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"Newborn" was made multiple times. The Romanian-born French modernist sculptor Constantin Brancusi made the first iconic version, *Le Nouveau Né*, early in the early twentieth century. He carved the egg-shaped form from marble in 1915, then made another version in bronze in 1920. The title’s allusion to originality—a key tenet of avant-garde art at the time—also embraced the peculiarities of artistic creation by comparing it to birth; the voided sculpture abstractly resembles a crying baby through an indentation on its surface. By shaping an evocative object out of physical material, Brancusi brought a thing into existence. His paternity was authored, and his name will accompany his progeny into the indefinite future.

Nearly a century after its making, this sculpture has become a touchstone for New York–based artist Carissa Rodriguez, though not quite in its original form. Brancusi’s gesture of birthing had already been complicated by American artist Sherrie Levine’s incorporation of his sculpture into her exhibition in 1993 at the Philadelphia Museum of Art, where the marble is in the permanent collection. The museum permitted Levine to make a mold of *Le Nouveau Né* to produce her own series on the work, which she cast in crystal and black sandblasted glass. Levine’s appropriation of the Brancusi was part of her ongoing artistic practice, the absorption of canonical artworks under her moniker, and in many ways an angling for shared parentage with selected patriarchs of twentieth-century art history. Further, *Le Nouveau Né*, with its male-gendered title, signifies something else entirely in terms of creation when a female artist christs it the gender-neutral *Newborn* in the 1990s, particularly when a male artist in the early twentieth century made it first.

In Rodriguez’s newly commissioned video *The Maid*, 2018, the artist has recast this object and its patrimony in yet another new role. *The Maid* interrogates Brancusi’s sculpture, or rather the multiple art objects that share its name, as Rodriguez surveys several of Levine’s *Newborn* casts in their respective places of residence, from New York City to Los Angeles. *Newborn* exists because of its art-historical lineage, but its baggage is in some way emptied out through Rodriguez’s mediations. Balanced on the top of tables, grand pianos, and plinths in the upscale homes of collectors, the auction room, and museum storage, over the course of the video the glass orb gains elusiveness as a thing that exists in this world. The twinned forms become objects that have a particular circulation and demand certain care. In this portrait of an artwork that goes beyond the work itself, *Newborn* belongs to neither Brancusi nor Levine, but has come into its own set of relations, as captured by Rodriguez’s lens.

The film spans the course of a day, swapping coasts several times as the sun rises and sets, peering into homes and studying the sculptures in situ. The settings inscribe these many *Newborns* with expanded significance, highlighting essential aspects of domesticity, the market, and conservation—making prominent the mechanisms that serve, and are likewise served by, the object. When the sculpture is physically detached from its maker, it takes on new meaning, as, for example, a marker of time. Bearing the timestamp of 1993 or 1994, when the objects came into being, they have since made their way into private and public collections. One iteration that was recently put up for auction was purchased at the sale and quickly found itself in a new home, with parts of the process documented in the video. Some are packed away in storage crates, others are prominently displayed. In one instance, the sculpture is nestled in among family photographs of children and grandchildren: notably, family members are posed next to former president Bill Clinton in a framed snapshot that appears to have been taken during his presidency, which commenced in 1993, the same year that Levine’s *Newborn* was first cast. Another recent photograph shows former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton during her 2016 presidential run. Flanking the sculpture on each side, the Clinton portraits could be seen as forming political, and perhaps art-historical, bookends of an era. While Rodriguez did not stage the shots, meaning the sculptures were more or less filmed as found, the details of the social and cultural milieus that have contributed to the creation and maintenance of Levine’s *Newborn* family come into focus. Qualities of the cultural life that has evolved since the works were made, over twenty years ago, contribute to the fabric of the story—the décor of the homes, the other artworks on view, the character of the cities in which they reside. The timespan of Levine’s *Newborn* is central, but so of course is the century that has elapsed since Brancusi’s sculpture and even more so the five centuries since Leonardo da Vinci’s *Salvator Mundi*, world famous since its rediscovery in 2011. The Leonardo makes a cameo in the video when a person reads from the Christie’s catalogue for the November 2017 sale where the work broke records. The painting’s reemergence within the contemporary moment through its authentication and sale puts it in dialogue with the cultural context of the *Newborn*. In another scene, the On Kawara paintings that hang on the walls of one home list off a series of millennial dates: 12NOV.2000, 14NOV.2000, 16NOV.2000, and so forth.

These references point to a range of antecedents to the contemporary moment, serving as a reminder that art is a product of its time, which is continuously becoming the past. The recording of events, like the sand that shapes Levine’s glass sculpture, is not only a metaphor for the passage of time but also a mechanism for defining history. While the life of an object enters a future of indeterminate length, Rodriguez places the artwork within the realm of human care. While the artwork will likely outlive its owners, its meaning is contingent on the generations it is passed on to. In this work, and the exhibition, the scale of human life is put into relation with the seemingly static qualities of the glass form.

The title of Rodriguez’s film is borrowed from Swiss writer Robert Walser’s 1913 short story “The Maid.” Written two years before Brancusi carved his first *Le Nouveau Né*, the paragraph-long tale follows the journey of a maid who is hired by a rich woman to care for her child. When the child becomes lost, the maid spends the next twenty years searching the world, to no avail. She finally arrives in Paris where, after she has become despondent, the child emerges in a beautiful garden. As soon as the maid recognizes her charge, she dies of joy. The narrator muses: “Why did she die? Did that do her any good?” At the same time, he notes that “the child is now a grand and beautiful lady.” The search for the child, not the maid’s by blood but hers by love and responsibility, ends with tragic futility mixed with redemption. The narrator asks the reader to pass along his kind regards if they ever meet the child, now a woman, indicating future encounters and timelines beyond those in which the maid is the protagonist. The cycle of intersecting lifetimes is punctuated by the events in the narrative of caretaking and devotion.

Within Rodriguez’s video, one could consider the unseen individuals who own *Newborns* as the rich lady who mothered the child. While the beloved artwork is an asset they are responsible for, they can delegate its care to domestic staff, or have it shipped off into temporary custody at a host museum. The relationship of the collectors
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to the sculpture, financially arranged yet emotionally charged, exceeds that of the administration of ownership. The role of emotional attachment is usually left out of the conversation on works of art; their symbolic meanings and associations for the individuals who assume ownership exist separately from their broader significance. Artists are both makers and temporary custodians of their own work, fitting somewhere between the mother and the maid in the story. They create and identify intimately with something that leaves their care and enters into new relationships that they are often excluded from. In all these roles, reciprocity, obligation, and care form personal and social bonds and contracts, and extend into an array of relations between human and non-human entities. Throughout Rodriguez’s film, by zeroing in on Newborn so closely, she amplifies the complexity of the world within its frame.

The two decades that passed from the inception of Levine’s Newborn in the early 1990s to its critical reevaluation through Rodriguez’s work have been a period marked by political instability, racial inequities, policy fluctuations for women and gender nonconforming individuals, the advancement of new conservative agendas, a group of children roaming around the playground under the watch of their parents, focusing in on a few girls.
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authorship when traditional biological functions are reconfigured and reordered? The embryo’s cells can exist in an eternal state of regeneration; they resist aging, which lends to their efficacy. Relevant to this inquiry is a recent news story featuring the oldest known preserved embryo that has been implanted and carried to term in a twenty-five-year-old woman who was born the same year as the embryo was frozen.¹ The new mother muses that she and her child “could have been best friends” had the embryo been used when initially preserved.² Is the mother from the future, or the child from the past? Or is this line of inquiry completely outdated?

The suspension and adjustment of supposed biological timelines exposes the complexity that arises from new chronologies. However, as Cooper explains, the investment made in embryonic technologies does not rest solely in their proposed application but also in their speculative value as producers of potential material, however abstract. This falls in line with the free-market capitalism that the neoliberal era has embraced. Levine’s critique of artistic authorship through appropriation coincided with the emergence of this period of economic policy and biotech innovation. The reconfiguration and malleability of biological time, as well as capital, have a correspondingly resounding impact for the conception and circulation of art.

The presentation of the magnified images of human cells in Rodriguez’s exhibition generates queries around property, authorship, and generational configurations. The stuff pictured is a record of the past as well as the future; it has the potential for the reversal of the order of human life through the regeneration of bodies, both extant and yet to be. By associating the images with The Maid, Rodriguez draws out the form of Newborn in relation to the notion of germination implied by the embryo. In this sense, The Girls pits timelines of biological life against the sculpture as well as against the new technologies that capture and hold the potential for human reproduction. The mark of the object and of the artist are not one and the same, as their fates diverge. Notions of time and the understanding of ownership are upended as genealogies are detached from linear progressions. Newborn is made and remade, changing owners indefinitely. The maid can seek and find the child again and again. The children in the park can continue to play, while their houses are razed and new ones are put up in their place. Value is abstracted, and capital is parked in paintings and emptied lots.

¹ Melinda Cooper, Life as Surplus: Biotechnology and Capitalism in the Neoliberal Era (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2008), 132.
² Ibid., 133.
³ Ibid., 143.
⁵ Ibid.

Man can never expect to start from scratch; he must start from ready-made things like even his own mother and father.
—Marcel Duchamp

I always wanted to find a way to make sculpture.

What I wanted was to be able to make a sculpture.
—Sherrie Levine

In one of her earliest works, The Book, 1977, Sherrie Levine inscribes these words in boldface serif type on individual sheets of cardstock. The white space surrounding each term leaves room for the specificity it accrues in the mind of the reader: every abstraction conjures an image. Though the pages together comprise a single work, the fact that they are unbound opens the possibility of their separation, circulation, and reconfiguration into arrangements other than the nuclear and bourgeois. By shifting the emphasis from production to reproduction, Levine’s work imagines alternate kinship structures for modernism.

In the present exhibition, Carissa Rodriguez considers how the material and affective labor that reproduces family structures likewise sustains artistic production and reproduction. Her film The Maid contemplates the lives of six Newborns: sculptures produced—or reproduced—in cast glass by Levine and later adopted by art institutions and private collectors. Rodriguez has used the invitation to exhibit at SculptureCenter as a means to navigate the social, legal, and bureaucratic structures that now govern access to the Newborns, determining whether or not they can be seen, and by whom. Her film overlays subjective views of the sculptures in their current homes with an account of familial separation and reunion borrowed from Robert Walser’s story “The Maid.” Significantly, Walser’s allegory of devotion and loss plays out not between parent and child, but between domestic worker and charge. The film is juxtaposed with silver gelatin prints of developing embryos captured by time-lapse photography and a video of children at play shot two decades ago when Rodriguez was first becoming an artist. Taken together, these elements invite consideration of the relationships between biological and artistic reproduction in an era when they have been thoroughly redefined by technology and the law. This, like much of her work, asks, What are the processes that transform us from bare life into subjects, actors, agents in the world?

Levine’s Newborns made their dramatic debut atop six grand pianos in the central pavilion of the Modern and Contemporary wing of the Philadelphia Museum of Art in the fall of 1993. Levine “transformed the museum into a maternity ward, to raise with new directness her stubborn questions about paternity within the institution of art history,” muses curator Ann Temkin. The translucent glass voids—which at once evoke a cell, an egg, and an infant’s head with its mouth agape—precisely replicate the form of Le Nouveau Né, a marble sculpture hand-carved by Constantin Brancusi in 1915. Though he later remade the sculpture in bronze, marble, and stainless steel, Brancusi insisted that each version (and the entirety of his oeuvre, for that matter) was singular, unique, and entirely new. “I never make reproductions,” he famously declared. This conviction made his work irresistible to Levine, who since the late 1970s had steadfastly appropriated and reproduced icons of artistic modernism as the substance of her own artistic production. Levine’s appropriations of other artists’ work married a romance with modernism to the knowledge that she could claim no place in a canon that exclusively celebrated male desire. She was both drawn to and repelled by the modernist myths of total freedom and sui generis creation, dependent as it was on the presumption of an unmarked, unencumbered body. Knowing that her production would always be read as reproduction, she worked to heighten the contradictions.

“Is her refusal of authorship not in fact a refusal of the role of creator as ‘father’ of his work, of the paternal rights assigned to the author by law?” the critic Craig Owens asks in an early essay on Levine’s work. He alludes to the modern understanding of an author as the sole creator of a work, which was born in the eighteenth century and swaddled by attendant notions of genius and mastery. This was, of course, a patently male archetype. Inextricable from individual attribution is the notion of intellectual property and its legal safeguard, copyright. The latter posits
a telling connection between the integrity (wholeness, coherence) of the work and the integrity of the self. The modern concept of authorship further consolidated private property as an exclusively male domain, a process that had been initiated in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries by the enclosure of the commons, the rise of monetary currency, and the invention of the family unit.8 The exclusion of women from land ownership and inheritance long restricted their autonomy and confined them to reproductive labor and the domestic sphere. The modern concept of authorship extended women’s dispossessio to the realm of ideas.

Beginning in the late 1970s, Levine and her peers expressed skepticism toward a tradition of artistic production that, in Owens’s words, amounted to “a contract between fathers and sons.”9 This contract was enshrined within legal, familial, and artistic structures alike. A generation of artists, many of them women, forged a new sensibility predicated on the appropriation and recontextualization of found words and images, especially those that originated with a proximity to patrilineal power. This led to a canny reappraisal of the claim that an image or text was extended like palms to be read.10 Rodriguez’s more recent photographs of artists’ tongues diagrammed by an acupuncturist,11 It’s Symptomatic / What Would Edith Say?, 2014–15, wryly consider the relationship between the body of the artist and the products of her labor. Practitioners of traditional Chinese medicine analyze the tongue’s surface appearance in order to assess the health of one’s internal organs; likewise, artworks have since antiquity been understood as a material reflection of the artist’s interior state—flesh of their flesh. Rodriguez severs this tie in order to acknowledge others: institutional, affective, biopolitical. Her work casts doubt on the presumption that surface appearances tell us anything at all about the inner lives of their producers.

Since the late 1970s, developments in both biological reproduction and artistic practice have shown that activities long understood as “natural” and spontaneous, if not God-given, are in fact thoroughly mediated. In 1977, the exhibition Pictures (which included Levine’s work) articulated a new approach to authorship. Curator Douglas Crimp proposed that the reproduction and modification of existing images through cropping, captioning, and juxtaposition had now taken precedence over the production of new images.12 One year later, in 1978, the first child was born through in vitro fertilization, revolutionizing the definition of human reproduction. In the years since, the legal status of personhood has been extended to corporations, while the laws that regulate the exchange of human gametes increasingly resemble those that govern private property. At the same time, copyright law has grappled with the rightful ownership of images and objects unetched from their makers. By now artistic production—like biological reproduction—is thoroughly mediated by institutions, technology, the law, and the market.

Does an acknowledgment of these structural conditions mark a loss of agency, or the very possibility of it? There are those who criticize assisted reproduction technologies on the grounds that they are “unnatural” and dehumanizing. The sociologist Charis Thompson offers a different view: they allow participants to “pursue agency through their own objectification.”13 Rodriguez refuges artistic production in parallel terms: the artist is at times alienated from the products of her labor, even as she is “reflected in and reproduced by” them.14 “It’s not hard to make things,” Brancusi once ventured. “What’s difficult is putting ourselves in the state to make them.”54 While for him the key to artistic creation was spiritual inspiration, for Rodriguez it is the coefficient of institutional, material, and libidinal forces mediated through the role of the artist. Under these conditions, the artist oscillates between the positions of subject and object. This generates a surprising form of agency: the refusal to choose between one position and another.

1 See Rodriguez’s exhibitions: I’m normal. I have a garden. I’m a person, at The Watts Institute, San Francisco (2015), and La Centre de Lisieux at Front Desk Apparel, New York (2019). The term “‘bare life’ is used by Giorgio Agamben to distinguish the biological fact of life (ζωή) from the way life is lived (ζωή). Giorgio Agamben, Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life, trans. Daniel Heller-Roazen (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1998), 9.
2 The display choice was inspired by a photograph of Constantin Brancusi’s sculpture Prometheus displayed on a piano in the home of H. S. Eccle in Kettle’s Yard, Cambridge, United Kingdom. As Temkin points out, a piano in a domestic space is a classic emblem of cultural capital and often doubles as a pedestal for family photos and heirlooms. Ann Temkin, Sherry Levine: Newborn (Frankfurt: Portikus, Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art, 1993), 31.
3 ibid.; 13; Rosalind Krauss, “Forms of Readymade: Duchamp and Brancusi,” Passages in Modern Sculpture (London: Thames & Hudson, 1977), 96. 4 Constantin Brancusi, quoted in Howard Singerman, Art History, after Sherry Levine (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2012), 198. Rosalind Krauss argues against Brancusi’s declaration, pointing out that the basic geometric forms that are the building blocks of all Brancusi’s sculptures are “found objects”…that (are) in a real sense given to Brancusi rather than invented by him.” Krauss, “Forms of Readymade,” 88.
5 Levine addressed this in several interviews in the 1980s: “As a woman, I felt there was no room for me. There was all this representation, in all this new painting, of male desire. The whole art world was geared to celebrating these objects of male desire. … What I was doing was making this explicit: how this oedipal relationship artists have with artists of the past gets repressed; and how I, as a woman, was only allowed to represent male desire.” Sherry Levine, quoted in Gerald Marzorati, “Art in the Reckoning,” ARTNews 85, no. 5 (May 1985): 96.
10 Temkin, Sherry Levine: Newborn, 37.
Carissa Rodriguez: The Maid

The Maid, 2018, video still.
Carissa Rodriguez: The Maid

The Maid, 2018, installation view.
Carissa Rodriguez: The Maid
Carissa Rodriguez: The Maid
Carissa Rodriguez: The Maid

All the Best Memories are Hers, 2018, installation view.

All the Best Memories are Hers, 2018, installation view.
Carissa Rodriguez: The Maid


Checklist of Works in the Exhibition

The Girls, 1997-2018
Hi8 video (digitized)
37:30 minutes

All the Best Memories are Hers, 2018
Silver gelatin print from LVT negative
11.5 x 12.5 inches (29.2 x 31.8 cm)

All the Best Memories are Hers, 2018
Silver gelatin print from LVT negative
11.5 x 12.5 inches (29.2 x 31.8 cm)

All the Best Memories are Hers, 2018
Silver gelatin print from LVT negative
11.5 x 12.5 inches (29.2 x 31.8 cm)

All the Best Memories are Hers, 2018
Silver gelatin print from LVT negative
11.5 x 12.5 inches (29.2 x 31.8 cm)

All the Best Memories are Hers, 2018
Silver gelatin print from LVT negative
11.5 x 12.5 inches (29.2 x 31.8 cm)

The Maid, 2018
4K video with sound
12:22 minutes

All works courtesy the artist and
Karma International, Zurich/Los Angeles
SculptureCenter Board of Trustees
Sascha S. Bauer, Chair
Sascha S. Bauer, Chair
Carol Bove, President
Robert K. Elliott, Vice Chair
Eleanor Heyman Propp, Vice Chair
Allen H. Brill, Treasurer
Danielle Andeman
Candy Barasch
Andreas Beroutsos
Sanford Biggers
Benoit P. Bosc
Priscilla Vail Caldwell
Eleanor Cayre
Libby Ellis
Dennis Freedman
John H. Friedman
Arthur Kuijpers
Nate McBride
Adam McEwen
Allison Rubler
Diane Solomon
Fred Wilson

SculptureCenter Staff
Mary Ceruti, Executive Director and Chief Curator
Allison Derusha, Director of Advancement
Ruba Katrib, Adjunct Curator
Kyle Dancewicz, Exhibition and Program Manager
Claire Valdez, Operations Manager
Jillian Scott, Communications, Marketing, and Digital Media Manager
Gracia Ross, Individual Giving and Events Manager
Chitra Arunasalam, Finance Manager
Cheryl Chan, Executive Office and Development Associate
Meredith Friedman, Visitor Services Coordinator
Kiersten Lukason, Head Installer
Tracy Keenan, Visitor Engagement Representative

Photo by Carissa Rodriguez. The intersection of Division Street and Canal Street seen from the artist’s window, circa 1990s.