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Deutsche Guggenheim Berlin is a unique joint venture between a corporation—Deutsche Bank—and a nonprofit arts foundation—The Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation. Designed by American architect Richard Gluckman, the 510-square-meter gallery is located on the ground floor of the Deutsche Bank headquarters in Berlin. Since opening in fall 1997, Deutsche Guggenheim Berlin has presented three or four important exhibitions each year, many of which showcase a specially commissioned work by an artist. The exhibition program and day-to-day management of the museum is the responsibility of the two partners.

Deutsche Guggenheim Berlin joins the Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation’s other locations: the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum in New York; the Peggy Guggenheim Collection in Venice; the Guggenheim Museum Bilbao; and the Guggenheim Las Vegas and Guggenheim Hermitage Museum, both in Las Vegas. Deutsche Bank regularly supports exhibitions in renowned museums, and since 1979, has been building up its own collection of contemporary art under the motto “art at the workplace.” The Deutsche Guggenheim Berlin initiative further represents a milestone in Deutsche Bank’s advancement of the arts.
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Over the past twenty years, Deutsche Bank has supported Gerhard Richter's artwork. As early as 1982, Deutsche Bank acquired the monumental, three-part painting Faust, 1980. In 1989, an exhibition tour was dedicated to the extensive number of works by Richter in the Deutsche Bank Collection. The presentation of his drawings and watercolors in Winterthur and Dresden in 1999 as well as the accompanying catalogue were supported to a significant extent by the Cultural Foundation of Deutsche Bank. We are delighted to continue and expand our relationship with the artist through the exhibition Acht Grau (Eight Gray), a work conceived for the Deutsche Guggenheim Berlin.

Commissioning works of art specifically for our exhibition space on Unter den Linden has been an important element of our vision for the museum and its programming since its inception. Over the past five years, works commissioned for and first exhibited in Berlin have traveled to subsequent venues around the world. Following their debut in Germany, for example, selections from Hiroshi Sugimoto's series of photographs Portraits, 1999, were shown at the Guggenheim Museums in SoHo and Bilbao as well as the Auckland Art Gallery, New Zealand, and the Singapore Art Museum. Jeff Koons's paintings Easyfun-Ethereal, 2000, were shown at the São Paulo Biennial as well as at the Guggenheim Museum Bilbao and the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum in New York, and Bill Viola's recent video installation Going Forth By Day, 2002, will be exhibited at the Guggenheim in New York this fall, and subsequently in Bilbao and elsewhere. It has been a consistently rewarding experience to collaborate with artists, and we are pleased to present this exhibition of Richter's work as the latest in our ongoing series.

When Gerhard Richter suggested the design of an installation with eight large-sized reflecting glass surfaces, the resonance was very positive. As this catalogue elucidates both in word and image, his new installation refers to exceptional early works such as his 4 Glasscheiben (4 Panes of Glass), 1967, and his eight-part monochrome painting series Grau (Gray), 1975, and also refers back to his more recent work for the German Bundestag, Schwarz, Rot, Gold (Black, Red, Yellow), 1999. Besides these works of art, Richter has also created related colored canvases for specific spaces, and investigated many possible variations in numerous preparatory drawings. Strich (auf Rot), 1980, twenty meters long, for a school in Soest and two large-sized canvases for an insurance company in Düsseldorf.

The interest in the relationships between picture, space, and viewer is a constant in Richter's work. At his request for the installation the opaque windows of the Deutsche Guggenheim Berlin have been replaced with clear panes of glass so they seem to open directly onto the street. The gray enameled panels of glass of Eight Gray will not only reflect the interior space and visitors to the gallery, but the world outside as well. "Glas Symbol (alles sehen/nichts begreifen)" (Glass symbol [to see everything/understand nothing])," wrote Richter in 1966 on the edge of one of the first drawings in preparation for 4 Glasscheiben. This short formula articulates the artist's continuing doubt that what we can see corresponds to an actual reality. Seen in this light, the eight gray mirrors seem only to show reflections; yet their true subject is a different type of reflection—the contemplation of our world through painting. To see and to reflect—that is my wish for visitors to this exhibition. I have trust in the power of art to guide us.

Dr. Tessen von Heydebreck
Member of the Board of Managing Directors of Deutsche Bank AG
In the 1930s, the Guggenheim Museum was established as a museum of non-objective painting, dedicated to the promotion of abstract art and, in particular, works on canvas. In the early 1950s, however, the institution expanded its scope by adding representational work to the collection, and throughout the 1990s photography and video were acquired to more fully represent the range of contemporary artistic expression.

Likewise, Gerhard Richter, one of the most innovative and influential artists of our time, does not devote himself to a single style or medium. His work includes abstract paintings and monochromes as well as realist landscapes and objects. The artist's varied approach to production reflects his interest in the nature of looking itself—how we frame our world—and the challenge of representing an ever-shifting reality. Acht Grau (Eight Gray), a remarkable group of eight colored mirrors commissioned by the Deutsche Guggenheim Berlin, continues the investigation Richter began in 1965, while embodying two related progressions in his career. Uniting his glass works with his gray monochromes, these opaque yet reflective panels are simultaneously abstract and representational, offering a monochromatic field as well as a "true" image of the viewer and his or her surroundings. Existing somewhere between painting, sculpture, and architecture, the monumental works—which can be tilted at various angles on steel supports—offer multiple perspectives and confound expectations of one singular, authoritarian vision. Lining the walls of the long, rectangular Berlin space, this series of large panels evokes the grandeur and monumentality of a traditional portrait gallery, yet here the artist's subject may perhaps be described as the spectator and his or her role in shaping both the form and meaning of the works. Installed in relation to the gallery windows the opposing rows of clouded mirrors produce a chain of changing reflections of interior and exterior views that render an original image ever-more elusive.

Considered in relation to the Guggenheim’s extensive collection of early abstraction as well as Minimalist, monochromatic, and environmental art of the 1960s and 1970s, which Benjamin H.D. Buchloh discusses in his essay, Richter’s Eight Gray is a fitting addition to the collection. It is with great pleasure that we share this work with our visitors, and so first and foremost, I would like to thank Gerhard Richter for his unwavering commitment to this project and for the care and thought with which he approached this commission. We are grateful for the attention he gave to every detail. Secondly, we offer our deep gratitude to Benjamin Buchloh, distinguished art historian and internationally recognized Richter expert, who guided the exhibition, and whose knowledge and insight into the artist’s work distinguishes this catalogue. His essay elucidates in detail a significant aspect of the
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artist's oeuvre and is an important addition to Richter scholarship.
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Gerhard Richter’s *Eight Gray*: Between *Vorschein* and *Glanz*

Benjamin H.D. Buchloh

*for Rosalind Krauss*
What, you have no colored glass, no pink, no red, no blue? No magic panes, no panes of Paradise? Scoundrel, what do you mean by going into poor neighborhoods without a single [piece of] glass to make life beautiful?
—Charles Baudelaire, "The Bad Glazier," Paris Spleen, 1869

One cannot say in general whether somebody who excises all expression is a mouthpiece of reification. He may also be a spokesman for a genuine, non-linguistic, expressionless expression, a kind of crying without tears.
—T. W Adorno, Aesthetic Theory, 1969

Paul Strand’s Wall Street, New York (1915, fig. 1), with its five black monochrome rectangles deeply embedded in the photographic grayscale, represents a series of elongated vertical windows, awe-inspiring rectangular zones of architectural shadow. These seem to organize our spatial perception with a previously unseen authority, announcing an emerging order with menacing certainty. One reason why this image has become a canonical photograph is that it articulates some of the most fundamental oppositions confronting artistic production in the twentieth century with almost prophetic emphasis.

That these oppositions would continue to haunt the century’s cultural constructions until its bitter end—and would extend even into the beginning of the next—is manifest in Gerhard Richter’s elegiac Acht Grau (Eight Gray), a new work that acts simultaneously within the registers of painting and photography, sculpture and architecture. Within Richter’s larger painterly œuvre, Eight Gray is the culmination of a pursuit that began in 1965 with 4 Glasscheiben (4 Panes of Glass),¹ the artist’s first work to programmatically bracket the age-old painterly episteme of the window with the paradigm of the monochrome.

What distinguishes Richter’s 4 Panes of Glass, his subsequent works on glass and mirrors, and Eight Gray from other monochrome paintings and Minimalist sculptures produced by his American contemporaries around 1965 is first of all the fact that Richter’s works have always attempted to integrate all of the aspects that most other artists of the Minimalist generation had been approaching as isolated inquiries. Generally, if a painting from that time dealt with the monochrome (e.g., those of Ellsworth Kelly or Barnett Newman), it was not inclined to address the conditions of opacity and its opposites, transparency and reflection, all of which are inherently present in the monochrome and its tendency to become an architectural divider or merely a perceptual membrane. By contrast, if an artist had actually dealt with painting’s evolution toward such a membrane (e.g., Eva Hesse), toward translucency and transparency (e.g., Larry Bell and Donald Judd) and mirror reflection (e.g., Larry Bell and Robert Morris), the newfound material radicality of the resulting works seemed to dismiss once and for all any connection to the traditionally fabricated formats and surfaces of painting. And finally, if a work eventually engaged with the architectural dimensions of glass and mirror panels (e.g., Dan Graham and Robert Smithson), it would foreground its relationship to modernist architecture alone, repressing any reflection on the pictorial episteme of the window and the paradigm of chromatic reduction that had determined Minimalist practices.

Since the inception of 4 Panes of Glass all of Richter’s monochrome works with mirror and glass—identified by the artist as “colored mirrors”—have engaged the spectator in the dialectic of reflection and transparency and translucency and opacity, suggesting the radical proposal that these are the logical conclusions within the paradigm of the monochrome. These works have also questioned the fate of painting were it to become a merely reflective or transparent spatial divider, dissolving the traditionally private space of pictorial contemplation and opening up visual experience to a wide range of perceptual, phenomenological, tactile, and social interactions. One of Richter’s most troubling proposals concerning his earlier monochromes addresses painting’s darkest possible future. In a series of drawings from 1975 (see page 48), the artist envisages the construction of a military barracks/administrative building as a museum for a thousand monochrome paintings, a space to house this serially produced, cultural industrial complex.

Thus Richter already offers at that time, if only in a “visionary” drawing, a historical spectrum in which to situate his predilection for gray and a glimpse of his understanding of the historical origins and the social destination of serialized cultural production. Yet it is not until Eight Gray that any of his glass or mirror works actually shift in size and scale from painterly surface to architectural plane, investing monochrome painting with an architectural dimension. Thus Eight Gray opens up a series of striking oppositions (some of which we first encountered in the reading of Paul Strand’s photograph).

The first opposition is that between the public dimension of the glass panels and the paradoxical privacy of contemplative experience that this painterly structure solicits (reversing, as it seems, the classical predictions of Benjaminian aesthetics). Viewing Eight Gray, we recognize that the work confronts first of all the extreme difficulties of creating conditions for simultaneous collective perception with painterly, sculptural, or architectural means in the present.
The second of these oppositions results from the improbable synthesis of seriality and monumentality. Traditionally it had been assumed that any conception of the monumental would only celebrate unique achievement (e.g., the master subject) or abstract unifying concepts (e.g., the nation-state) and that monumentality would be anchored most successfully within a rigorously structured hierarchical display. By contrast, it had been taken for granted that seriality (in all its forms of production and reproduction) had only come about to cheapen the world. In an incessant process of industrialization and secularization, the order of production and the representation of the commodity had the last word in annihilating the sublime, the unique, and the transcendent in favor of a mere mass ornament to democratize experience at the price of a total loss of the aural and the hieratic.

A third opposition we face in Eight Gray is one inherent to the monochrome as a painterly paradigm. After all, it had once been perceived as a radical intervention, either mystical in its purity or critical in its self-reflexivity, but in Richter’s Eight Gray the monochrome seems to have become an affectless record of loss. In this regard, what Jeff Wall once wrote in his essay about Conceptual art could apply just as well to Richter’s gray monochrome projects from the late 1960s onward:

The gray volumes of conceptualism are filled with somber ciphers which express primarily the inexpressibility of socially critical thought in the form of art. They embody a terrible contradiction. These artists attempted to break out of the prison house of the art business, its bureaucracy and architecture, and to turn toward social life. But in that process they reassure the very emptiness they wished to put behind them.2

The fourth opposition in Richter’s Eight Gray is the improbable synthesis of void and transcendence. When does the process of voiding and erasure in painting give access to a higher transcendental experience? And when does it lead to mere boredom or even atrophy of the senses? Or, by contrast, when does entropic experience turn into a radical aesthetic and when does it simply reiterate the internalized melancholia of a closed system of cultural administration?

It seems that these oppositions could be resolved with a relative degree of certainty when looking at Strand’s photograph: those windows and spaces are clearly not opening up towards liberation and transcendence, religious or otherwise. Yet in Eight Gray—in spite of

---

1 There are extensive studies for a variety of glass installations and wall dividers as well as preparatory drawings for the 4 Panes of Glass dating from 1965 and 1966 (see the reproductions in the present catalogue), although the actual sculptural work was executed in 1967. 2 Jeff Wall, Dan Graham’s Kammerspiel (Toronto: Art Metropole, 1991), p. 19.
the absence of affect—the glass panes might still retain a residual dimension of those aspirations. In Strand’s image, the walls are clearly not those of a space of ritual whose massive openings promise access to transcendentality mediated by colored glass and an infinity of fractured light, but in Eight Gray a glance is cast backwards, it seems, to that tradition.

Strand was perhaps the first artist in the twentieth century to have photographed an architecture where classical form organizes industrial confinement. In looking at the massiveness of the architectural voids he recorded, we would expect a corresponding presence of urban masses. Instead, the photograph shows only a handful of nervously scurrying subjects, all running in one direction as though they already recognized that amid the regulated definition of these monumental spaces the days of their subjecthood were numbered. By contrast, it appears impossible to answer any of these questions when viewing Richter’s Eight Gray. In order to respond adequately, we will have to unravel the work’s immense range of implications and the oppositions concealed by its treacherous simplicity, first by situating these glass panels in a variety of specific historical contexts.

The Monochrome

In the same year that Strand’s photograph recorded the serial repetition of architectural voids, Kazimir Malevich exhibited arguably the first monochrome painting, Black Square, in the famous 0.10 exhibition in St. Petersburg. This painting undoubtedly established more than any other work the preconditions for a Modernist pictorial dialectic of purification and elimination. But of course, the historically overdetermined desire to erase all linguistic and aesthetic conventions in favor of a new beginning, be it the white of carte blanche or the black of tabula rasa, would be fraught with ideological origins and consequences.

Malevich in 1913 still felt compelled to demarcate the difference between the zones of pictorial and spatial experience by situating his Black Square within a white field that functioned simultaneously as the figure’s ground and its frame. Alexandr Rodchenko, in his radical answer to Malevich, was more decisive: his triptych Red Yellow Blue (1921) opened up the boundaries of the monochrome to the seemingly uncontrollable influx of actual space; they transformed the painterly plane into a purely chromatic spatial relief.

Malevich and Rodchenko both deployed those strategies to extract painting once and for all from the episteme of the window and from the seemingly eternal pictorial obedience of the construction of perspectival space. Either deciding, as Malevich did, to “simply”
geometricize the figure-ground relationship and to transform the painting into a perceptual tautology (the inscription of a square figure within a square ground that serves simultaneously as frame), or opting, as Rodchenko did, to "simply" abolish that opposition altogether, shifting it from an epistemological distinction between window/frame and figure/ground into an opposition between the relief/object and architectural/social space.

Both Malevich and Rodchenko's monochrome panels remain the predecessors of all subsequent monochrome painting, and their programmatic or vicarious attempts to clarify the treacherous suspensions of painting brought about by the new paradigm: to hover between painting and object, between pictorial surface and material relief, between framed painterly perception and unbound architectural vision, between virtual space and actual space. The new architectural scale of Richter's monumental Eight Gray makes these contradictions all the more apparent. All monochrome painting had claimed to achieve an erasure of the past in preparation for future purity; once all representational conventions had been abolished, anything appeared to be possible. Almost thirty years later, though failing to understand the causes or envision solutions, but describing the continuation of the same phenomenon with more precision than anyone else at that time or afterwards, Clement Greenberg reignited this same type of reflection:

There is a persistent urge, as persistent as it is largely unconscious, to go beyond the cabinet (or easel) picture . . . to a kind of picture that without actually becoming identified with the wall like a mural, would spread over it and acknowledge its physical reality. I do not know whether there is anything in modern architecture itself that explicitly invites this tendency. . . . Abstract painting being flat needs a greater extension of surface on which to develop its ideas than does the old three dimensional easel painting, and it seems to become trivial when confined within anything measuring less than two feet by two. Thus, while the painter's relation to his art has become more private than ever because of a shrinking appreciation on the public's part, the architectural and, presumably, social location for which he destines his product has become, in inverse ratio, more public. . . . Perhaps the contradiction between the architectural destination of abstract art and the very private atmosphere in which it is produced will kill ambitious painting in the end. As it is, this contradiction whose ultimate cause lies outside of the autonomy of art, defines specifically the crisis in which painting now finds itself.\footnote{Clement Greenberg, "The Situation at the Moment," Partisan Review, January 1948, pp. 83–84.}

Figure 3
Josef Albers, Park, ca. 1924
Glass, wire, metal, and paint in wood frame
49.5 x 38 cm
The Josef Albers Foundation
This is a dialectic that would be played out in extremis throughout the 1950s and 1960s in monochrome works as irreconcilable in their ambitions as those of Ad Reinhardt and Yves Klein, or Barnett Newman and Ellsworth Kelly, legacies with which Richter's first gray monochrome paintings of the mid-1960s were explicitly engaged.* In response to these various receptions of the monochrome, Richter's projects with glass and mirror, in their prohibition on drawing, on figuration, on contrast, on tonality, on perspective, on modeling, on iconography, on metaphoricity, and ultimately—in the painter's insistent commitment to the noncolor gray from the mid-1960s onward—on chroma itself, were based on a radical project: to void the conventions of pictorial representation and of all privileged forms of experience. Yet, as the artist himself wrote, commenting on a major series of large-scale gray monochrome paintings from 1975 that could be considered one precursor to the current Eight Gray paintings, the voiding was inevitably also a beginning. Richter has written, "In the Gray pictures it's lack of differentiation, nothing, nil, the beginning and the end, in the panes of glass it's the analogy with attitudes and possibilities, in the color charts it's chance, anything is correct, or rather, form is nonsense."

Thus Richter's monochromes and glass and mirror works are not only erasures, probing the purity of negation and the sobriety of withdrawal. Richter's Eight Gray also asks what kind of spectatorial subject would be inscribed within this architecture of effacement and elimination. Could Eight Gray generate the same type of spatiality that determined the monochrome voids of the architecture in Strand's photograph, a tectonics of oppression, melancholia, and silence? Or would it generate the opposite, a space of mirror inscriptions where the new subject would suture itself in the architectural dimension of reflective glass, but a painterly construction that would at the same time preserve the memory of its Modernist self-reflexivity and empirical skepticism?

**Chroma and Chrome**

It is particularly productive to study the various instances where the carefully drawn territorial demarcations of monochrome color break down, either by deliberate artistic acts of destabilization, or by a failure to fully control the entwining of registers in which the monochrome operates: between a hieratic and diaphanous transcendental space on the one hand and a neo-positivist field of empirical verification on the other. Or it shifts continuously between a spectacular blague and industrial design's streamlining of color to its opposite extreme, the melancholic despair about the evaporation of the painterly plenitude.

---

*Figure 4
Blinky Palermo, *Himmelsrichtungen* (detail), 1976
Acrylic, glass, and steel
Two of four elements, each 100 x 130 x 50 cm
In Richter’s glass paintings, color is now sealed beneath the reflective surface while drawing occurs only in the space of reflections and shadows of the spectators. With the spectator’s departure, all visual incident disappears as well, leaving behind an unmarked, monochromatic field. One of the problems that this fusion of chroma and support had already brought out in the context of Minimalism was the fact that baked enamel and colored Plexiglas (the materials favored by Donald Judd, for example) all carried connotations of industrial design culture. This register offered itself in lieu of a revolutionary architectural project of collective simultaneous perception still accessible to the artists of the Russian avant-garde. Monochrome painting’s unconscious lodging in industrial design culture seemed to anchor what Greenberg had rightly called the historical condition of “homeless abstraction.” This condition applied just as much, if not more, to the German artists of that generation, in particular to the monochrome work of Richter and Blinky Palermo, Richter’s closest friend throughout the 1960s and into the 1970s. Yet both Richter’s and Palermo’s works within the monochrome around 1965 shift from the sphere of industrial design to the social spaces of consumption and domesticity and to a sphere of administrative self-reflexivity.

Paradoxically, Richter’s first experiments with a monochrome mirrored surface were executed on the occasion of a rather precarious juxtaposition of his work with that of Neo-Expressionist painter Georg Baselitz in 1981. These mirror paintings foregrounded the immediate

---

4 The first properly gray monochrome paintings would be numbers 143/1, 143/2, and 143/3 in Richter’s catalogue raisonné where the artist combines two or three different tones of gray and stacks them as squares or rectangles one above the other. See Jürgen Harten, ed., Gerhard Richter: Paintings 1962–1985, 3 vols., catalogue raisonné and exh. cat. (vol. 1), Kunsthalle Düsseldorf (Cologne: DuMont, 1986), p. 60. 5 In a letter to the author, May 23, 1977; published in Hans-Ulrich Obrist, ed., Gerhard Richter: The Daily Practice of Painting: Writings and Interviews 1962–1992 (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press; London: Anthony d’Offay Gallery, 1995), pp. 84–85. 6 All of Richter’s glass paintings are produced the same way: pure pigment is dispersed on the backside of a glass pane and subsequently fused with the surface at considerable heat. These monochrome glass panels make it evident that even hue and tint are influenced by and dependent upon the texture of painterly application (or its absence). For example, in a series of square glass panels conceived by Richter for the lobby of a German bank (pages 86 and 89), he chose to match the square format with unlikely bright hues bordering on light versions of the primaries. Inevitably—as it appears to the spectator in hindsight and as it might well have been intended by the artist—the fusion of glass and bright color gave the work a purely decorative, almost vapid appearance. By contrast, it is perfectly possible to imagine a heavily textured or textured bright red or yellow painted monochrome that would escape that fate. 7 Throughout the late 1960s and early 1970s, Palermo devised a procedure for fusing painterly support and chroma within a single surface in his fabric paintings (e.g., the Stoffbilder, 1967–72). In 1976, Palermo produced his first major work using baked enamel on glass panels, which must be considered one of the precursors to Richter’s subsequent work with colored-glass panes. Palermo produced Himmelsrichtungen (figs. 4 and 5) for the groundbreaking exhibition Ambiente Arte organized by Germano Celant for the 1976 Venice Biennale, the same exhibition that showed one of Dan Graham’s most crucial works using glass and mirrors, Public Space/Two Audiences (see discussion below). Richter confirmed in a conversation with this author that Palermo’s Himmelsrichtungen left a major impression on him when he saw the exhibition.
functionality of a neutral reflective device much more explicitly than the subsequent “colored mirrors” of which *Eight Gray* undoubtedly constitutes a culminating moment. Deploying the cold and skeptical tool of the mirror that Richter himself often inserts into the inspection of his own paintings during the final stages of their execution in order to verify their spatial, gestural, and compositional cohesion, his mirror paintings reflected the spectacular display of Baselitz’s painterly traces. Ironically, these appeared reversed in the mirror’s image, thus—perhaps inadvertently—enacting a subtle travesty of Baselitz’s own desperate maneuver to save his obsolete project by an apparenly scandalous spatial rotation of the reading order of his paintings by 180 degrees. The function of pure mirror reflection—while integral to all of Richter’s subsequent deployments of mirrored or highly reflective colored-glass surfaces—consisted, on this occasion, in reflecting the conditions of painterly facture in the present. Thus, against Baselitz’s rather ostentatious assertion that painting could still claim facture as gesture, as psychic inscription, as unconscious record, as bravura performance, and finally, as proof of an historical continuity with Expressionism as the untroubled painterly idiom of the German nation-state, Richter positioned the spectator in the space of a sudden withdrawal of any authorial inscription. The promises of painterly facture revealed themselves in these reflective monochrome voids as so many falsities, as empty claims for a presence of the author, an achievement of the virtuoso, a mastery of the painterly craft, conditions that all lacked credibility in the historical context and the experience of their spectators.

Clearly then, the mirror and the highly reflective monochromatic glass pane intensify the purging of all indexical mark-making processes and situate the production of inscription entirely within the range of the reader/spectator. Now it is in fact the spectators’ movement alone, the reflection of their random acts performed in front of these mirrors or in the ambient spaces that surround them, that is *temporarily* and *temporally*—as in a photograph or in a cinematic image—recorded as “marks” within the mirrors’ immaculate surfaces.

Richter’s mirror paintings suggest that the monochrome surface, in its total eradication of the indexical inscription of any mark-making process, inevitably has to become a mirror, or a spatial and architectural membrane in which spectatorial movement inscribes itself as the sole source of perceptual activity. Thus it establishes a dialectic between aesthetic device and spectatorial participation that can adequately reflect the necessary conditions of radical equality and equivalence between aesthetic experience of the spectator and aesthetic conception of the artist.

The Window

In exact correspondence to the monochrome’s attempt at purifying painting’s planarity, another Modernist episteme emerged in 1912: the compositional planarity of the grid. The spatial vectors of horizontality and verticality that had traditionally served to map the scheme of illusionistic perspectival depth now became themselves the principle markers of the painterly surface.

The most important early example of this Modernist episteme is the series of *Windows* (e.g., fig. 2) begun by the French Orphist painter Robert Delaunay in 1912, when he attempted to integrate the legacies of Cézanne and Seurat and to transcend what he believed to be the limitations of Cubism. Delaunay’s project, conservative when compared to the development of Cubist reliefs (also around 1912), attempted to sublate the episteme of the window into the new pictorial matrix. Rosalind Krauss was the first to delineate the full range of aesthetic and theoretical oppositions that were articulated in the pictorial matrix of the window from Romanticism to Symbolism in her landmark essay “Grills”:

*The Symbolist interest in windows clearly reaches back into the early nineteenth century and romanticism. But in the hands of the Symbolist painters and poets this image is turned in an explicitly Modernist direction. For the window is experienced as simultaneously transparent and opaque. As a transparent vehicle the window is that which admits light—or spirit—into the initial darkness of the room. But if glass admits, it also reflects. And so the window is experienced by the Symbolists as a mirror as well—something that freezes and locks the self into the space of its own reduplicated being. Flowing and freezing: glass in French means glass, mirror, and ice; transparency, opacity, and water.*

Delaunay recognized, as had Seurat before him, that it would become increasingly problematic to contain vision—one it had been considered in scientific terms—and its painterly representations within the spatial parameters of the picture frame. His decision to conceive of a painting as an actual window within its frame signaled the inevitable dialectic of a simultaneous containment and expansion of the virtual pictorial field into actual spectatorial space. Thus Delaunay’s incorporation of the frame within the pictorial field answers a question that the monochrome would face shortly thereafter with greater urgency: how could one justify painterly containment in the frame given the evident necessity of painting’s unlimited expansion into actual space?

This duplicity (or historical ambiguity) that hesitates to abolish the memory of the painterly episteme within the very act of its radical
deconstruction (an episteme that had, after all, determined European painting’s functions for centuries) would become the starting point for a series of key Modernist works that have engaged painting’s containment within that episteme, from Delaunay’s Windows to Marcel Duchamp’s Fresh Widow (1920, fig. 7), from Joseph Albers’s glass assemblages such his Park (ca. 1924, fig. 3) made from industrial glass to Ellsworth Kelly’s Window, Museum of Modern Art, Paris (1949, fig. 8), to Palermo’s wall painting Window 1 (fig. 6) for the Kabinett für Aktuelle Kunst in Bremerhaven in 1970–71. It is within this lineage, as much as within the history of monochrome painting, that Richter’s Eight Gray and his earlier works on glass must be situated.

Glass

Inevitably, the episteme of the window not only opens up a whole range of historical references that are particularly charged in the context of German Romanticism, it also shifts our attention to Richter’s use of actual glass in the production of Eight Gray (and in his work using this material since 1967). After all, glass is defined by perceptual, technical, historical, and ideological investments that range across an extremely contradictory spectrum.

The Modern mythemes of glass originate in the nineteenth century, ranging from the cult of glass and crystal as a mystical substance in German Romanticism (as in the work of the mine inspector Friedrich von Hardenberg, known as Novalis), to its industrial celebration in Joseph Paxton’s Crystal Palace of 1851, an example of secular architecture that opened up new spaces for the commodity, its circulation, display, and consumption. In the twentieth century, the material would be recoded once again in diametrically opposed terms. For German Expressionism, glass would become the transmitter of a radiant new world in the poetry and the writings of Paul Scheerbart (e.g., his essay “Glass Architecture” of 1914), and it would become the matter of utopian visions in the architectural designs of Bruno Taut and the young Walter Gropius. In 1919, art historian and critic Adolf Behne imagined that glass architecture promised to purify and transform the European bourgeois subject:

Glass architecture. . . . No material overcomes matter as much as glass. Glass is a completely new, pure material into which matter is
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Figure 6

Blinky Palermo, study for wall painting Window 1, Kabinett für Aktuelle Kunst, Bremerhaven, 1970–71
Pencil drawing and photograph on board
90 x 66 cm
Städtische Kunstmuseum, Bonn

melted and transformed. Of all the substances at our disposal, it achieves the most elemental effect. It reflects the sky and the sun; it is like luminous water, and it possesses a wealth of possibilities in the way of color, shape, and character that is truly inexhaustible and can leave no one indifferent. . . . Its most profound effect, however, will be that it breaks the European of his rigidity along with his hardness. . . . Glass will transform him.  

Glass, generating light and sudden transparency, promised to liberate the subject from the impenetrable orders of domination, the unfathomable structures of mythical and religious thought. But the cultic veneration of the material also provided a new mythic imagery to propagate the emancipatory powers of industrial rationality. Transferred from the natural to the social realm, the crystal and glass now served as an analogue in which geological forms of growth were correlated to the sphere of a future transparent social collective.

Thus, vision in the definition of the avant-garde artists and architects of the first two decades in Germany was inextricably intertwined with utopian vision, with what Ernst Bloch called Vorschein (best translated as “promising appearance,” or “prophetic semblance”). Paradoxically, in spite of their secular aspirations, visions of utopian architecture such as Taut’s Die Stadtkrone (Crown of the City, 1919), as well as Gropius’s early conceptions of the Bauhaus, all circulate around the idea and image of a secular cathedral, one of the traditional sites of Western European collectivity bound by myth and religion. It seems then that the new cult of glass and transparency had to enact its secularization first at the very site of the cathedral—in the very material of stained glass—where religious transcendence had been traditionally transmitted. Christoph Asendorf quotes the German architect A. G. Meyer as making this link explicit as early as 1907:

A. G. Meyer, in his study Eisenbauten, discovers a further analogy in the history of design. The glass wall, which is a membrane and solid body in one, allows interior and exterior space to blend into one another, has a prototype in the Gothic church window. Believers and their God are connected by light. According to the symbolism of the church building, “. . . the glass windows correspond to the precious gems in the walls of the heavenly Jerusalem.”

It is not surprising that even an artist as central to painterly purification as Joseph Albers, one of the Bauhaus masters devoted to a new scientific register of perceptual experience, remained entangled in those legacies at least until the mid-1920s, and executed a series of stained-glass assemblages and “stained” glass windows. In secularizing this pictorial-architectural idiom once foundational to religious cult however, Albers systematically dismantled its hierarchical color
schemes by opposing the traditional primacy of blue in favor of a randomly ordered constellation of square particles, manifestly made out of industrially produced wire mesh security glass (see fig. 3). Sixty years later, Richter engaged with the material of stained glass in one of his lesser-known works. Unknowingly—we presume—Richter echoed Albers’s attempt to emancipate the material of glass and the format of the stained-glass window from its religious and cultic as much as from its Romantic and Symbolist legacies when he produced a window as a commission in 1982 for a private home in Berlin originally designed by Walter Gropius (see page 75). Richter’s window reiterated and intensified Albers’s emphatic coloristic de-hierarchization in its programmatically aleatory combination of color squares arranged according to the very same chance procedures that Richter had already applied earlier in the color combinations of his various 1024 Colors (1973–74).

Yet the conception of light as the embodiment of transcendental experience, and of glass as its transmitter, would inevitably undergo the same changes, slow and radical, as the conception of vision itself. Barely twenty years after Scheerbart’s Expressionist-utopian pamphlet “Glass Architecture” was published, Walter Benjamin would discuss that very essay and the philosophical implications of glass in distinctly anti-Expressionist and anti-utopian terms in his “Experience and Poverty.” Benjamin writes, “It is no coincidence that glass is such a hard, smooth material to which nothing can be fixed. A cold and sober material into the bargain. Objects made of glass have no ‘aura’. Glass is in general the enemy of secrets. It is also the enemy of possession. (...) Do people like Scheerbart dream of glass buildings because they are the spokesmen of a new poverty?”

If “transparency” remained at all integral to the promises invested in the new glass architecture of the 1920s and 1930s, the concept was now altogether different from the Expressionists’ definition. Their binaries of mystical versus secular luminosity, of transcendentality versus enlightenment, would now be displaced by a new set of ideals: sobriety, clarity, and functionality. These new promises responded to

the general cultural calls to integrate inside and outside, private and public, the redefinition of matter as energy and to fuse spatial and temporal modes of perception.

Thus, already in the context of his architecture in the late 1920s, Mies van der Rohe stated for example that he was primarily interested in glass because it generated an infinite play of light and reflection on its surfaces: "... but my experiments with a glass model showed me that the use of glass depended, not on the effect of lights and shadows, but on the rich play of reflection." What followed the cult of transparency was a cult of reflections, of mirror effects that would reflect audience behavior and movement in the manner of a recording camera. Or, as we will argue, in the manner of a technologically evolving system of narcissistic containment, one which could provide technological loops, recording and replaying the activities of the perceiving subject back onto itself. And soon enough, the space of radiance and reflection would become a new space of total confinement, as Jeff Wall has analyzed:

Mies's response to the historical catastrophe of the 1920–50 period is to renounce the implicit utopian critique of the city contained within Modernism and to relinquish the city to its Caesars: the speculators, bureaucrats and real-estate developers. His gesture of withdrawal is deliberate and his architecture, in its perfected emptiness, expresses his submission to the modern forms of power which have apparently vanquished all opposition and rule over a chaotic estranged mass. His buildings reflect the atomization suffered by that mass at the hands of the institutions the building symbolizes. In their perfection of technique and proportion, these buildings relinquish the Modernist utopia in an act of silent, stoic purity, and come to exist, as has been said, "by means of their own death." ( . . ) The combination of puristic resignation and spectacularized expertise of Miesian building becomes of course the prototype for the post-1945 corporate skyscraper style.¹⁵

It becomes apparent then that some of the difficulties posed by Richter's Eight Gray result from the fact that the large-scale gray glass panes can neither be fully mapped onto the historical formation of the monochrome nor can they be exclusively seen through the episteme of painting as a window. It is just as difficult to situate the work within the utopian architectural traditions that invested glass with those extraordinary historical aspirations sketched out above. We will therefore have to turn to subsequent and, eventually, to more recent developments in both architecture and sculpture in the second half of the twentieth century where glass and vision have been associated with a different set of perceptual and psychosexual functions.
Radiance, Reflection, and Polish

What we have left behind then is the historical era of Ernst Bloch's concept of Vorschein in which the glance and the shine—the reflection of light and its radiance—could still be perceived as the promise of fulfillment and gratification. What we have also vacated is Scheerbar and Benjamin's glass house, whose clarity and new sobriety corresponded to actual, existing poverty, yet also to an authentic experience. What we have entered instead is a phase of the deployment and investment of glass in which the regime of consumption has taken total control of the sphere of perceptual phenomena. This qualitative shift alone would explain why any attempt to situate Richter's works on glass within an unbroken continuity of the history of utopian avant-garde thought would be profoundly problematic. As problematic in fact, as it was for John Cage—admittedly one of Richter's central figures of aesthetic reference—to situate the cult of transparency and reflections in the work of Mies in an unbroken continuity. As for example in his famous lecture in 1957 where Cage explicitly refers to Mies as model: "This openness exists in the fields of modern sculpture and architecture. The glass houses of Mies van der Rohe reflect their environment, presenting to the eye images of clouds, trees, or grass, according to the situation."14

The most problematic aspect of this argument is its unconditional trust in an abstract, i.e., dehistorized concept of nature as a foundational correlate of aesthetic experience. What was actually at stake—as Mies himself had been the first to understand in the immediate postwar period—was to recognize the irreversible destruction of both utopian and naturalist associations of the myths of glass, transparency, and reflection. After all, the postwar period begins the phase of experience of transparency and reflection when even the slightest radiance is skimmed off and instantly deployed to transform hope and desire into their smallest possible quantifiable units. We are moving therefore from Bloch's Vorschein into the realm of Glanz auf der Nase ("the shine on the nose"), Freud's initial definition of the experience of the fetishizing gaze and its deflection from the encounter with the site of loss and absence and its displacement onto substitutional body parts, and eventually, the shifting over to the substitutional objects of consumption, whether products of mass or "high" culture.

The painterly, more frequently sculptural, concern with immaculate surfaces in the twentieth century ranges from the desire for sublime perfection in artisanal production to fetishistic subjection under the new precision of the industrial object. Constantin Brancusi seems to have been the first to articulate this dilemma: he achieved infinitesimal refinement in an endless application of artisanal skills, attempting to match, if not to supercede, the supreme finishes of industrial objects (for example, ball bearings). Brancusi's admirer Duchamp responded by having the readymade guarantee the work's appearance as "immaculate" production. It is certainly not accidental that one of the works by Richter, evolving in tandem with the monochrome glass panels, is a group of perfectly milled stainless-steel spheres whose status as readymade or as sculpture remains ambiguous.

The transition from an artisanal to an industrial mode clearly shifts the means of painting's manufacture, but this shift also forces it to confront unexpected (and at times, it seems, unwanted) registers of perception. While industrial painting might have initially aimed at annihilating the fetishization of the virtuoso application of paint, it might have already entered the treacherous domain of industrial brand— and commodity design (call it Stella's and Judd's problem). Certainly, Richter's first glass panes from 1965, and works that emerged simultaneously, such as Larry Bell's glass cubes and Robert Morris's Untitled (Mirrored Cubes) (fig. 10), would seem to come closest to the neutrality of the perceptual tool or an aesthetic device of experimental vision.

As Minimalism has involuntarily proven (and Richter's works on glass and mirror most certainly have one of their origins in the history of Minimalism), at this moment in time it is very difficult to invent aesthetic models that operate as merely perceptual or cognitive devices that could convincingly claim to analyze or alter the governing conditions of perception and conventions of language without simultaneously, if involuntarily, partaking in numerous other formations of "vision." Paradoxically, it was precisely their intended lack of aesthetic qualities that triggered Greenberg's notorious attack on Minimalist works in 1967:

Minimal works are readable as art, as almost anything is today, including a door, a table, or a blank sheet of paper. (That almost any
nonfigurative object can approach the condition of architecture or of an architectural member is, on the other hand, beside the point, so is the fact that some of the Minimal works are mounted on the wall in the attitude of bas-relief. Likeness of condition or attitude is not necessary in order to experience a seemingly arbitrary object as art. Yet it would seem that a kind of art nearer the condition of non-art could not be envisaged or ideated at this moment.  

Even in these instances, the deployment of glass and mirror and the industrial quality of the finish, the steel and chromium frames and, in the case of Bell’s and Morris’s boxes, the peculiar fusion of the most classical planar and volumetric trope of Modernism—the square and the cube—could not protect any of these works from immediately acquiring references that opposed and surpassed the presumed purity of the perceptual model, ranging from the shop window’s display case to the design of gadgets for garnering narcissistic attraction.

Obviously, the industrial material and production of Eight Gray (and of the “colored mirrors” that precede it) partially originates in the desire to change painting from a surface of belabored inscription into one of polished perfection. The monochrome’s passion for erasure, its pursuit of a fusion of pigment and process, its desire to totalize texture and surface, leads to the paradoxical project of a \textit{pittura immaculata}—a stainless painting.

What Richter’s stainless paintings reflect first of all are these questions: When does erasure achieve perfection and when does it end up merely as polish? When would the perfection of erasure signal a sealed repression and when would the shiny surface merely entrap the gaze in a fetishistic exchange? Once the immaculate surfaces of Minimalism cross over into a spatial, or even an architectural structure, these contradictions necessarily intensify, since it is no longer the fetishistic object that captures spectators. Instead, the environment in its entirety entangles them within a phenomenological process of mirror reflection, inevitably expanding the subject’s narcissistic object relations to those of a spatial confinement of suturing and surveillance.

Notable among the large-scale architectural and site-specific installations of Post-Minimalism are those by Dan Graham from 1974 onward, his \textit{Public Space/Two Audiences} (1976) being among the most exemplary works to use glass and/or mirror (see fig. 11). In these works, Graham was not aiming to continue the conditions of simultaneous collective perception conceived by the avant-garde artists of the 1920s and 1930s (from El Lissitzky to Mies and—with increasingly affirmative and opportunistic intentions—from László Moholy-Nagy to Frederick Kiesler). De facto, these artists found
themselves compelled to articulate the conditions of a highly isolated, almost cellular perception. Atomized individual capacities to perceive an aesthetic object are, if at all, alerted only on the condition of a guaranteed experience of narcissistic mirroring: after all, the only conditions of simultaneous collective perception that are accessible are those in which the design of commodities contains its consumers. As Jeff Wall succinctly phrased it: "[In] these performance works (i.e., Graham's), the 'environmental functional behavioral' models use window, mirror, and video control systems to construct dramas of spectatorship and surveillance in the abstracted containers of gallery architecture."  

Exhibition Value

Thus, in a way, Eight Gray is an installation whose range of historical references—and references of a considerable magnitude, as we have attempted to sketch out—is surpassed by its temporal and spatial specificity. There is a quiet grandeur in this work that is, however, immediately contradicted by its hidden yet manifestly present mechanical dimension. Like an object straight out of a novella by E.T.A. Hoffman, Richter's painting can be mechanically adjusted—like that of a vanity mirror—according to the spectator's needs. The austere rigor and stasis of Richter's wall-size gates, whose direction or openings are hermetic, find an instant counterpoint in their mechanics, which generates a perceptual-perspectival disorder that troubles both the hieratic and traditional orders of perspectival vision as much as the perception of a sacred ambience of the memorial hall that the paintings might otherwise induce. They achieve this instability through their structural support: these large-scale glass panels are mounted on metal frames with fastenings that can be loosened, allowing the artist or the curator (and, by implication, the spectator) to manipulate the angles of the panels by tilting them slightly, reorienting their reflections enough to alter the overall spatial orientation, creating the peculiar conditions of a mirror cabinet. Thus the mechanisms introduce a sudden dimension of domesticity or even vaudeville into an otherwise extremely serene and austere project. To get a sense of the profoundly disturbing qualities of the potentially participatory mobility of these panels, one might imagine for a moment the large paintings of Mark Rothko's chapel in Houston installed on movable hinges to allow them to be tilted according to unknown criteria, willful or programmed, by artist, curator, or spectator.

It should by now be evident that *Eight Gray* responds in a very particular way to the location of the museum where it will first be exhibited, to the city that is home to this museum, and to the particular historical circumstances of the newly found cult of the monument in that city, becoming, in the end, a kind of antimonument. When first considering the project, Richter was uncertain; but then he had the idea of removing all the architectural paneling that the museum often deploys in order to close its large-scale vertical windows that open to the street as part of its mission of “exhibiting,” of producing exhibition value.

By contrast, the work itself, in juxtaposition with the open windows, acquires an almost austere muteness, withholding rather than exhibiting itself, relativizing rather than foregrounding its aesthetic ambitions and its status in direct juxtaposition to the architectural reality of a newly established interpenetration of inside and outside spaces, of daylight and noise, that now intrude into the artificially created spaces of pure exhibition value. The work diffuses that condition in favor of a more real constellation of actual given: daylight and street noise, the grandiloquent claims of sponsorship, the cultural pretense for a newly found national identity, the self-congratulatory celebration of the newly found capital and the cultural and political delegation of the task of commemorating to the artist as specialist.

The problem of public commemoration in Berlin had posed itself only a few years ago when Richter was commissioned (along with several other artists) to produce a work to adorn the new German Reichstag in Berlin. The result should be recognized as a rather important predecessor to *Eight Gray*, especially in the way that both works perform the complicated dialectic of revelation and concealment, of subversive affirmation and critical refusal typical of Richter’s work at large. In particular the preparatory studies for the Reichstag project reveal the complicated process that eventually led to the large-scale installation of three glass panels in black, red, and gold (almost inevitably to be read as a representation of the German flag defined at the moment of the foundation of the Weimar Republic).

As the preparatory sketches and drawings indicate in great detail (see page 94), Richter had initially planned a project in which images of the victims of concentration camps in Nazi Germany would have constituted the iconic information in the public mural installation for the Berlin parliament building, supposedly corresponding (and conforming) exactly to the demands of the commissions and the patron: to fulfill the duty of commemoration, now executed by the artist as specialist in such matters. Step by step in the preparatory drawings, all representation is effaced. At first, a polychromatic work on chance constellations takes over, eventually leaving room only for the self-negating and restrictive framework of the national emblem itself: thus Richter’s painting abdicates its false expertise as much as it insists on critically reflecting on the services that it actually supplies and then makes those services part of the restrictive tautology.

Thus *Eight Gray*, certainly as a result of its hue as much as of its size and scale, acquires the condition of a curtain or a veil that conceals, while its radiant reflections position the spectator in a set of equivalent relationships. As is constitutive of Richter’s work at large, the extreme contradictions that operate inside the pictorial structure remain unreconciled: The window, the frame, the glass pane here operate at least to the same degree as works of a radical critique of ocularcentrism (as had been the case in Duchamp’s *Fresh Widow* and in Kelly’s *Window*).

As a work about the conditions of vision, Richter’s *Eight Gray* assumes then a rather different attitude from the works about transparency and mirror reflection discussed above. The coloration of each panel (also its tension between opacity and reflection) point to Richter’s extreme ambivalence with regard to the desirability (or rather, the prohibition) of an ever-expanding regime of exhibition value and its associated spaces and objects.

Richter’s *Eight Gray* shares these premises of a critique of ocularcentrism. It is a work in which the institutional restriction of art and its ensuing condemnation to a tautology have been formulated with a clarity that programmatically deprivileges vision rather than celebrating it. In this work, the promise of seeing as an act of transcendental experience is manifestly denied. Instead we encounter a definition of a visibility that seems to suggest that it is far from liberating and transcendental, that is in fact deeply inscribed in or causally connected to other formations, the regulations of institutional interests and control or the processes of systematic fetishization. Or going further, *Eight Gray* might outright identify “vision,” the specular desire in its present forms of socialization, as the compulsion, the site, and the sense of a fraudulently obtained gratification, if not even as the practice of deceit.

And it seems that this conflict acquires a real urgency for Richter when the spectacularization and institutionalization of memory itself is at stake. That is, when the contemporary cult of exhibition value is transferred onto the necessity of constructing spectacular sites and images of commemoration. Thus the withholding of the spectacularized acts of memory serves as a reminder that the individual has to perform acts of commemoration on his or her own terms, in continuity, outside of the officially administered and advocated locations of delegated mnemonic representations.
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Page 33
4 Glasscheiben (4 Panes of Glass), 1967
Glass and steel, in four parts
Each 190 x 100 cm
Herbert Collection, Ghent
GR 160

Page 34
4 Glasscheiben (4 Panes of Glass), 1967
Glass and steel, in four parts
Each 190 x 100 cm
Herbert Collection, Ghent
GR 160

Page 36 (top)
Study for 4 Glasscheiben (4 Panes of Glass), 1965
Ball pen and felt pen on paper
21 x 29.7 cm
Herbert Collection, Ghent
65/12

Page 36 (bottom)
Study for 4 Glasscheiben (4 Panes of Glass), 1965
Graphite and felt pen on paper
21 x 29.7 cm
Herbert Collection, Ghent
65/13 (recto)

Page 37 (top)
Study for 4 Glasscheiben (4 Panes of Glass), 1966
Graphite, ball pen, and color pencil on paper
21 x 29.7 cm
Private collection, Munich
66/7

Page 37 (bottom)
Study for 4 Glasscheiben (4 Panes of Glass), 1966
Graphite and felt pen on light blue paper
21 x 29.7 cm
Herbert Collection, Ghent
66/4

Page 38 (top left)
Study for 4 Glasscheiben (4 Panes of Glass), 1966
Graphite on paper
29.7 x 21 cm
Herbert Collection, Ghent
66/1

Page 38 (bottom left)
Study for 4 Glasscheiben (4 Panes of Glass), 1966
Graphite on light blue paper
29.7 x 21 cm
Herbert Collection, Ghent
66/2

Page 38 (top right)
Study for 4 Glasscheiben (4 Panes of Glass), 1966
Graphite on paper
29.7 x 21 cm
Herbert Collection, Ghent
66/3

Page 38 (bottom right)
Study for 4 Glasscheiben (4 Panes of Glass), 1966
Graphite on paper
29.7 x 21 cm
Herbert Collection, Ghent
66/4

Page 39 (top left)
Study for 4 Glasscheiben (4 Panes of Glass), 1966
Ink (pen) on paper
29.7 x 21 cm
Herbert Collection, Ghent
66/5

Page 39 (bottom left)
Study for 4 Glasscheiben (4 Panes of Glass), 1966
Ink (pen) and graphite on paper
29.7 x 21 cm
Herbert Collection, Ghent
66/6

Page 39 (top right)
Study for Glaswand (Glass Wall), 1966
Graphite on paper
29.7 x 21 cm
Herbert Collection, Ghent
66/8

Page 39 (bottom right)
Study for Glaswand (Glass Wall), 1966
Ink (pen) and graphite on paper
29.7 x 21 cm
Herbert Collection, Ghent
66/9 (recto)

Page 41
Study for Glaswände (Glass Walls), 1966
Graphite and ball pen on paper
21 x 29.7 cm
Herbert Collection, Ghent
66/10 (recto)

Page 43
Königsallee (grau) (Königsallee [Gray]), 1969
Oil on canvas
60 x 70 cm
Collection Unknown
GR 225/1
Page 45 (top)
Study for Innenaum (interior), recto, 1970
Graphite on paper
24.2 x 32.5 cm
Peter Dibke, Cologne
70/2

Page 45 (bottom)
Study for Innenaum (interior), verso, 1970
Graphite on paper
24.2 x 32.5 cm
Peter Dibke, Cologne
70/2

Page 47
Grau (Gray), 1973
Oil on canvas
90 x 65 cm
Private collection, Cologne
GR 348/7

Page 48
Museum (Kaserne bzw. Amtsgebaude) fur 1000
große Bilder (Museum [Barracks or Administration
Building] for 1,000 Large Pictures), 1975
Ink (pen) on paper
21 x 29.7 cm
Private collection, Cologne
75/1

Page 49
Study for the installation of Graue Bilder (Gray
Pictures), 1975
Graphite on paper
21 x 29.7 cm
Private collection, Cologne
75/2

Page 50 (top)
Study for the installation of Graue Bilder (Gray
Pictures), 1975
Ball pen and graphite on paper
21 x 29.7 cm
Private collection, Cologne
75/3

Page 50 (bottom)
Study for the installation of Graue Bilder (Gray
Pictures), 1975
Graphite, ball pen, and collage (with oil paint)
on paper
21 x 29.7 cm
Private collection, Cologne
75/4

Page 51 (top)
Installation instructions for 8 Graue Bilder
(8 Gray Pictures), 1975
Graphite, ball pen, and china ink on paper
21 x 29.7 cm
Städtisches Museum Abteiberg, Monchengladbach,
Inv. Nr. 8989a, Purchase 1975
75/5

Page 51 (bottom)
Installation instructions for 8 Graue Bilder
(8 Gray Pictures), 1975
Collage, felt pen, and graphite on paper
21 x 29.7 cm
Städtisches Museum Abteiberg, Monchengladbach,
Inv. Nr. 8989b, Purchase 1975
75/6

Page 52
Installation view, Graue Bilder (Gray Pictures) at
Städtisches Museum Abteiberg, Monchengladbach,
1975

Page 55
Grau (Gray), 1975
Studio view, Düsseldorf
Oil on canvas, in eight parts
Each 225 x 175 cm
Städtisches Museum Abteiberg, Monchengladbach
GR 367/1-8

Page 57
Grau (Gray), 1976
Oil on aluminum
63 x 59 cm
Private Collection, Cologne
GR 392/2

Page 58 (top)
Bild mit Spiegel, mit Glasplatte abgesperrt
(Picture and Mirror Closed Off with Glass Pane), 1976
Graphite on paper
21 x 29.7 cm
Private collection, Cologne
76/10

Page 58 (bottom)
Study for Glasscheibe (Pane of Glass) and
Doppelglasscheibe (Double Pane of Glass), 1976
Ball pen on paper
21 x 29.7 cm
Private collection, Cologne
76/12

Page 59 (top)
Bild und Spiegel (Pictures and Mirrors), 1976
Graphite on paper
21 x 29.7 cm
Private collection, Cologne
76/11

Page 59 (bottom)
Study for Glasscheibe (Pane of Glass), 1976
Ball pen and graphite on paper
21 x 29.7 cm
Stadtschule Galern im Leinbachhaus, Munich
76/14

Page 60 (top)
Study for Glasscheibe (Pane of Glass), 1977
Ball pen, graphite, and color pencil on paper
21 x 29.7 cm
Private collection, Cologne
77/4

Page 60 (bottom)
Study for Glasscheibe (Pane of Glass), 1977
Ball pen and graphite on paper
21 x 29.7 cm
Private collection, Cologne
77/5

Page 61
Study for Glasscheibe (Pane of Glass) and
Doppelglasscheibe (Double Pane of Glass), 1977
Ball pen and graphite on glass paper
21 x 29.7 cm
Private collection, Cologne
77/6

Page 63
Study for Doppelglasscheibe (Double Pane of Glass),
1977
Chinese ink (pen) and graphite on paper
42 x 29.7 cm
Private collection, Cologne
77/7

Page 64
Doppelglasscheibe (Double Pane of Glass), 1977
2 Panes of glass and steel, each painted gray on
one side
200 x 150 x 50 cm
Private collection
GR 416
Page 65
Glas scheibe (Pane of Glass), 1977
Glass and steel, painted gray on one side
151 x 131 cm (without pedestal)
Private collection
GR 415/1

Glas scheibe (Pane of Glass), 1977
Glass and steel, painted gray on one side
151 x 131 cm (without pedestal)
Private collection
GR 415/2

Page 66 (top)
Study for Glas scheibe (Pane of Glass), 1978
Graphite on paper
20.3 x 25.2 cm
Städtische Galerie im Lenbachhaus, Munich
78/6

Page 66 (bottom)
Study for Glas scheibe (Pane of Glass), 1978
Graphite on paper
20.3 x 25.2 cm
Städtische Galerie im Lenbachhaus, Munich
78/7

Page 67 (top)
Study for Glas scheibe (Pane of Glass), 1978
Graphite on paper
20.3 x 25.2 cm
Städtische Galerie im Lenbachhaus, Munich
78/9

Page 67 (bottom)
Study for Glas scheibe (Pane of Glass), 1978
Graphite and felt pen on paper
20.3 x 25.2 cm
Private collection, Cologne
78/10

Pages 68–69
Study for the installation of Strich (auf Rot)
(Stroke [on Red]), Bördeschule Soest, 1980
Collage and cardboard on paper
53.5 x 117.5 cm
Collection unknown

Page 70
Spiegel (Mirror), 1986
Mirror on cork
21 x 29.8 cm
Edition of 100, signed and dated
Published by Kunstverein für die Rheinlande und Westfalen, Düsseldorf

Page 71
Spiegel (Mirror), 1981
Exhibition view, Georg Baselitz–Gerhard Richter,
Kunsthalle Düsseldorf, 1981
Crystal mirror
225 x 318 cm
Kunsthalle Düsseldorf
GR 470/1

Spiegel (Mirror), 1981
Exhibition view, Georg Baselitz–Gerhard Richter,
Kunsthalle Düsseldorf, 1981
Crystal mirror
225 x 318 cm
Städtische Galerie im Lenbachhaus, Munich
GR 470/2

Page 73
Study for a room with Bilder (Pictures), 1986
Graphite on photocopy
21 x 29.7 cm
Private Collection, Cologne
86/1

Page 75
Glasfenster, 625 Farben (Stained-Glass Window, 625 Colors), 1989
Colored lead-glass window
273 x 268 cm
Haus Otte (Walter Gropius, 1922), Berlin-Zehlendorf
Hans Karl Herr, Berlin
GR 703

Page 76
Spiegel, grau (Mirror, Gray), 1991
Enameled glass
280 x 165 cm
Musée des Beaux-Arts de Nantes
GR 735/1

Page 79
Eckspiegel, braun-blau (Corner Mirrors, Brown-Blue), 1991
Enameled glass, in two parts
Each 225 x 100 cm
Anthony d’Offay, London
GR 737/1

Page 81
Spiegel (Mirror), 1981
Crystal mirror
100 x 100 cm
De Pury and Luxembourg, Zürich
GR 485/1

Page 83
Spiegel, grau (Mirror, Gray), 1991
Studio view, Cologne
Enameled glass
100 x 100 cm
Edwin Cohen Collection, New York
GR 739/1

Page 85
Spiegel, blutrot (Mirror, Blood-Red), 1991
Enameled glass
210 x 175 cm
Martin and Toni Sosnoff Collection
GR 736/1

Page 86
Zwölf Spiegel für eine Bank (Twelve Mirrors for a Bank), 1991
4 Crystal mirrors, 8 panes of color-coated glass
Each 120 x 120 cm
Hypobank, Düsseldorf
GR 740

Page 89
Sechs Spiegel für eine Bank (Six Mirrors for a Bank), 1991
2 crystal mirrors, each 350 x 110 cm
4 panes of color-coated glass, each 350 x 172 cm
Hypobank, Düsseldorf
GR 741

Page 91
Grauer Spiegel (Gray Mirror), 1991
Installation view, The Saint Louis Art Museum
Enameled glass, in four parts
Each 300 x 175 cm
The Saint Louis Art Museum, Gift of Gerhard Richter
GR 751/1–4

Page 93
Installation view, Documenta IX, Kassel, 1992

Page 94 (left)
Study for the Reichstag, 1997
7 black-and-white photographs mounted on sketches, 1:50
71 x 51.7 cm
Städtische Galerie im Lenbachhaus, Munich
Atlas panel 647

Page 94 (right)
Study for the Reichstag, 1997
Collage (4 photographs mounted on photocopy), 71 x 51.7 cm
Städtische Galerie im Lenbachhaus, Munich
Atlas panel 648
Page 95 (left)
Four Studies for the Reichstag, 1997
4 parts. 4 paper cutouts mounted on photocopy, 4 photocopy cutouts mounted on photocopy, 1 color photograph mounted on photocopy, 4 black and white photographs mounted on photocopy
71 x 51.7 cm
Städtische Galerie im Lenbachhaus, Munich
Atlas panel 649
Page 95 (right)
Study for the Reichstag, 126 Farben (126 Colors), 1997
126 plastic sheets on photocopy, 2 color photocopies, 1:50
71 x 51.7 cm
Städtische Galerie im Lenbachhaus, Munich
Atlas panel 650
Page 96 (left)
Four Studies for the Reichstag, 1997
4 parts. Pencil, ballpoint, felt-tip pen on photocopy, color plastic sheets on photocopy, 2 color photocopies
71 x 51.7 cm
Städtische Galerie im Lenbachhaus, Munich
Atlas panel 651
Page 96 (right)
Sixteen Studies for the Reichstag, Schwarz, Rot, Gold (Black, Red, Gold), 1998
16 color photographs
71 x 51.7 cm
Städtische Galerie im Lenbachhaus, Munich
Atlas panel 652
Page 97 (left)
Study for the Reichstag, Schwarz, Rot, Gold (Black, Red, Gold), 1998
Color Plexiglas mounted on paper on photocopy, 1:50
71 x 51.7 cm
Städtische Galerie im Lenbachhaus, Munich
Atlas panel 653
Page 97 (right)
Study for the Reichstag, Schwarz, Rot, Gold (Black, Red, Gold), 1998
Color Plexiglas mounted on paper on photocopy, 1:50
71 x 51.7 cm
Städtische Galerie im Lenbachhaus, Munich
Atlas panel 654
Page 98
Study for the Reichstag, Schwarz, Rot, Gold (Black, Red, Gold), 1998
Color Plexiglas mounted on photocopy, 1:50
71 x 51.7 cm
Städtische Galerie im Lenbachhaus, Munich
Atlas panel 655
Page 99
Schwarz, Rot, Gold (Black, Red, Gold), 1999
Installation view, Reichstag Building
Enameled glass
2043 x 296 cm
German Bundestag, Berlin
GR 856
Page 100
Glässcheibe (Pane of Glass), 2002
Glass and steel
200 x 140 x 25 cm
GR 876/1
Page 101
8 Grau (Eight Gray), 2001
Studio view, Cologne
8 panes of enameled glass and steel
Each 320 x 200 x 30 cm
21st-Century Museum of Contemporary Art, Kanazawa, Japan
GR 874/1
Page 102
Stehtende Scheiben (4 Standing Panes), 2002
Glass and steel
230 x 153 x 172 cm
GR 877
Page 103
7 Stehtende Scheiben (7 Standing Panes), 2002
Glass and steel
234 x 167 x 318 cm
Courtesy Marian Goodman Gallery, New York
GR 879/1
Installation Drawings
Page 108
Construction plan for separate panes of Acht Grau (Eight Gray), 2002
Colored pencil on photocopy
29.7 x 21 cm
Deutsche Guggenheim Berlin
Page 109
Construction plan for separate panes of Acht Grau (Eight Gray), 2002
Colored pencil on photocopy
29.7 x 21 cm
Deutsche Guggenheim Berlin
Page 111 (top)
Technical drawing for Acht Grau (Eight Gray) by Verroplan Ingenieurburo für Glasanwendungen, 2002
Page 111 (bottom)
Technical drawing for Acht Grau (Eight Gray) by Verroplan Ingenieurburo für Glasanwendungen, 2002
Page 113 (top)
Sketch for tilting of Acht Grau (Eight Gray), 2002
Collage on cardboard
29.7 x 21 cm
Deutsche Guggenheim Berlin
Page 113 (bottom)
Sketch for tilting of Acht Grau (Eight Gray), 2002
Collage on cardboard
29.7 x 21 cm
Deutsche Guggenheim Berlin
Pages 114–15
Eighteen studies for the installation of Acht Grau (Eight Gray), Deutsche Guggenheim Berlin, 2002
Pages 116–117
Final drawing ((#17) for the installation of Acht Grau (Eight Gray), Deutsche Guggenheim Berlin, 2002
Ink on blueprint
35 x 70 cm
Deutsche Guggenheim Berlin
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