

From: *Markus Lüpertz, Giulio Paolini: figure, colonne, finestre*, curated by Rudi Fuchs and Johannes Gachnang, exhibition catalog (Rivoli-Torino, Castello di Rivoli Museo d'Arte Contemporanea, 19 December 1986 - 29 March 1987), Castello di Rivoli, Rivoli-Torino 1986, p. 104.

## **Rudi Fuchs**

Looking at Markus Lüpertz and Giulio Paolini, together, there is this to say: Albrecht Dürer tried hard to construct the ideal human figure within the perfectly balanced composition - but even he, the fountainhead of the Renaissance in the North, felt more at ease when observing the landscape in front of his eyes or drawing a hare.

This is a general tendency in Northern painting, a tilt towards the real, *that is towards the irregular* - just as gothic decoration is the rough systematization of abrupt irregularities. Northern artists struggled with the concept of the ideal form. Instinctively they preferred the tree to the column - their windows admitted light into the room and not supreme order.

The North produced its best art when Rembrandt gave up the struggle with Italy (where he never wanted to go). And when, much later, Mondrian found himself forced to seek order (because only order could save the idea of the picture), he could only do it in the most orthodox way. He almost paralyzed himself with his orthodox passion - something which would never have happened to Boccioni. So, even if well-structured order, a certain clarity of design, are an essential element in Italian art, Italian artists also have a way of handling it, without getting really trapped. Raphael himself, in his late work, invented Mannerist variations; and when Mannerism went too far, Caravaggio brought art back to a point of order. Thus, Italians could never be Expressionist (like Kirchner or Nolde) because they are too agile.

There is always some distance between the figures and unexpected movements. German paintings are thick and full as forests.