David Smith was born in 1906 in Decatur, Indiana, a small, midwestern town in the United States. At the time of Smith’s upbringing, the region was characterized by innovation and self-sufficiency. Smith later recalled:

“When I was a kid, everyone from the whole town was an inventor. There must have been fifteen automobiles made in Decatur, Indiana, and they were all put together in parts by all kinds of people. Just two blocks from where I lived there were guys building automobiles in an old barn. Invention was the fertile thing then. Invention was the great thing. ... There was never any art involved. ... The inventors in Decatur were the heroes.”
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As an adult, Smith would apply his own practical experience in mechanical labor to become the first artist in America to radically redefine notions of sculpture—most famously by welding together found utilitarian objects such as farm tools and machine parts using a combination of advance planning and improvisation, rather than through traditional methods of casting or carving. Smith’s work would help to define the New York School generation of artists and influence the direction of contemporary sculpture.

After working a number of jobs in the Midwest such as laying telephone cable and doing assembly line work at a Studebaker automobile factory, Smith moved to New York City in 1926 to study art. Like many members of the New York School, he studied at the Art Students League where, until 1931, he took classes in painting with the Czech modernist Jan Matulka. Matulka introduced Smith to Cubism and Constructivism and to the work of Piet Mondrian and Wassily Kandinsky, among other European artists. Smith’s education was augmented by the acquaintance of the well-connected artist and theorist John Graham, who introduced Smith to painters Milton Avery, Stuart Davis, Arshile Gorky, and Willem de Kooning.

In 1933, while perusing Graham’s back copies of the journal Cahiers d’Art, Smith discovered an example of Picasso’s welded sculpture (Fig. 1). The method of welding together metal elements validated for Smith the possibility of applying his own skills in industrial work to the making of art. Though he would retain a lifelong affinity with painters, Smith would later explain, “When I saw that art was being made with material I knew and could work, it appealed to me immediately. So from then on, I was a sculptor.” Among his earliest works from this period is Saw Head (1933; Fig. 2), which was made from a saw blade, a small metal strainer, and metal rods and cylinders welded together in the form of a classic bust.

In 1940 Smith permanently moved to the remote hamlet of Bolton Landing in the Adirondack Mountains of New York State. He built a studio for painting and drawing and a separate workshop for making sculpture. A Guggenheim fellowship Smith received in 1950 allowed him to focus full-time on artmaking and launched his most productive decade to date. As his sculptures gradually increased in size, Smith began arranging them in the fields surrounding his home (Fig. 3).

Timeless Clock was made at Bolton Landing during a period of particularly robust experimentation with scale and materials. The sculpture belongs to a rare and small group of works that Smith realized in silver in fall 1957 (Fig. 4). Smith had worked with silver before: in 1941–42 and 1956 when he made silver jewelry, and again in 1954 when he produced two other sculptures out of silver: Birthday (Harvard Art Museums) and Egyptian Barnyard (Indianapolis Museum of Art). Both were horizontal sculptures measuring about two feet across and mounted on slender posts. The silver sculptures Smith made in 1957 are more diverse in form, size, and treatment. Bird (Harvard Art Museums) features an irregular, hammered surface; Tower Eight (Nasher Sculpture Center) is a linear constellation of silver rods; and Books and Apple (Harvard Art Museums) and Lonesome Man (private collection) are proto-Minimalist constructions of flat, geometric planes. As was his common practice, Smith would document these works in his sketchbook after they were completed (Fig. 5).

1. Pablo Picasso. Project for a Monument to Guillaume Apollinaire, 1962 (enlarged version after 1928 original maquette). This is an enlargement of an earlier 1928 maquette that Smith would have seen in Cahiers d’Art.
In Timeless Clock, Smith welded together silver rods of varying lengths and widths onto broken axes that transgress the rough perimeter of an open circle. The result is a complex arrangement of shard-like projections into space – like an exploded clock, perhaps, that can no longer tell time. Smith possessed a deep knowledge of the physical properties of his materials. His reasons for choosing silver, a relatively precious metal commonly associated with decoration, to make Timeless Clock are unknown, though Smith’s younger daughter, Candida, has said that her father “loved the living glow” of silver.1 In a letter to painter Helen Frankenthaler dated October 1957, Smith mentions that he is in the process of making six silver sculptures. The previous year, Smith had begun his “Sentinels” series of sculpture, which incorporated stainless steel polished with a mechanical grinder to give the surface a textured yet reflective sheen. It is possible that Smith chose silver as a means of investigating this same reflective property. Smith would also later point out that silver, like stainless steel but unlike most other metals, does not rust – a property that lends itself particularly well to the evocation of timelessness.

The early influences of Cubism and Constructivism that Smith absorbed in his student years remain evident in Timeless Clock. The sculpture possesses an open geometry akin to Picasso’s Project for a Monument to Guillaume Apollinaire – a spatial organization that conveys volume and also characterizes the work of El Lissitzky or Kasimir Malevich (e.g., Fig. 6). Timeless Clock also recalls Mondrian’s “Pier and Ocean” series of paintings which, like Smith’s sculpture, are ringed by a circular boundary (e.g., Fig. 7). Smith addressed the relationship of actual versus implied volume in a lecture in 1952 when he declared, “I want to be free from mass and bulk and the solidity of sculpture. I want to deny form as such. I don’t see any need to show that relationship of actual versus implied volume in a lecture in 1952 when he declared, “I want to be free from mass and bulk and the solidity of sculpture. I want to deny form as such. I don’t see any need to show that relationship of actual versus implied volume in a lecture in 1952 when he declared, “I want to be free from mass and bulk and the solidity of sculpture. I want to deny form as such. I don’t see any need to show that...”

Lastly, the organizational structure of Timeless Clock may be said to resemble machine parts like gears and levers fitting together to animate a whole – a logic that would have been familiar to Smith from his factory days. The inner workings of Smith’s sculpture workshop itself were described by writer and curator Frank levers fitting together to animate a whole – a logic that would have been familiar to Smith from his factory days. The inner workings of Smith’s sculpture workshop itself were described by writer and curator Frank

15 Kubler would expand on Focillon’s concepts in his own publication, The Shape of Time (1962), which would become a key source for a new generation of Minimalist sculptors. While an attempt to ascribe metaphorical meaning to Smith’s work belies its full significance, in both form and name Timeless Clock appears to acknowledge Smith’s indebtedness to art of the past as well as his conviction of the work of art’s future relevance and its dependence on the viewer – an approach that now speaks to artistic crosscurrents at the time.
Works on paper

Timeless Clock provides an extraordinary opportunity to trace Smith's creative process through various mediums. Smith maintained a fluid practice of working out ideas in painting, drawing, and sculpture. In addition to photography and poetry, in advance of making Timeless Clock, he prepared at least two drawings in which he worked out a form for the concept. “Drawings remain the life force of the artist,” Smith explained. “especially this is true for the sculptor, who, of necessity, works in media slow to take realization.” By 1952, Smith was making 200 to 300 large drawings per year, usually with Chinese ink that he mixed with egg yolk to achieve a desired viscosity. Candida later recalled, “Drawing could record ideas soaring through his mind more quickly than the labors of sculpture. The process, more gentle, more reflective, was often done late at night after dinner. I can remember waking to a living room floor covered with drying drawings. It was a little like Christmas morning...”1

Smith selected paper and brushes that could yield either loose, calligraphic marks or thin lines that skip across the sheet. Sometimes the drawings were studies for sculpture; at other times, Smith stated, they were “atmospheres from which sculptural form is unconsciously selected during the labor process of producing form.” In the first of the drawings related to Timeless Clock, produced the previous year, in 1956 (Fig. 8), the circular form of the clock is schematic, the lines seemingly tentative, though the sense of volume conveyed in the final work is already visible. By the time Smith made the second drawing in April 1957 (Fig. 9), the composition had been more assuredly worked out in clusters of broad, inky strokes.

Given Smith’s organic processes, it is impossible to know for certain whether the idea for the sculpture preceded the drawings, or the drawings generated the idea for the sculpture. However, a vision of the sculpture – and possibly the medium in which he would execute the sense of volume conveyed in the final work is already visible. By the time Smith made the second drawing in April 1957 (Fig. 9), the composition had been more assuredly worked out in clusters of broad, inky strokes.

In the first of the drawings related to Timeless Clock, produced the previous year, in 1956 (Fig. 8), the circular form of the clock is schematic, the lines seemingly tentative, though the sense of volume conveyed in the final work is already visible. By the time Smith made the second drawing in April 1957 (Fig. 9), the composition had been more assuredly worked out in clusters of broad, inky strokes.

Given Smith’s organic processes, it is impossible to know for certain whether the idea for the sculpture preceded the drawings, or the drawings generated the idea for the sculpture. However, a vision of the sculpture – and possibly the medium in which he would execute the sense of volume conveyed in the final work is already visible. By the time Smith made the second drawing in April 1957 (Fig. 9), the composition had been more assuredly worked out in clusters of broad, inky strokes.

Photography

In the years immediately following the completion of Timeless Clock, public perception of this work was largely determined by Smith himself in the form of a photograph he took of the sculpture at his home in Bolton Landing. Timeless Clock was exhibited in a number of important shows, and Smith’s photograph often illustrated reviews in the press. Smith produced two images of the work: one in black and white from a frontal perspective (Fig. 11) and one in color from an oblique angle (Fig. 12), but the black-and-white photo was chosen for publication.

Smith had incorporated photography as part of his artistic practice beginning in the mid-1930s, when he experimented with double-exposed negatives and photo-collage – techniques that were favored by the Surrealists and especially by Smith’s fellow American, Man Ray. By the late 1940s, Smith had recognized the power of reproduction and assumed the role of primary photographer of his work. In taking control of his own representation, Smith joined a lineage of artists who photographed their own sculptures – notably, Auguste Rodin, Medardo Rosso, Pablo Picasso, Henry Moore, and Constantin Brancusi. Like the sculptors before him, Smith rejected the “neutral, decontextualized” photo studio in favor of dramatic angles and settings that destabilized expectations of how sculpture is supposed to be represented and, by extension, its role in the world. He photographed his sculptures alone or in family groups against the dramatic mountain landscape of Bolton Landing, in all seasons. Sometimes he would haul sculptures in his truck to the dock on nearby Lake George to photograph them on the flat expanse of water. The sculptures appear to be living things at once separate from, yet a part of, their ever-changing environment.

Smith’s photographs of individual artworks are tightly cropped and generally shot from a low angle so that even modest-sized sculptures appear monumental in scale. In Smith’s photograph of Timeless Clock, for example, the sculpture is shown in silhouette against a cloudy sky, with a thin, mountainous horizon along the bottom. The magnifying effect leaves little room for consideration of the artist’s presence, even though Smith very carefully composed each frame.

Smith considered photographic reproduction “to act as first acquaintance” with his work, Sarah Hamill has written. “He sent his pictures to critics, curators, dealers, editors, and patrons, and his photographs were published in countless magazines, newspapers, journals, and exhibition catalogues, albeit as anonymous illustrations of his sculptures.” For artists of the New York School, the matter of publicity was a double-edged sword. In the late 1940s, some artists found that critical recognition came at the price of unwanted personal scrutiny and even public humiliation from an audience which did not yet appreciate abstract art. Dorothy Sieberling’s unflattering exposé on Jackson Pollock, published in Life magazine in August 1949 and provocatively subtitled “Is He the Greatest Living Painter in the United States?” served for years as a
persistent reminder of the perils of success. Smith allowed photographers into his workspace; he even staged a number of photographs of himself at work, in the process of welding. Whether or not it was Smith’s intent, in taking control of public images of his work and emphasizing the autonomy of the finished object, he preempted initial associations of the work itself with the artist’s persona.

After Smith’s premature death in 1965, Timeless Clock appeared in a photograph accompanying a feature in Vogue magazine on collector William S. Rubin’s art-filled Manhattan apartment.2 It is seen on the coffee table of Rubin’s living room, surrounded by paintings by Pollock, de Kooning, Rothko, Robert Motherwell, Adolph Gottlieb, Clyfford Still, and Ad Reinhardt (Fig. 13). Rubin, who would later become chief curator of MoMA’s Painting and Sculpture department, had acquired the sculpture directly from the artist by 1962. He lent it to important posthumous retrospectives at the Fogg Museum at Harvard (1966) and at the Guggenheim Museum (1969).

Timeless Clock was sold by Rubin’s brother, dealer Lawrence Rubin, in 1971 to Harry W. and Mary Margaret Anderson, who donated it to the Anderson Collection at Stanford University in 2014.
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