"To Be With Architecture Is All We Ask"
A Critical Genealogy of The Serpentine Pavilions

Susan Holden
The University of Queensland

Abstract

Upon the opening of the 2016 Serpentine Galleries Pavilion, artistic director Hans-Ulrich Obrist explained that, "To be with architecture is all we ask", highlighting the current popularity of architecture in the art world, and the relative closeness of art and architecture in the contemporary cultural scene. The international popularity of the commissioned architectural pavilion as a curatorial strategy of art institutions, for which the Serpentine Galleries Pavilion programme has served as a catalyst, deserves further analysis, not least because of the disciplinary questions it raises for architecture. What has it meant for an art institution like the Serpentine to "be with architecture"? And conversely what has it meant for architecture to be with the Serpentine? In order to explore these questions, this paper outlines a genealogy of the Serpentine Pavilion programme, drawing attention to key moments in the exhibition history of the institution since Julia Peyton-Jones took up the directorship in 1991, in which architecture was taken up as a medium for artworks, and a curatorial focus on architecture was developed. It argues that not only is the threshold between art and architecture conceptually at stake in the Serpentine Pavilions, but that it is a structural aspect of the programme that can be shown to have developed historically out of the 1990s exhibition programme of the Gallery. While others have accounted for the contemporary pavilion as one of many interdisciplinary practices in an ever-expanding field, or evidence of a collapse of art and architecture into one another, this paper recognises a persistent tension in its characterisation as both an architectural type and artistic medium. In doing so it aims to reopen a discussion about the ongoing relevance of questions of medium to an understanding of architecture's disciplinary condition.

Introduction

Upon the opening of the 2016 Serpentine Summer Pavilion, artistic director Hans-Ulrich Obrist explained that, "To be with architecture is all we ask".[1] In doing so he was appropriating the words of artists Gilbert and George, from their 1970 artwork *To Be With Art Is All We Ask…*, an early text based work that included a series of *Art for All* rooms, around which viewers were invited to wander and consider Gilbert and George's musings: "Oh Art, what are you? You are so strong and so powerful, so beautiful and so moving. You make us walk around and around, pacing the city at all hours, in and out of our Art for All room".[2]

For those in the know, Obrist's appropriation of the words of Gilbert and George made a subtle connection between the artists' accessible and democratic ambition for art, and a stated ambition of the Serpentine Pavilion programme – to champion the value of contemporary architecture by giving the public an opportunity to experience it directly. In 2016, however, Obrist's remarks have a new resonance, highlighting the closeness of architecture and art in the contemporary cultural scene. Who doesn't want to be with architecture these days, as the widespread replication of the Serpentine pavilion model internationally, attests?

The contemporary pavilion, of which the Serpentine Pavilion is the exemplar, provides evidence that the disciplinary condition of architecture is changing. However, there remains a question about but how to characterise this change. One answer to this question can be found in the history of the Serpentine Galleries itself. While important aspects of the contemporary pavilion – as a form of museum expansion and a vehicle for philanthropy and branding – have been explored by others, this paper focuses on the conceptual issues at stake in their double status as architecture and art.[3] It aims to show that not only is the threshold between art and architecture conceptually at stake in the Serpentine Pavilions, but that it is a structural aspect of the programme that can be shown to have developed historically out of the 1990s exhibition programme of the Gallery developed under the helm of director Julia-Peyton Jones.

To evidence this argument, this paper works backwards from the Serpentine Galleries Pavilion programme in the manner of a genealogy. Firstly, it identifies moments in the programme when the question of disciplinary differentiation has surfaced - moments when there has been some debate or confusion about whether the pavilions are architecture or art. Secondly it looks at the renovation of the Serpentine Galleries building in 1996-98 and how this was a catalyst for commissioning temporary art and architecture works, and set a precedent for the exhibition of works on the lawns outside the building. These exhibitions paralleled a general trend in curating in the 1980s and 1990s towards the institutional re-appropriation of practices identified by Rosalind Krauss in her 1979 essay "Sculpture in the Expanded Field", and was the basis for extending a curatorial approach to architecture at the Serpentine.[4] Lastly, this paper looks at one of Peyton-Jones's first exhibitions, *Like Nothing Else in Tennessee*, a group exhibition held in 1992, for which the Gallery commissioned a work by Dan Graham titled *Two-Way Mirror and Hedge Labyrinth*, a site-specific work exhibited on the lawn that Graham described as a pavilion.

These episodes in the exhibition history of the Serpentine have been recognized in occasional literature on the Pavilion programme, often as a way to retrospectively explain it as a natural outgrowth of a sustained engagement with architecture.[5] In this paper I cast a critical eye over this 'official' history, to explore the terms of exchange between architecture and art and to what extent they persist in the Pavilion programme. Graham's pavilion works are instructive in this genealogy, not only as an example of the way architecture was taken up as a subject of art practice in the 1980s and 90s, but also because of his sustained development of the pavilion as a specific form in his oeuvre, which exploited a tension between its status as an architectural type and an artistic medium, a tension that I argue is also at stake in the contemporary pavilion.

Architecture or Art?

The Serpentine Pavilion programme has always described itself as a form of advocacy for contemporary architecture. This remit was certainly more pronounced at the programme's inception, and the early Pavilions (Zaha Hadid, 2000; Daniel Libeskind, 2001; Toyo Ito and Cecil Balmond, 2002; Alvaro Siza and Eduardo Souto de Moura, 2004) were opportunities not only to expose the British public to the work of contemporary architects yet to realise a building in the UK, but at a more fundamental level, presented an opportunity for architects who had built very little at all. As described by art theorist Joel Robinson, these pavilions: "reflect the architectural establishment's late embrace of the deconstructivist style … [which i]n the British context … was enlisted as a weapon against the fairytale historicism of the Prince of Wales and his circle".[6] While the Pavilion commission in these early years did not in every case act as a catalyst for future commissions in the UK, it was a somewhat reliable indicator of future Pritzker Prize winners (Hadid, 2004; Ito, 2013; Souto de Moura, 2011). Overtime the original remit of the programme has become less stringent, and the selection criteria for the commission has evolved with new points of focus. The arrival in 2006 of Hans Ulrich Obrist as co-director was an important moment in its evolution and marked a new emphasis on the design of the Pavilion as a venue for events. It also marked a shift towards the commissioning of architects with well-established careers and oeuvres of built work. The Pavilions of 2006 (Rem Koolhaas), 2008 (Frank Gehry); 2010 (Jean Nouvel), 2011 (Peter Zumthor) and 2012 (Herzog and de Meuron) were completed by architects who had already won the Pritzker and had the 'starchitect' status that comes with it. More recently, with the burgeoning of pavilion commissions and programmes internationally, the demand for reinvention has been apparent, and in 2016 (Julia Peyton-Jones's last year as director), in addition to the Pavilion by Bjarke Ingels Group (BIG), four smaller and more experimental structures referred to as Summer Houses, were commissioned from Asif Kahn, Yona Friedman, Barkow Leibinge, Kunle Adayemi.

While this brief history shows how the programme has evolved and changed over time, one aspect of the commission that the Serpentine Galleries have held a steadfast position on, is that the Pavilions are not art, but architecture exhibited 1:1. However in the history of the programme the tension around whether the Pavilions are art or architecture has surfaced at several times.[7] In this way, the Pavilions have become an occasion for a contestation between art and architecture. The first section of this paper draws out some of these moments, which I argue have become more prominent over time, and even a defining feature of the programme.

Although designated by the Serpentine Galleries as the second Pavilion, the 2001 Pavilion by Daniel Libeskind, titled *Eighteen Turns*, was the first for which the Galleries started to develop a commissioning process and to structure the commission as an ongoing programme. Libeskind's Pavilion, like Zaha Hadid's the year before, had the quality of being one step up from the paper architecture that defined both their practices at this time. As indicative of buildings to come, they neatly fitted the "proleptic" characterization often invoked in attempts to account for the contemporary pavilion historically, which seek to emphasise its origins as a site of experimentation in twentieth century modernism.[8]

However, against this characterization, Libeskind's Pavilion also demonstrates how in developing a model for commissioning temporary architectural works, the Serpentine Galleries has overlaid art-world conventions which treat the Pavilions more like artworks. As a means of funding the construction of Libeskind's design, the gallery sought its pre-sale, a model which applied the art-world convention of private galleries acting as sales agents, which has since become the preferred model for funding the Pavilions.[9] In a further twist on this model, Libeskind's Pavilion was also conceived as an edition.[10] Not, however, like Le Corbusier's *Pavillion de l'Esprit Nouveau* (1924) that was to be a model for serial architecture in the modern world, where architecture was a capacity that was instantiated in its material production; but more like a limited edition of artists prints. Libeskind's Pavilion was eventually purchased by an unknown buyer, and loaned in 2005, in the manner of an

artwork, to the city Cork as part of its celebrations as the European Capital of Culture.[11] While there were no additional buyers to warrant the production of any multiples, the secondary market for the pavilions shows one way that architecture has become more art-like in the present, by being less like an instance of a capacity as it was conceived in modernism, and more like a unique object.

The 2006 Pavilion by Rem Koolhaas and Cecil Balmond with Ove Arup is recognised as marking an important moment in the institutional history of the programme, as it coincided with the arrival of Hans-Ulrich Obrist as co-director of the Serpentine Galleries, and the instigation of the *24-hour Marathon* speaker event that has since become a significant feature of the Pavilion programme.

It is hard to look past the obvious similarities between Koolhaas's inflatable helium Pavilion and French artist Yves Klein's 1960s manifesto-like proposals for air architecture. Koolhaas himself made this connection:

> I thought it was very important not so much to reinvent the tradition of the Pavilion, but to try and do something that was not about space or about materials. I tried to imagine something that was like Yves Klein's Fire Pavilion, on which he collaborated with Claude Parent and Werner Ruhnau, or the one based on air.[12]

However the 2006 Pavilion is also significant for being the only time an artwork has been exhibited inside the Pavilion, and represents another moment of self-consciousness about the question of disciplinary categories in the history of the programme.

In the catalogue produced by the gallery for the exhibition of the Pavilion, Koolhaas stated how he wanted to engage the artist Thomas Demand who was scheduled to exhibit in the Serpentine Gallery at the same time. The programme otherwise avoids the Pavilions being venues for the display of art, for the reason that it would confuse and detract from the display of the Pavilions themselves.[13] In pursuing this line, the Pavilion programme recognizes the changed relationship between art and architecture after modernism. As Penelope Curtis has pointed out, there was an established tradition of the pavilion being a setting for sculpture in modernism, in which a mutually beneficial dialogue between – or co-articulation of – the two arts was staged.[14] Such an interrelationship was no longer possible after the trend of sculpture practice adopting the scale and extra-mural logic of architecture, which became entrenched in the 1970s, and the emphasis of sculptural form in architecture.

For Koolhaas, the exhibition of a frieze wallpaper by Demand was intended to blur the authorship of the Pavilion and to emphasise its capacity for appropriation: an "important element is that the artist inside The Serpentine will intervene in our structure with work of their own. So the identity of the author will be completely blurred".[15] Paradoxically, it was a way for Koolhaas to work against what the Serpentine Pavilions were, by 2006, already becoming – an emblem of the trend towards iconic 'starchitecture'.

The following year, in 2007, despite earlier proclamations that the Pavilions were an architectural commission, the artist Olafur Eliasson took top billing, in a collaboration with architect Kjetil Thorsen of the Norwegian firm Snøhetta. This anomaly was explained by Peyton-Jones as Eliasson "wearing his architectural hat" for this commission.[16] Her statement references the degree to which Eliasson's absorption of architectural processes and techniques has become a recognized form of practice in the art world, not to mention the scale of his studio enterprise, which employs artists, architects and designers to produce the architectural works that he has become known for.[17] Eliasson's Pavilion, with its ascending spiral ramp, accentuated the characterization of architecture as directly aesthetic and having the capacity to effect the whole sensorium. This was also the year that Hadid, at the last minute, made *Lilas*, a sculptural flower-like pavilion that serve as a setting for the summer party, when Eliasson and Thorsen's complicated rising spiral Pavilion was delayed due to the rising cost of steel.

In 2012 there was another architect-artist collaboration – between Herzog and de Meuron and Ai Wei Wei – a collaboration that allowed a stretching of the usual criteria of the programme: to commission architects who had not completed a building in the UK at the time of the invitation.[18] The invitation of Herzog and de Meuron and Ai Wei Wei can, in part, be explained by the concurrence of their Pavilion with the London Olympics – their 'Birds Nest' stadium was an iconic feature of the Beijing Olympics in 2008 – and the demand for a similarly sophisticated work to be a feature of the so-called 'Cultural Olympiad,' an exercise in national cultural branding that sought to exploit the global media coverage associated with the sporting event, and draw attention to all aspects of British culture.[19]

2012 also marked the burgeoning of the contemporary pavilion globally, as well as one of the most decisive critique of the phenomena to date, by Sylvia Lavin.[20] Herzog and de Mueron's and Ai Wei Wei's Pavilion unsurprisingly had a critical edge, which came from the way it excavated down into the ground, eschewing the tendency of the contemporary pavilion towards objecthood, and reclaiming the quality of site specificity, not in the way that this term had been appropriated by large-scale, extra-mural art practice, but in a way that made reference to the impact of the Serpentine Pavilion programme itself. In reconstructing a cumulative archeology of the footprints of all the past pavilions, it was a Pavilion to rise above all Pavilions. It highlighted the physical and cultural impact of the Pavilions, and how their temporariness, while illusory, was nonetheless impacting on the disciplinary condition of architecture – on the one hand making it more exchangeable like art, and on the other cultivating an expectation for temporariness and continuous novelty in the built environment more generally.[21]

Perhaps the most telling episode in this selective history of the Serpentine Galleries Pavilion programme, was the completion in 2014 of the Serpentine Sackler Gallery, a new space for the Serpentine housed in the renovated Magazine, the 1805 artillery store situated in Hyde Park a little way from the existing Gallery. The building was renovated and extended by Zaha Hadid with a design that closely resembled Hadid's 2007 stand-in pavilion *Lilas*, and in many respects brought the Pavilion programme full-circle. The Sackler provided a new architecturally iconic space for the Gallery, a much needed event space that all contemporary galleries now require, and a new permanent home for the *Serpentine Galleries 24-hour Marathon* event. A permanent pavilion, if you will.

If the first Pavilions were a reaction to a conservative attitude towards contemporary architecture in British society in the 1990s, then the Sackler was a demonstration that this attitude has largely been overcome. The temporary did indeed give a taste for the permanent, fulfilling one of the stated aims of the programme. The now-entrenched tradition of the Serpentine Pavilion served as a precedent for extending a building in the tightly administered Royal Parks. And yet the Serpentine Pavilion programme continues, its popularity not in question. In *The Art Newspaper's* international survey of most visited exhibitions in 2016, the Serpentine Pavilion by BIG and the four Summer Houses came in at number one in the architecture and design category. In visitor numbers (263, 918) it also surpassed the most visited free exhibition in London in any category – the Saatchi Gallery's Carmignac Photojournalism Award (255, 330), demonstrating the accessibility of architecture as a popular art. [22]

Commissioning or Curating?
While Zaha's tent-like structure of 2000 was retrospectively declared the first Serpentine Pavilion, it was also the third in a series of temporary architectural structures commissioned by the Serpentine Gallery as settings for parties. The next section of this paper looks at how the practice of curating contemporary architecture that has become entrenched in the Pavilion programme, developed out of a pattern of commissioning temporary architecturally designed structures for fundraising parties, which coincided with a series of exhibitions involving art commissions that engaged directly with the building as an artistic medium.

The 1996-98 renovation of the building by the British architecture firm John Miller and Partners, specialist in museum design, was the catalyst for these commissions and exhibitions.[23] Peyton-Jones has reflected on the constrained nature of the renovation process, due to the building's Grade II Heritage listing and the control of the Royal Parks over the surrounding site, as well as the way the project was run on a construction management basis.[24] However, it did create an opportunity for a series of exhibitions that temporarily utilised the space outside the gallery for the display of art, and made the building itself into an artistic medium. These exhibitions set a precedent for exhibiting works outside the building. They also evidence the institutional re-absorption of expanded field art practices described by Rosalind Krauss in her important essay "Sculpture in the Expanded Field" that was widespread in the 1990s, and should be recognized as an important precursor to the contemporary pavilion.[25]

The first of these exhibitions, *Jamming Gears* (1996), exhibited the work of British sculptor Richard Wilson. It was the last exhibition held inside the Gallery before it was closed for renovations. This exhibition included a range of works in which Wilson made reference to the processes of construction, and played with the perceptual ambiguity of thresholds between interior and exterior space. As described by Peyton-Jones "without doubt this exhibition alludes to the immanent transformation of the Serpentine Gallery".[26] Several of the works were rooms within rooms, such as *Lodger* (1992), *Elbow Room* (1993), *Room 6 Channel View Hotel* (1996), and *High Rise* (1989). While, the title work made for the exhibition, *Jamming Gears,* presaged the material impact and spectacle of impending renovation, and showed the *work* of architecture that would otherwise be invisible once the renovation was complete. In this work, a construction site-hut was awkwardly maneuvered by a forklift and appeared to crash into the floor of the gallery, while another haphazardly penetrated an exterior window wall, hovering half inside and half out.

Jamming Gears was followed by *Inside Out* (1996-97), which involved the Gallery commissioning a series of five site-specific works for the garden spaces outside the gallery to take place during the renovation of the building. These were: *To Whom it May Concern* by Rasheed Araeen, *Skylight II* by Bill Culbert, *One Two Tree* by Richard Deacon, *Keep Off the Grass* by Anya Gallaccio, and *Relocation Project for the Serpentine Gallery Lawn* by Tadashi Kawamata. The title of this exhibition series obviously related to the circumstance of the renovation and the necessity of making use of spaces outside the Gallery, but it was also a marker of how the move beyond the gallery that typified a significant strand of 1960s art, had by this time been embraced at an institutional level and become a subject for curatorial practice.[27]

Kawamata's *Relocation*, was a distinctive work from this series. It consisted of a collection of doors that had been stripped out of the gallery and incorporated into an open-frame construction of recycled timber studs that replicated the spaces of the gallery on the adjacent lawn. In its unfinished state, it referred to both the unmaking and remaking of the Serpentine Galleries. It demarcated a place for occupation, but did not provide protection from the weather or a place to sit. In this respect, *Relocation* was prophetic of the threshold quality of the Pavilions to come, and of how in many cases their display function usurped other functional requirements otherwise asked of architecture.

To celebrate the completion of the renovation, the Serpentine Galleries held a re-opening party, for which they commissioned a temporary canopy structure by architect Seth Stein, a new graduate of the Architecture Association, to accommodate the large number of invited guests. The pattern of holding a celebratory party to mark the start of summer continued in 1999, for which the gallery commissioned a temporary structure by designer Ron Arad. While the building renovation had, by necessity, worked relatively conservatively within the parameters of the existing heritage-listed structure, these temporary structures, involved a "lighter process" and allowed a more contemporary and dynamic kind of architectural expression, which suited the focus of the gallery on contemporary

art.[28] For Peyton-Jones, it was in this moment that the potential for commissioning temporary architectural works in the manner of art materialized as a strategy: "Once you embrace the idea of commissioning artists, it follows that you can commission designers or architects".[29]

In 2000, the Summer party also marked the thirtieth anniversary of the Serpentine Gallery, and it commissioned a more substantial, though still temporary structure from Hadid, which would retrospectively become known as the first Serpentine Pavilion. According to Julia Peyton-Jones, the opportunity to make this a more substantial and recurring architectural commission came about because of the support of Chris Smith, then Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport, who after attending the summer party and seeing first-hand the popularity of the pavilion, agreed to liaise with Royal Parks so that Hadid's structure could remain in the park longer than the originally planned three days.[30]

Type or Medium?

While *Jamming Gears* and *Inside Out* set the scene for how the Serpentine would include architecture in their curatorial remit, it was one of Peyton-Jones's first exhibitions, *Like Nothing Else in Tennessee*, and the commissioning of a work by Dan Graham, *Two-Way Mirror and Hedge Labyrinth* for the Serpentine Gallery lawn, which is an instructive final point in the genealogy set out in this paper. Despite his sustained attention to the pavilion since 1982, the work of Graham has mostly eluded critical accounts of the contemporary pavilion in recent literature.[31] It is Graham's development of the pavilion as both an architectural type and an artistic medium that sheds light on the tensions between art and architecture that persist in the Serpentine Pavilion programme.

Like Nothing Else in Tennessee was a group exhibition held in 1992 that focused on works with "architectural references, both as a utopian concept and an urban reality".[32] The exhibition showed eleven artists, including *Ivrea* by Langlands and Bell (1991) and *7.12.86* by Jürgen Albrecht (1986), which adopted model-making techniques used by architects, and installations such as *Elements 5#* by Siah Armajani (1987) and *Tor 1* by Hubert Kiecol (1991), which utilised construction industry materials such as concrete, aluminium and glass in compositions that referenced architectural elements such as windows and doors.[33] That London art critic Andrew Graham-Dixon, writing in his review of the show for *The Independent,* described curatorial interest in the relationship between art and architecture as "a live issue right now" reminds us of the recurring topicality of this theme.[34]

Graham's was the only large-scale work, and the only work exhibited outside the gallery. It consisted of three rectangular panels pivoting from a common point at right angles to each other, and a fourth positioned just beyond this composition. The work used two-way mirror glass, a material with a surface that is both reflective and transparent, which has become synonymous with Grahams work. From various points the panels reflected the Serpentine Gallery itself. At other points they reflected the hedges that created a sense of spatial enclosure around the panels. Together the actual and reflected surfaces creating a perceptual labyrinth of landscape and building.

By the time of the Serpentine exhibition, Graham had established the pavilion as a specific form in his oeuvre.[35] Like Gilbert and George, he was seeking a way beyond the elitism of minimalist and conceptual art. While Gilbert and George found this in immersive and process driven art that engaged the viewer, Graham found it in the disciplinary condition of architecture.[36]

Graham's early pavilions track some of the key moments in the rising popularity of outdoor sculpture exhibitions during the 1980s. His first pavilion to be included in a major public exhibition was *Two Adjacent Pavilions* at *Documenta VII* in 1982, one of the exhibitions recognized by Benjamin Buchloch as exemplars of the changing character of sculpture exhibition.[37] Not only did these exhibitions mark the curatorial absorption of practices that had aimed to be critical of the museum institution by working beyond the limits of the category of sculpture identified by Krauss, they were also contexts in which

the exhibition pavilion took on a new potential as the subject of art.[38] As Penelope Curtis has written, the pavilion played an important role in the co-articulation of sculpture architecture in modernism, but, as the work of Graham helps demonstrate, pavilions became a site of convergence of sculpture and architecture in late modernism:

> Modernist architects found a particular use for sculpture that, in part, was premised on a traditional belief in the complementary nature (but essential difference) of the two arts. The abstract and transparent qualities of modernist architecture even gave sculpture a heightened role. When sculpture diverged from its figurative form, and when architecture acquired more bodily presence, the two disciplines had less use for each other. … When the two disciplines converge … their combination makes less sense. Sculpture can make their own pavilions, or architects their own sculpture.[39]

Graham's own descriptions of some of his pavilion works demonstrate his awareness of this situation of disciplinary confusion, and his interest in exploiting the capacity of the pavilion to have both ornamental and utilitarian functions that he observed in its history as a building type. At the 1976 Venice Biennale Graham exhibited the work *Public Space/Two Audiences* (in the Italian pavilion) in which he "wanted it to function doubly as art and as simply an exhibition pavilion (for itself), following the examples of Mies van der Rohe's Barcelona Pavilion or Lissitzky's two exhibition rooms".[40] In writing about his work *Pavilion/Sculpture for Argonne*, a work situated in a generic urban public space, he highlights the pavilion's capacity to be both "sculptural and utilitarian form".[41]

Theirry de Duve's astute reflection on Graham's pavilions highlight the way they exploited the fluctuating status of architecture as both a discipline and a medium:

> Their scale, carefully calibrated around that of a slightly oversized telephone booth or bus stop shelter, makes them objects which hesitate between urban furnishings and habitations. Their location in a park and their title – Pavilions – places them in the ambiguous cultural space of an urbanized nature reserved for leisure activities and bodily pleasures. … Their avowed references – the rococo pavilion with all its windows and mirrors, but also Rietveld's sculpture pavilion in the park of the Kröller-Müller – exasperate their non-functional status as art objects even while elevating the ambiguity between their function as architecture for sculpture (or the body) and their symbolism as sculptural objects standing in for architecture. Their formal vocabulary of glass and steel, their functionalist appearance and their modernist faithfulness to the logic of materials, poses them as an ironic quotation of the international style … but off-scale and out of context.[42]

Graham's pavilions thus register not only how the disciplinary condition of architecture was taken up as a subject matter for art; but also how this has returned to architecture – in the contemporary pavilion – the question of how it operates as an artistic medium.

Conclusion

If Obrist sees the Serpentine Pavilion programme as an opportunity for art to be with architecture, it is equally the case that being with art is changing architecture's place in contemporary culture. The genealogy set out in this paper has aimed to offer an understanding of the significance of the contemporary pavilion, beyond its characterization as a form of museum expansion, and a vehicle for philanthropy and branding. In this paper I have argued that the Serpentine Pavilion programme exemplifies a new and significant episode in a longer history of the contestation between art and architecture, in which the differences between them have become a subject matter and curatorial project of cultural institutions. The 1990s exhibition history of the Serpentine Galleries described in this paper highlights some of the conceptual issues that continue to be at stake in this contest. In

particular, it highlights the persistence of a certain friction in architecture's identity as both a medium and a discipline, a friction that was arguably occluded in Krauss's expanded field but perhaps resurfaces in the contemporary pavilion. In doing so it aims to reopen a discussion about the ongoing relevance of questions of medium to an understanding of architecture's disciplinary condition.

Endnotes

---

[1] Robert Urquhart, '"To be with architecture is all we ask". – interview with Hans-Ulrich Obrist, Artistic Director of the Serpentine Galleries', *Archinect,* (Aug 8, 2016). http://archinect.com/features/article/149961842/to-be-with-architecture-is-all-we-ask-interview-with-hans-ulrich-obrist-artistic-director-of-the-serpentine-galleries (accessed 25 October, 2016).

[2] Heidi Hirschl, 'All In: Gilbert & George's Art for All', *Inside Out: A MOMA / MOMAPS1 Blog*, https://www.moma.org/explore/inside_out/2015/06/24/all-in-gilbert-georges-art-for-all/ (accessed 28 March 2017).

[3] See: Andrea Phillips, 'Pavilion Politics', *Log,* 20 (Fall 2010): 104-15; and Sylvia Lavin, 'Vanishing Point', *Artforum International,* 51, 2 (Oct, 2012), 212-19.

[4] Rosalind Krauss, 'Sculpture in the Expanded Field,' *October,* 8 (1979), 30-44.

[5] Julia Peyton-Jones, 'Fast Forward Architecture', in *Serpentine Gallery Pavilion 2005 Designed by Eduardo Souto de Moura with Cecil Balmond – Arup* (London: Serpentine Gallery, 2005), 24-41. This text is an edited version of the RIBA Trust Annual Lecture given by Peyton-Jones on 21 April 2005. Philip Jodidio, Julia Peyton-Jones and Hans Ulrich Obrist, 'Interview with Julia Peyton-Jones and Hans Ulrich Obrist', in Philip Jodidio (ed.), *Serpentine Gallery Pavilions* (Köln: Taschen, 2011), 8-20. Sarah Ichioka, 'Patronage, Persuasion and the Public: Fifteen Years of the Serpentine Pavilion', in *Selgascano Serpentine Pavilion 2015* (London: Serpentine Gallery, 2015), 65-79.

[6] Joel Robinson, 'Pavilions as Public Sculpture', *World Sculpture News,* (Autumn 2015): 33.

[7] Peyton-Jones, 'Fast Forward Architecture', 28.

[8] Lavin, 'Vanishing Point', 214.

[9] For each Pavilion commission the Serpentine Galleries seek to raise 40% of the cost of constructing through their pre-sale.

[10] Libeskind designed it so that it could be flat packed and easily transported.

[11] Marina Otero Verzier, 'Tales from beyond the grave', *Domus* (12 November 2012). http://www.domusweb.it/en/architecture/2012/11/12/tales-from-beyond-the-grave.html (accessed 6 Sep 2016).

[12] Rem Koolhaas, *Serpentine Gallery Pavilion 2006: Rem Koolhaas and Cecil Balmond with Arup* (London: Serpentine Gallery, 2006), 31.

[13] Commenting directly on this case Obrist stated: "In 2006, there was a site-specific frieze by Thomas Demand in the Pavilion and an exhibition of his work inside the Serpentine Gallery, but we have otherwise intentionally avoided placing art objects inside the Pavilions". Jodidio, Peyton-Jones and Obrist 'Interview', 13.

[14] Penelope Curtis, *Patio and Pavilion: The Place of Sculpture in Modern Architecture* (Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum and London: Ridinghouse, 2008), 9.

[15] Koolhaas, *Serpentine Gallery Pavilion 2006*, 10.

[16] Jodidio, Peyton-Jones and Obrist, 'Interview', 16.

[17] Studio Olafur Eliasson, *Unspoken Spaces* (London: Thames and Hudson, 2015).

[18] Herzog and de Meuron completed the Laban Dance School building in the UK in 2002. They had an established working relationship with Ai Wei Wei but had not undertaken a project together in the UK.

[19] Julia Peyton-Jones and Han Ulrich Obrist, 'Directors' Forward', in *Herzog & de Meuron + Ai Wei Wei Serpentine Gallery Pavilion 2012* (London: Serpentine Gallery and Koenig Books, 2012), 35.

[20] Lavin, 'Vanishing Point'.

[21] There is a whole subset of occasional literature on the afterlives of contemporary pavilions. Beyond the article by Otero Verzier already mentioned, other examples include: Oliver Wainwright, 'Beach Café, Billionaire's Retreat, Wedding Marquee: Second lives of the Serpentine pavilion,' *The Guardian*, Wednesday 17 June, 2015. https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2015/jun/16/serpentine-pavilion-second-lives-zaha-hadid-toyo-ito-frank-gehry (accessed 6 Sep 2016). 'Burnt, recycled, sold: the fate of 2015's temporary pavilions' Dezeen, 14 June 2016. http://www.dezeen.com/2016/06/14/2015-temporary-pavilions-fate-burnt-recycled-storage-sold-serpentine-gallery-milan-expo-moma-ps1/ (accessed 6 Sep 2016)

[22] '2016's most popular exhibitions by genre and city', *The Art Newspaper*, 29 March 2017. http://theartnewspaper.com/reports/visitor-figures-2016/2016-s-most-popular-exhibitions-by-genre-and-city-/ (accessed 5 April 2017). In 2015 the Serpentine Pavilion was No. 7 and in 2014 it was No. 10 in *The Art Newspaper* survey.

[23] John Miller + Partners, *Custom and Innovation* (London: Black Dog, 2009).

[24] Peyton-Jones, 'Fast-Forward Architecture', 30.

[25] Krauss, 'Sculpture in the Expanded Field'. See also: Spyros Papapetros and Julian Rose (eds.), *Retracing the Expanded Field: Encounters between Art and Architecture* (Massachusetts: MIT Press, 2016).

[26] Julia Peyton-Jones, 'Forward', in *Jamming Gears* (London: Serpentine Galleries, 1996), 5.

[27] The title of this exhibition was the same used by the exhibition *Inside Out: Museo Citta Eventi* held at the Museo Pecci in Prato in 1993 in which Kawamata also exhibited.

[28] Jodidio, Peyton-Jones and Obrist, 'Interview', 9.

[29] Jodidio, Peyton-Jones and Obrist, 'Interview', 9.

[30] Peyton-Jones, 'Fast Forward Architecture', 32. This anecdote, which has become entrenched in the Serpentine's sanctioned history, is significant because it also connects the Serpentine Galleries Pavilion programme with the rise of creative industries as a focus of cultural policy in Britain, which happened under the leadership of Smith.

[31] The exception is Beatriz Colomina's article: Beatrice Colomina, 'Beyond Pavilions: Architecture as a Machine to See', in Peter Cachola Schmal (ed.), *The Pavilion: Pleasure and Polemics in Architecture* (Ostfildern: Hatje Cantz, 2009), 64-78.

[32] Julia Peyton-Jones, 'Forward', in *Like Nothing Else in Tennessee* (London: Serpentine Gallery, 1992), np. The title of the exhibition is the last line in the poem *Anecdote of the Jar*, by Wallace Stevens, to which one of the works in the exhibition, *Elements #5* by Siah Armajani, refers.

[33] The exhibition showed from 17 March – 26 April 1992. It was co-curated by Peyton-Jones and Bartomeu Marí, then a curator at the Foundation Pour l'Architecture in Brussels. It exhibited the work of artists Jürgen Albrecht, Siah Armajani, Ludgers Gerdes, Dan Graham, Marin Kasimir, Herbert Kiecol, Landlands and Bell, Matt Mullican, Maria Nordman, Julian Opie, Thomas Schütte.

[34] Andrew Graham Dixon, 'Corridors of Power', *The Independent*, 7 April 1992. http://www.andrewgrahamdixon.com/archive/corridors-of-power.html (accessed 25 Jan 2017).

[35] Throughout the 1980s Dan Graham had several solo exhibitions focused on pavilions, and in 1991, in the lead up to the *Tennessee* show, he had a solo exhibition *Pavilion Sculptures and Photographs* at the Lisson Gallery in London.

[36] As he described in an interview with Hans Ulrich Obrist, the pavilions were a way "to defeat the minimal art object". Graham wanted "a narrative structure that you could walk through". Dan Graham and Hans Ulrich Obrist, *Dan Graham and Hans Ulrich Obrist, Conversation Series Vol. 25* (Köln: Walther König, 2012), 8.

[37] As Benjamin Buchloch recognised at the time, Dan Graham's work was one that showed a consciousness of the: "transformation of sculpture during the past two decades, including the recent preoccupation with outdoor installation". Benjamin Buchloch "Excerpt from Documenta 7: A Dictionary of Received Ideas", in Alex Kitnick (ed.), *Dan Graham* (Cambridge and London, MIT Press, 2011), 173. In this piece Buchloch further identified the exhibition *Ambiente Arte*, curated by Germano Celent at the 1976 Venice Biennale, and Kaspar Koenig's *Skulptur Projekte* at Münster (1977), as exemplars of this new trend. Celent went on to do the exhibition *Synthetic Unity: Architecture & Arts 1900-2004* at the Palazzo Ducale in Genoa, in 2004.

[38] Krauss, 'Sculpture in the Expanded Field'.

[39] Curtis, *Patio and Pavilion*, 9.

[40] Graham quoted in Curtis, *Patio and Pavilion*, 138. (Original reference is from: Alexander Alberro (ed.), *Two-Way Mirror Power: Selected writings by Dan Graham on his art* (Cambridge, Mass. and London: MIT Press, c1999)).

[41] Graham quoted in Curtis, *Patio and Pavilion*, 138. (Original reference is from: Alexander Alberro (ed.), *Two-Way Mirror Power: Selected writings by Dan Graham on his art* (Cambridge, Mass. and London: MIT Press, c1999)).

[42] Thierry de Duve, 'Dan Graham and the Critique of Artistic Autonomy', in Alex Kitnick (ed.), *Dan Graham* (Cambridge and London, MIT Press, 2011), 86-87.