earlier table designs, which were simpler, smaller, and without storage. Even though Judd’s desks from 1978 and after are clearly in dialogue with Vinciarelli’s 1977 design, he cited his own work as the primary inspiration. According to Judd, the children’s desk (and subsequent furniture) developed from a bed that he designed in Marfa: “the lumber yard could cut the few different lengths to size and I could then nail them together in place…. Later… I designed desks and chairs for the children using the same method of construction. More furniture developed from this beginning.”

From 1979 to the mid-1980s, Vinciarelli also designed and prepared the plates for a number of Judd’s prints, including a series of fifty-four plates for two series of etchings. These fifty-four plates resulted in twenty-nine prints, which comprise nearly forty percent of the seventy-five total etchings in the catalogue raisonné of Judd’s prints and works in editions. She also worked on a series of his woodcuts, which required that a maroon line be inserted by hand, a challenging task for which Vinciarelli had the necessary dexterity. As she recalled in 2008, “Donald had some difficulty in doing precise drawings of this kind,” at least partially due to his eyesight, so he asked Vinciarelli to assist in the preparation and delineation of the printing plates.

The catalogue raisonné notes that the “images on the plates” of a large series of vertical etchings were made “after drawings by Loretta [sic] Vinciarelli,” indicating that her role extended beyond that of technician. Elsewhere in the catalogue, it states that these attributions were “based on the records and memory of the artist.” Adding to the confusion is the lack of specific identification on Vinciarelli’s part. In her 2008 interview with Rainer Judd, Vinciarelli identified a few particular series she worked on but also speaks broadly, noting, “I did many for Donald … I mean, many of these drawings, that are more technical, let’s say, were done by me.” It is therefore difficult to ascertain her exact role in the process, even if some examples were signed “A.P. L.V.” (Artist’s Proof) Vinciarelli.

Vinciarelli explained her position vis-à-vis this collaborative work, saying, “I think this is quite natural. If you know how to do something, you do it for the person you love.” She also confirmed the extent to which the two were indeed partners, stating, “When I speak of his architecture, it’s as if I would speak of mine, so much we agreed.” (Armstrong describes their working process as “fluid.”) Although it is challenging to assign credit to one or the other for specific details in their
collaborative projects, at issue here—and what I hope to rectify—is the acknowledgment that these projects were, in fact, collaborative.

Vinciarelli is, of course, one of many women whose role in the collaborative work with their male colleagues has been minimized or altogether erased. Designers Charlotte Perriand’s and Lilly Reich’s collaborations with Le Corbusier and Mies van der Rohe, respectively, were only uncovered in recent decades, thanks to Mary McLeod, Matilda McQuaid, and other feminist scholars. It is within this context that Vinciarelli’s erasure must be considered, as she brought her architectural knowledge and history of collaborative design to her partnership with Donald Judd. One of the only mentions of Vinciarelli in the Judd literature refers to her as Judd’s “erstwhile girlfriend,” after which her name appears only in the footnotes. Dancer and choreographer Julie Finch, Judd’s wife from 1964 to 1975, returned to the limelight after 101 Spring Street reopened to discuss the early days of loft living, and Marianne Stockebrand, Judd’s romantic partner for the last several years of his life, has since championed his work. When Judd passed away in 1994, the obituaries mentioned his wife and his final companion, but none mentioned the “erstwhile girlfriend,” whose impact on his work was undoubtedly the most visible and sustained. Acknowledging Vinciarelli as a professional partner could pose a threat to his legacy by placing his authorship into question, while as an “erstwhile girlfriend” she barely scores a mention in his biography. It is also clear that Stockebrand, as a spokeswoman for Judd’s legacy, contributed to his mythic status. This last point signals perhaps the most troubling notion: that Vinciarelli’s erasure occurred not only at the hands of men but of women as well.

Although rooted in the same impetus as her architectonic works on paper of the 1970s, Vinciarelli’s watercolors, begun in 1986, were a stark contrast in many respects: emotionally affecting, suffused with memory, and brimming with vibrant color. The spaces she depicted were voluminous, luminous, and noticeably empty; in the absence of “things,” light and color take on an unusually physical, tangible presence. Color was especially vital, according to her husband, Peter Rowe: “[C]olors lived for her”—ultramarine blue was “sexy,” whereas sienna brown was “La Mama,” and cadmium yellow was altogether avoided—it was “dangerous” and “poisonous,” she would say. Here again, architecture was the driving force behind these works. Her aim was to construct spaces containing “the simplest architecture as possible … something more solid and massive,” as she explained in a 2009 lecture. Works such as Water Enclosure in Blue of 1987 (Fig. 10 and Pl. 10), which depicts an interior space open to the sky above and a pool of pristine, placid water below, is reminiscent of the ancient Roman domus on which it was loosely based. Also embodying several dualities characteristic of Vinciarelli’s entire oeuvre of watercolors, it is both art and architecture, open and enclosed, filled with light yet devoid of people or objects, and solid, yet threatening to dematerialize before our eyes. Water is another common subject, as it had been in her architectural projects. In the watercolors, it gave her the opportunity to construct an expansive, multilayered space, imbuing the surface with a sense of “evanescence.” In these ways, although Vinciarelli’s architectural subjects suggest timelessness and permanence, the incorporation of water elements paired with her medium and process underscore a sense of fragility and ephemeralism.

By the late 1990s, Vinciarelli’s work found greater visibility and institutional success. After the first monograph on her work was published in 1998, her Orange Sound series (1999; Pl. 11) was purchased by the Museum of Modern Art in 1999, and her work was featured in the 2002 Whitney Biennial. Her more representational works had slowly given way to increasingly abstract compositions such as Orange Sound, harkening back to her early works from the 1970s. These late works feature startlingly reductive compositions, floating rectilinear planes of electric color, with titles like Icy Water (2004–07) and Orange Incandescence (1997) suggesting extremes in temperature, whereas Orange Sound and Silence in Red (2000) render auditory phenomena visible.

Given her relationship with Judd, critics have been eager to identify a correspondence between Vinciarelli’s late work (c. 1998–2007) and the Minimalist aesthetic, even though the watercolors were made more than a decade after the couple...
separated. In The New York Times review of the 2002 Whitney Biennial, Julie Iovine stated matter-of-factly that “Ms. Vinciarelli does Minimalist watercolors.” In MoMA’s Envisioning Architecture catalogue (also 2002), Peter Reed compared her work to Judd’s Minimalism, while glossing over her role in his work: “The warm orange and ochre tones of Orange Sound recall remembered landscapes, perhaps particularly the American Southwest, where Vinciarelli spent time with the artist Donald Judd. She clearly admires Judd’s serial Minimalist sculpture, and art in a similar vein.” Similarly, New York Times critic Martha Schwendener described the watercolors in her 2016 show at the Totah Gallery as “rectangular interiors reminiscent of Mr. Judd’s minimalist sculptures.”

In fact, Vinciarelli’s late watercolors engage in a variety of metaphysical, autobiographical, and historical references—she was consciously working within “that whole European tradition,” employing the “compositional effects” that Judd earlier disavowed in a famed 1964 interview with Bruce Glaser. Vinciarelli made no recorded mention of Minimalism. Rather, she described a strong connection to Abstract Expressionism, speaking admiringly about it in a 2009 lecture she gave at the Spitzer School of Architecture at The College of New York. She described Abstract Expressionist art as “extremely affecting and uplifting, at least to me”—hardly the cold, impassive qualities commonly associated with canonical Minimalism.

To label Vinciarelli’s watercolors simply as “Minimalist” is not only a mischaracterization, it credits her later successes to Judd’s influence and further undermines any possibility of her influence on his work and thinking.

Questions of influence are essential to identifying the mechanisms that continue to determine the discourse on creative partnerships, and certainly they must be resolved to correct the narrative of Judd’s legacy. Proper attribution, however, is not the only matter at stake. There is, too, the call for a wider acceptance and understanding of architectural partnerships between couples through a toppling of the outdated but persistent myth of the solitary male artist, and an examination of the unique nature of collaborations between architects and artists. The oft-repeated tale of the overlooked woman might seem just as outdated, not to mention dangerous, as it risks perpetuating a victim narrative for women like Vinciarelli who had accomplished careers separate from their partners. Vinciarelli’s pioneering work must be properly evaluated as it contributes to the story of women in architecture, the socio-political imperatives of the architectural drawings revival, the role of pedagogy, and the dialogue between Italy and the United States during the postmodern era, the historiography of which is still in its infancy.
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