Dialogues. First part

19th march – 3rd october 2009

Following the quick succession of ideologies created by modern thought, the twentieth century saw many different forms of expression in the visual arts. Each generation at some moment breaks with the criteria set by their predecessors, but every work of art, despite its unique nature, is always related through interpretation, influence or contradiction with what went before.

At the start of the last century, the academic vision of the constant allusion to nature was dismantled. The dissection of the work of art itself and the subsequent questioning of what art actually is started with Picasso and Duchamp. Whilst Picasso analysed nature and used Cubism to reveal the structure and all-embracing vision of things, Duchamp questioned the meaning and practice of art itself, proclaiming "there's no need to actually make the piece of art, since it exists simply by the fact that the artist decides so."

Although artists maintain very different and to a certain extent contradictory positions, what is clear is that each and every way of understanding art falls within the scope of what we understand as the visual arts, even though fierce debate constantly rages about the criteria of what art is and what it is for.

If the opposing and matching sides to different approaches are to lead to progress, they must be open to confrontation and dialogue. The antagonism between the trends that often follow one quick on the next is what each artist defends and pushes forward with their own particular vision and portrait of the world around them, even though another current or another artist might be moving in the opposite direction.

Another form of dissent is shaping the same idea in many different forms or containers. An artist conceives an image and/or idea by contrasting it within a wide framework of interpretations, in terms of both similarity and difference, but always true to the original idea.

This exhibition is based on twelve 'dialogues' between different works in the Josep Suñol Collection, encompassing different kinds of discourse. From the friendly chat between Miró and Calder to Xifra and Tàpies' radically different ways of conceiving an object to sit on. We hope that these rooms will echo with stimulating conversations and heated discussions offering a stimulating visual reading of the leading trends of the twentieth century.

Salvador Dalí. *Studies for the script for the film "Les Mystères Surréalistes de New York",* 1935

Pencil, charcoal and Indian ink on paper. 55 x 41 cm

Joan Ponç. *La mosca,* 1948

Indian ink and colour on paper. 41 x 64 cm

A fantasy world runs riot in the two works in this room. Salvador Dalí and Joan Ponç engage in deep conversation through their pieces and explore the depths of their obsessions. These artists' delirious interior worlds are reflected in their drawings and pull in wide-eyed, intrigued spectators.

The same year that Ponç painted *La mosca* also saw the birth of the Dau al Set group, which was initially heavily influenced by Surrealism. Both artists were involved in this movement to differing extents, and their unique personalities – strong depressive tendencies in Ponç and brilliant hilarity in Dalí – led them to see their work through different prisms. Nevertheless, we can find certain connexions between their works, linked by a painstaking and detailed technique that evidences their mastery of drawing.

In the two pieces compared and contrasted here, a set of irrational beings in surprising situations live out their creators' wildest dreams. Dalí and Ponç's inner worlds come to life by inviting us to join in with their hallucinations. The mistrust that hung over Ponç could at times blind him to the difference between reality and fiction and led him to live an introspective life. Dalí, on the other hand, aimed to reach the masses and soon discovered that film, painting and his literary talents made a perfect trinity and pressed them into service for his fertile imagination.

Les Mystères Surréalistes de New York offers a clear example of the irresistible pull film had on Dalí for many years, thanks to his work with Luis Buñuel. This New York surrealist project never hit the cinema screens, but several sketches survive. In the studies here, the images are broken up through a set of simultaneous scenes which, amongst other things, reflect the artist's mental capacity, based on his paranoiac-critical method.

Deeply mysterious dreamlike situations flow with a certain narrative interest, describing film scenes created by a Dalí who was heavily influenced by violence, sexuality and organised crime, as seen in New York movies of the time. Dalí's film language contrasts with the intimate and obsessive world of Joan Ponç, whose *La mosca* is dominated by a monstrous being, surrounded by an environment that evokes an unreal and apprehensive world. A magical atmosphere envelops both scenes and makes everything about these two works absolutely fascinating.

Juli González. *Gran personaje de pie,* 1934
Bronze. 128,5 x 67 x 23 cm

Anthony Caro. *Table piece Y-73,* 1985-1986
Steel. 59 x 76 x 66 cm

10 A half-century separates Juli González's *Gran personaje de pie* and Anthony Caro's *Table Piece Y-73*. Nevertheless, there are certain ties between these two works that draw us closer to see how they interact. Anthony Caro's admiration for Juli González and Pablo Picasso will help us get a better understanding of these ties.

These two pieces both use the language of abstraction, albeit argued from different perspectives. The abstract representation of shapes in *Gran personaje de pie* represents a human figure: someone standing up in front of us expressing drama and astonishment. The extreme verticality contrasts with the horizontal layout of *Table Piece Y-73,* a format repeated in other pieces from the same series. This still life is made up of irreconcilable objects brought together to reflectively make up an architectural unit.

The traditional techniques of sculpting and modelling are nowhere to be seen in these two examples. The metals used by these artists, together with the techniques of welding and assemblage, reveal an innovative discourse that opens up new forms. Welding gives Caro incredible freedom of movement that lets him work, like the Cubists, with collage, albeit in this case in three dimensions. Juli González uses it to draw in space, combining the supposed weight of the material with the ethereal figure represented. Anthony Caro continues González's skilful work in the curved lines that crown the upper part of *Table Piece Y-7,* although in general his work invades space more boldly. His sheets of rusted steel create an expanding volume. In contrast to Caro, the volume in González's work is represented by a void – the space trapped between the lines that outline the figure.

In González's linear, threadlike sculpture we can appreciate the Catalan tradition of wrought iron. Forging techniques offer a primitive-looking rugged texture that was highly valued by most of the artists of his generation. Caro's textures are more industrial, with steel sheets, girders and other discarded materials. However, you have place yourself in the historical context to understand the importance of treating materials, since their 'skin' forms an inalienable part of the artist's idea.

Both works ask to be surrounded, for us to get the greatest possible number of perspectives on each piece. By walking around them we can appreciate the different ways of converting rigidity into movement and connecting matter with space, independent of the different final result pursued by each artist.

Jean Arp. *Bourgeon sur coupe,* 1960
White marble. 105 x 54 x 35 cm

Lucio Fontana. *Concetto spaziale natura,* 1960-1961
Bronze. 46 x 48 x 40 cm and 32 x 40 x 37 cm

Human beings need nature in order to feel life more intensely and get back to their roots, in the face of an increasingly technological and mechanised society. And many artists have used nature as a central part of their work. Nature exerted a strong pull on both Jean Arp, one of the founders of the Dada movement, and Lucio Fontana, an Argentinean artist who trained in Paris during the Abstraction-Création years.

Bourgeon sur coupe and *Concetto spaziale natura* were produced by these artists at the same time, but in different places. Whilst Jean Arp represents fragments of nature in highly schematic organic forms, the more conceptual Fontana stresses idea over form and the object becomes a means to express itself. The orifices in his *Concetto spaziale natura* let the surrounding space penetrate the pieces – just like the slashes on his monochrome canvases – creating a new dimension, a new space within the real space.

Fontana's pieces look like stones, as if they had been happened upon in nature by chance and exhibited here out of context. Their ruff, rugged texture contrasts with the smooth, polished surfaces Jean Arp works with.

Arp made *Bourgeon sur coupe*, an example of his biomorphic abstraction, by delicately balancing rounded, curved edges with a new element that cuts across to give a more angular feel to the piece. This way of working contrasts with Fontana's coarser and more primitive *Concetto spaziale natura,* fruit of the subtle material aggression that played such a characteristic role in his work. The precise edges in Arp's piece are completely unlike the supposedly spontaneous holes that perforate Fontana's bronze pieces, which were originally terracotta. However, once again appearances are deceptive, since in Fontana everything is premeditated and studied. Arp, in contrast, inherited the idea of chance from the Dadaists and applied it to his sculptures, even though these appear perfect.

Jean Arp builds his sculptures by searching for the essential, giving his work an aura of purity, whereas Fontana first destroys and then creates a new spatial dimension afresh. Both artists reflect their identification with – or transformation of – nature and, at the time, convey their confrontation with the affected world around them.

Alexander Calder. *Une lune bleue,* 1971
Aluminum honeycomb, steel and paint. 88 x 280 x 120 cm

Joan Miró. *Peinture,* 1926
Oil on canvas. 19 x 24 cm

11

The great friendship between Joan Miró and Alexander Calder becomes clear when looking at their respective works *Peinture* and *Une lune bleue*. This close bond led to a highly productive visual dialogue, fruit of their long talks and mutual admiration.

Miró and Calder shared a similar way of looking at and seeing the world. In their works, space goes beyond the limits of the canvas or sculpture and serves as the basis for an imaginary universe fashioned with their own sign language, far removed from traditional forms. In works by both artists, undefined shapes float in accordance with each artist's idea of freedom. Mobility, represented more explicitly by Calder, helps capture this feeling of detachment from the conventional world. This movement, which in Miró we have to imagine ourselves, forms the bedrock of Calder's work, a harmonious cosmic movement.

In both *Peinture* and *Une lune bleue* the weightless shapes that perfectly balance the composition convey a sense of premeditated serenity. As Joan Miró himself said: "conquering freedom is conquering simplicity".

However, despite the dreamlike side to Miró's work, he is less interested in capturing the essence of his real-life dreams than reflecting the experience he drew from observing changing aspects of everyday life, such as the shifting shapes of clouds. By putting his thoughts to canvas, he aimed to make others dream through his use of shapes and colours. These ideas led André Breton to describe Miró as "the greatest Surrealist of us all".

Influenced by Miró and the cultural atmosphere of 1920s Paris, Calder also followed in the footsteps of Surrealism and used his mobiles to express his belief that nothing is fixed and every moment is moving and swinging in perfect harmony with the universe.

Joan Miró's work is set in a world of semi-abstraction, based on symbolism and a certain naive primitivism that combines geometric and biomorphic shapes; Alexander Calder's work is always characterised by the purest abstraction, with pieces full of poetic substance. However, the dialogue between them is based on the same single notion of ethics and aesthetics.

José Jardiel. *La bouche de ma soeur est un bourgeon,* 1971
Mixed media on paper. 44 x 36 cm

Manolo Quejido. *El beso,* 1980
Acrylic on canvas. 191 x 181 cm

José Jardiel and Manolo Quejido led their work towards a figurative style from different fronts: in 1962 Jardiel set up the Grupo Hondo, a highly combative group against abstraction in art, whilst in the 1970s Quejido was a member of the Nueva Figuración Madrileña, a group Jardiel also sympathised with.

Although different in terms of technique, format and style, their pieces reveal something as universal as a kiss. And their different ways of looking at a kiss reflect their different approaches.

Jardiel's passionate lovers, although possibly identifiable in a specific reality, find themselves in an uncertain space. Accompanied by an anguished, shouting face and disturbingly cracked lips, they overlap with the composition, creating a feeling of unease. Nevertheless, there is the intention of a certain degree of order within this chaos, since some of the simultaneous scenes are encircled. (Interestingly, under the title of the piece is the inscription 'Papyrus Harris 18th Dynasty', in reference to the largest papyrus to be found from the world of the 18th Egyptian Dynasty, the most chaotic of the troubled ones that followed.)

A greater sense of optimism and serenity characterises Manolo Quejido's painting. The well-structured and balanced structure shows us completely anonymous lovers who could well represent hope for new times ahead. However, the work does not hide the artist's misgivings with regard to the future, possibly related to the historic transition Spain was going through at the time. In all his work, including this one, Quejido turned his back on the serious existentialist tone that characterised Informalism.

Set apart from this dominant artistic current, Quejido took on influences from Pop Art and skilfully combined them with very personal Neo-expressionism. In this sense, the thick, carefree brushstrokes of *El beso,* where blues and yellows stand out from the dominant black, contrast with the meticulous lead-grey drawing, tinged with sadness, in Jardiel's *La bouche de ma sœur est un bourgeon,* more academic in style. This drive for perfection in drawing can be traced to the influence of the Baroque painter from Seville Juan de Valdés Leal had on Jardiel right from the start of his artistic stirrings.

Luis Gordillo. *Untitled,* 1987
Photocopy and collage on paper. 29 x 42 cm

Shichiro Enjoji. *Untitled,* 1979
Tempera on board. 16 x 22 cm

13

Two different ways of understanding art come face to face in this dialogue between Shichiro Enjoji and Luis Gordillo. Both offer a stark contrast of personalities: the former, more rational; the latter, more visceral. Oriental philosophy, guided by serenity, is clearly present in Enjoji's work, whilst Western noise can be heard in Gordillo's. Only the diagonal line that slices across both compositions links these two pieces: Enjoji's is perfect; the other, vague.

Shichiro Enjoji plays with pure geometry to create gentle shades of grey. His delicate drawing, with fine, well-defined lines, contrasts with Luis Gordillo's convulsed composition. Here, the jumble of forms expresses a dialectic tension, where abhorrence of a vacuum is overcome with figures from his personal universe that dramatically overwhelm us, almost painfully. In contrast, Enjoji's atmosphere relaxes us and introduces us into an all-encompassing, completely empty atmosphere that leaves space for reflection.

Opposite Enjoji's perfect, ordered lines, in Gordillo's piece we find ourselves in front of a complex, mazelike network made up of organic and mechanical shapes linked by long tubular membranes, variations on his *Situaciones Meándricas.* Despite the alienating discourse, this work strikes a perfect compositional balance against a background of pastel tones that shun the sharp, bright colours of his earlier stage.

Whereas Enjoji boldly uses an almost forgotten Renaissance painting technique, Gordillo sometimes wonders whether painting is the most suitable medium for his time. Hence his interest in mechanical reproductions of images. Cuttings of drawings and photographs form part of his collages, a technique he alternates and relates simultaneously with painting.

Mass production is present in Gordillo's work in the repetition of certain elements, which even appear separately. With Enjoji, this sequence is more logical, since it follows in the footsteps of geometric optics offered by a linear perspective of the past, recovered and made contemporary by the artist.

Opposite Enjoji's methodical image stands Gordillo's discordant vision of the world. They represent opposing concepts and are highly representative of each artist's own perceptions.

Sean Scully. *8.1.96,* 1996
Water colour on paper. 30 x 33 cm

Juan Uslé. *Untitled,* 1999
Mixed media on canvas. 31 x 46 cm

Abstraction as a universal language is the approach followed by both Sean Scully and Juan Uslé to create their own dimension. Their particular images lead us to search for, and perhaps connect with, their ability to express meaning through this abstraction. Both artists remain true to painting, although the images reflect their close ties to photography, which in both cases is front-on, flat, decontextualised and lacking any environment to break it up.

Both artists do away with sporadic trends and concentrate on their own experience. The geometries with which they surround their composition space in no way detract from the intimism of the work. Quite the opposite: they strengthen it. Their horizontal and vertical lines, their strips or oblong bodies of colour and their crisscrossing lines lead us to think about what's hidden or fragmented and to view the work as a whole.

As an intellectual, Scully imbues his work with philosophical meaning. His pieces are intimate and use colours to reaffirm his connexion with the natural world. The concept of duality is also clearly present, as seen in *8.1.96* with the location of compelling strips of colour laid out over a more uniform thin, striped background. His art is not spontaneous, but reveals a deliberate choice of shapes and colours, with the same restrictions he imposes on all his canvases.

Uslé also starts with a preconceived idea, but his work draws from his own perceptions of the world around him and his most intimate memories. Uslé explores and interacts with his painting to reveal hidden mysteries. He experiments with his own intuitions, and the delicate nature of his work leads us to think about his treatment of space, rhythm and structure in *Untitled*, 1999.

In both pieces, the colours combine to strike a perfect balance. With Uslé, the superposition of different layers of paint creates deliberate textures, whilst Scully uses watercolours to hint at greater transparency on paper, expressing the contradiction of being human and imperfect. Both pieces present episodes of permanent observation of nature and remind us of nature's constant, inherent structure.

Alberto Giacometti. *La Jambe,* 1958
Bronze. 218 x 46 x 26 cm

Joan Rom. *Peu,* 1991
Wool and wood. 149 x 40 x 29 cm

14 Alberto Giacometti and Joan Rom offer us two sculptures with the same goal. These two pieces are from different places and times and follow different concepts, but they share the same curiosity for new perspectives and defy all artistic pigeonholing. In this respect, their pieces strike up a respectful dialogue.

Feet connect humans to the ground, and their legs support them and carry them closer to or further away from their fate, as suggested by both artists in their respective works. However, although they aim to represent the same thing, the two pieces convey different feelings, due, amongst other things, to the use of different materials. What in a talk or speech would be words are here wool and bronze. As a result, there is a stimulating and challenging contrast of textures between Giacometti's *La Jambe* and Rom's *Peu.*

The gentle, soft touch of Rom's Peu contrasts with the rough, rigid *La Jambe.* However, perhaps counter-intuitively, Joan Rom's work is more robust than Giacometti's, which appears weaker and more delicate.

Rom is interested in the perception the surfaces in his work can give off, and the influence of *arte povera* is clear. This is why he affords so much importance to the materials he uses, which, as in this case, are usually somewhat unconventional. His human foot, turned into something animal and anomalous, creates an enigma that can confuse spectators and make them feel uneasy. In one of his catalogues, he wrote: "The possibility of creating meaning is often found not in the centre of what we're being offered, but on the edges, at the limit between the object and the world, where the visual aspect caves in."

Giacometti's work is also perturbing in that it shows us humans' fragile side in an almost spiritual fashion. The extreme thinness of *La Jambe* leads us to observe the human condition with a certain melancholic air, and we can feel the influence of the existentialist philosophy of his friend Jean Paul Sartre.

After appreciating these pieces, we could try to assess the strength of the feelings of irrationality or unease both artists provoke with their works. Through their superficial variety, these unusual materials, shapes, perspectives and structures link with spectators to produce an inexorable reflection on their own perception of everyday life.

Antoni Tàpies. *Butaca,* 1987
Bronze and paint. 87 x 91 x 90 cm

Jaume Xifra. *Chaise de salon d'art,* 1974
Barbed wire. 96 x 45 x 44 cm

Both these works clearly identify with everyday objects we can find wherever we go. This might lead some to view these pieces as somewhat obvious and even to question the limits between sculpture and the objects themselves.

Today, sitting down on a chair or reclining in an armchair is such a natural act that we forget that in other cultures at other moments in history this object has had very different connotations. In some countries there are still chairs that kill.

The dialogue between Tàpies' armchair and Xifra's chair hints at the voice of a third creator: Joan Brossa, the visual poet admired by both. These object-poems or object-sculptures try to communicate messages through their three-dimensional nature.

Both artists see these pieces as something that goes beyond their own nature as objects. *Butaca* is full of nostalgia, whilst *Chaise de salon d'art* emanates unease. They manage to strike up a dialogue between them, even though they are separated by thirteen years and many miles, as a result of Jaume Xifra's enforced exile in Paris as Spain fell under the shadow of Franco's dictatorship. In this dialogue, individual freedoms are questioned as spectators are drawn in.

Jaume Xifra's fragile barbed-wire chair – like a barbed-wire fence in wartime – becomes an impossible chair and stands in stark contrast to Antoni Tàpies' solid bronze armchair. Tàpies didn't hesitate to treat the armchair's cold, hard texture to evoke the patina caused by the passing of time.

Art gave way to antiwar criticism as a result of the dictatorial regime that had taken over the country. The defence of human rights and freedom was supported by thousands of artists and intellectuals, including Antoni Tàpies and Jaume Xifra.

Both pieces were made during an extremely radical time, when the interpretative sense of the object expressed familiar, everyday objects and questioned the validity of historical avant-gardes.

Pietro Consagra. *Colloquio,* 1955
Bronze. 121 x 60,5 x 11,5 cm

Luis Gordillo. *Trío gris y vinagre,* 1976
Acrylic on canvas. 200 x 276 cm

15

Pietro Consagra and Luis Gordillo's work is dominated by characters squaring up to each other in an attempt to communicate. Both artists strip the outlines of each of their figures to the bare minimum. Flat shapes are the order of the day and perhaps in this head-on approach we can sense the shrinking of time related to human existence.

In 1947 Consagra helped set up the *Forma I* group, which played a key role in abstract art in Italy. Gordillo soon distanced himself from his informalist beginnings and evolved introspectively towards a more figurative style. He formed part of the *Nueva Generación* group and in the 1970s was linked to the *Nueva Figuración Madrileña,* creating works that would influence future generations of artists.

Consagra, a sculptor par excellence, created this work the same year that he won an award at the São Paulo Biennale. His bronze *Colloquio* represents two people engaged in conversation. The meeting between these two abstract forms stands out from the space thanks to the effect produced by the bas-relief faces. The sharp, angular shapes stand in stark contrast to the flickering outlines in Gordillo's *Trío gris y vinagre.*

Gordillo places his figures in a diptych, whose monochrome background fuses with the figures themselves. In contrast to Consagra, these figures are of identical proportion, as if one were the reflection of the other, and the vertical line that splits the composition in two, a mirror. Only a subtle shift in colour between the left- and right-hand sides breaks this strict symmetry, which might have been achieved using mechanical systems before the work was painted. In Consagra's *Colloquio* the geometric asymmetry, which still recalls his Cubist influences, comes apart in irregular abstract segments on the right-hand side of the work, making the piece lighter and distinguishing the two outlines. Gordillo's work produces a feeling of unease and reflects the artist's disquiet. The figure is duplicated as if it were a doubling of personality, and from his aura rises a third, who is engrossed in watching them.

Both artists express the emotional rhythm of life, with elements that give synthesised form to man's actions.

Zush-Evru. *Zeyemax,* 1974
Mixed media on paper. 71 x 55 cm

José Noguero. *Untitled,* 1992
Pencil on paper. 33 x 24 cm

In all cultures, different looks and visions invite us to communicate with others and what's around us. By observing, we set up a reciprocal exchange between subject and object. We're being observed too. This is the central focus of the dialogue between Zush-Evru and José Noguero, which offers us two different visual narratives in their respective works.

These two artists based their work on introspective experience. Both compositions are extremely intimate, although they are conceived very differently. Whilst Noguero's discourse leads us towards denial of the look, Zush-Evru's is completely obsessive. In addition, Noguero's traditional drawing technique contrasts with the digital media Zush-Evru uses to express himself.

In Noguero's *Untitled*, he is concerned with the relationship between reality and representation. In this sense, his drawing only evokes the vision – or blindness – of the person lightly sketched out on paper. The sightless face conveys serenity despite the missing eyes. Silence invades the work and makes the represented figure appear surprisingly fragile. Something different happens with Zush-Evru, where his array of eyes suggests a multitude of beings staring at us. There is an overwhelming feeling of unease, since all these eyes appear to be asking us for something at the same time.

As a result, whilst Zush-Evru's work unsettles us, Noguero's invites us to think and reflect. Despite these differences, the two works are both enigmatic: both hide a mystery that refuses to reveal itself at first sight.

For Zush-Evru, an eye becomes more than a symbol, since its connexion with the brain makes it representative of one of the ideals he tirelessly pursues in both his real life and his own invented world, *Evrugo Mental State*, namely "to see things clearly." It's no surprise that the flag of his imaginary State bears an eye and a brain.

However, his *Zeyemax* hides yet more. Zush-Evru marks out a series of energy spots with thin lines that run from each eye to the outside. Eastern traditions from India, which he came across during his time in Ibiza, may well be behind all this. Energy is channelled, captured from outside. When we analyse Noguero's apparently eclectic career, we can also find influences from his long stays in India, at the Lingaraj Maharana Indian sculpture studio in Orissa.

Nino Longobardi. *Untitled,* 1982
Mixed media on canvas. 200 x 300 cm

Manolo Valdés. *Bodegón Morandi II,* 1985
Stone. 56 x 110 x 78 cm

15

Still lifes had their golden age in the 17th century, although they date back to ancient Egyptian tombs and 1st-century Pompeian painting. Over the course of history they have evolved thanks to the large number of artists from all ages who have tried their hand at representing them. Nino Longobardi and Manolo Valdés both pick up the discourse of this genre, although with differences in concept and technique.

If Valdés gives his *Bodegón Morandi II* pride of place, Longobardi relegates his still life to a secondary role, since the real banquet or motive for his work lies under the table – a very ethereal, barely sketched-out table. In response to the voices proclaiming the 'death of painting', Longobardi champions this traditional technique as a valid, present-day way to express new ideas and emotions. His spontaneous and uninhibited work *Untitled* contains a set of intertwined bodies that give free rein to his most basic instincts, with plenty of scope for sex. Here the 'still life' gives way to a scene full of vibrant life. Manolo Valdés, in contrast, restrains himself in his reinterpretation of one of the works of the great Italian master Giorgio Morandi, highly admired for his austerity and sensitivity.

Both artists dispense with colour in their pieces: Valdés because he respects the natural colour of the material he uses, and Longobardi because he aims to remove any decorative trace. What Longobardi is most interested in is the act of painting, how fast he acts. This is reflected in the spontaneous lines that flow from his creative impulse. He gives as much importance to drawing and chiaroscuros as Valdés does to the play of volumes on which, juggling with the light, he creates interesting shadows on the set as a whole, characterised by its aseptic surface.

The simplicity we can extract from Valdés' *Bodegón Morandi II* is nowhere to be found in Longobardi, despite his primitive and wild expressive freedom, which avoids any conventional posture with respect to a still life.

Fundació **Suñol**

Passeig de Gràcia 98
08008 Barcelona
T 93 496 10 32
F 93 487 20 19
info@fundaciosunol.org
www.fundaciosunol.org