



# Diachronic Pavilion Variations of the *Pabellón de la República Española* (difiere del índice)

Urtzi Grau

The reconstruction of the *Pabellón de la República Española* completed in 1992 by Juan Miguel Hernández León, and Miquel Espinet and Antoni Ubach in Barcelona includes omissions and additions that were not part of the pavilion built in 1937 by Luis Lacasa and Josep Lluís Sert. This article look does not look at these differences as unconscious mistakes or absentminded omissions. Instead, it reads them as material evidence of the historiographical arguments around the origins of Spanish modern architecture that emerged during the country's transition to democracy. This approach allows abandoning discussions over the faithfulness of the reproduction, to analyse the relationship between the pavilions in terms of *trajectory* (Latour, 2010) or *inframince* (Banz, 2019) opening up the discussion of the cultural relevance of architectural copies.

## KEYWORDS

Architectural Copy, Architectural Reconstruction, Pabellón de la República, Original Architecture

## PALABRAS CLAVE

Palabra, palabra

[...] the real phenomenon to be accounted for is not the punctual delineation of one version divorced from the rest of its copies, but the whole assemblage made up of one —or several— original(s) *together with* the retinue of its continually re-written biography.

Bruno Latour, *The migration of the aura*

As one approaches the 1992 reconstruction of the *Pabellón de la República Española* in Barcelona, something odd happens. Walking down Pare Mariana Street from the Montbau subway station, the

## Urtzi Grau

is an architect and an academic. His research work is divided in two areas. One explores the potential of replicas—both literal reproductions and responses to previous statements—as a tool for architectural production. The other explores the role of architecture in responding to critical challenges impacting the Indo-Pacific region, including climate justice, immigration, land rights and extractive economics. His research work has been exhibited broadly, including Venice Biennale (2021); the Seoul Biennale (2017), the Istanbul Design Triennale (2016); and the Chicago Architectural Biennial (2015). He is responsible for internationally acclaimed projects such as the Velodrome for Medellín (2012), OE House (2016), Loreteggio Library in Milan (2019), or The future of Living (2019). He is the author of several books, including *Folk Costumes Indo Pacific Air* (Brussels: APE, 2022), *Better Together, Stories of Contemporary Documents* (Melbourne: URO, 2022) or *Learning to Live Together: Humans, Cars, and Kerbs in Solidarity* (Madrid: Bartlebooth, 2021). Affiliation: University of Technology Sydney (UTS)  
E-mail: urtzi.grau@uts.edu.au  
ORCID iD: 0000-0003-1906-1615  
Researcher ID:

Fig. 01  
1937, François Kollar, *Pavillon de la république espagnole; Façade du pavillon, 1937* (postcard) in *EL Pabellón Español Paris, 1937*, Barcelona, Ediciones de la Central, 2009.

Fig. 02  
1992 - Reconstrucción del pabellón de la república española en *Espinet & Ubach*, Barcelona, Editorial Gustavo Gili, 1996 pp. 72-73.

Fig. 03  
1955 - *Picasso, Guernica: avec 60 études et variantes met 60 studies en varianten*, Catalogue, Bruxelles, Palais des beaux-arts, Amsterdam, Stedelijk Museum, 1956.

Fig. 04  
2008 - Museo Nacional Centro de Arte Reina Sofía, *Pabellón de la República Española, 1937*, Información de Salas.

Fig. 05  
1976 - 'Momento en el que empieza a funcionar la fuente de mercurio de Almadén, obra de A. Calder' in *España. Vanguardia Artística y Realidad Social, 1936-1976*, ed. BOZAL, Valeriano, Barcelona, Editorial G. Gili, 1976, pp. 32-43.

Vall d'Hebron park emerges on the right. This area's role in the Barcelona Olympics transformation is still present in its derelict architecture. The precast panels of Enric Miralles and Carme Pinós' Olympic Archery Range Competition Pavilion lay there, piled up for a reconstruction that never arrives. Several traces of Eduard Bru's public space infrastructure survive, exposing the lack of maintenance characteristic of the *terrain vague* they initially sort to emulate. Claes Oldenburg's *Matches*, apparently abandoned half-burnt by a gigantic smoker at the end of the street, adds to the sequence of ruins that the pavilion seems to culminate.

The procession is only a prelude to the impression the building creates. The visitor does not immediately know how to describe her malaise. Dwarfed by the scale of Oldenburg's piece, the building seems completely flat; the sculpture's bright colours render its reds and greys mute. Its humble volume doesn't seem to match François Kollar's 1937 heroic images. The observer wonders what has happened to this favourite building. How has it lost its historical weight? The elements that grounded it to a moment in time—that made it *necessary*—seem gone. Josep Arnau's changing collages that cyclically transformed its façade have vanished. The vertical lightness of Alberto Sánchez's sculpture *El pueblo español tiene un camino que conduce a una estrella* does not signal the entrance to the courtyard anymore. There is a void under the stair leading to the main floor, in the space reserved for Picasso's bust *Cabeza de Mujer*. Even the shadowy presence of Albert Speer's German Pavilion hovering from above is gone.

Our visitor is not the first to feel uneasy. Over the years, other commentators have unpacked this sense of dissatisfaction. The architect Alfonso Muñoz imputed its symptoms to architecture's loss of Benjaminian aura in the age of mechanical reproduction.<sup>1</sup> The historian Ascension Hernández Martínez cited the temporal and geographical de-contextualisation implicit in the reconstruction in the 1992 Barcelona of a 1937 pavilion originally sited in the Trocadéro in Paris.<sup>2</sup> The journalist Jordi Busquets went further. In 1991, even before the reconstruction of the pavilion started, he noticed the uncanny effect of the absence of the art pieces would produce in the future.<sup>3</sup> These characterisations of the new structure as an empty shell are not solely empirical. They are grounded in the extensive bibliography on the 1937 building. The vast majority of this scholarship skips the building to focus on the materials it exhibited, comparing them to other art pieces defined as "degenerate art" in the German pavilion or socialist realism in the Soviet one. This attention to collages, paintings, sculptures, films and events that the building hosted has led authors like Jordana Mendelson or David Rivera to describe the Spanish pavilion as a support infrastructure whose architecture's more distinctive feature was the propagandistic images on display.<sup>4</sup> In summary, previous to its reconstruction, accounts of the 1937 building that skip the works on display barely existed.

In this context, the doomed fate of a reconstruction that separates content and container—and opts to rebuild only the latter—seems inevitable. Yet, the authors of the new building, the historian Juan Miguel Hernández León, and the architects Miquel Espinet and Antoni Ubach do not mention these absences when describing the new structure. Instead, they list another set of differences altogether. Their accounts of the building are explicit about design modifications, which, according to the authors, were necessary to transform the temporary

pavilion into a permanent one. The list includes the addition of a freight elevator, ensuring that the building's accessibility was up to current standards, several material changes to comply with health and fire regulations or a new basement level beneath the new structure.<sup>5</sup>

Reconstructions are two-faced operations. They require an original and the arguments that make it so. The thing to be rebuilt goes together with a narrative that supports its value, backed up by historical evidence. Corrections and amendments are often inevitable and need to be negotiated against the historical evidence, presented as minor challenges to the originality of the reconstructed object. A prominent issue in the case of the *Pabellón de la República Española* was the limited amount of historical evidence. The building was dismantled after the International Exposition closed its doors on November 25<sup>th</sup>, 1937. Only a few documents survived in the architects' records and Spanish Government archives, which were heavily affected by the ongoing Civil War. They did not include final construction drawings. As the pavilion was designed and built in a state of warfare, the design and the rushed four-month-long construction process were subject to so many difficulties and last-minute changes that it is impossible to speak of any definitive documentation.<sup>6</sup> Schematic design, including plans and elevations, was available, but, as the authors of the reconstruction acknowledged, the most valuable references were the original images from 1937.<sup>7</sup> They were the evidence that, before constructing the building again, allowed to redraw it, to define the original, to identify its historical value.

The surviving images of the pavilion are well-known. Besides the seminal photographs by François Kollar and the amateur pictures taken by visitors, artists, and public servants, the images by the pavilion's deputy curator, the architect José Lino Vaamonde Valencia, taken during the construction process, reveal intimate details of the building's design and materiality. All the images confirm the differences between the 1937 and the 1992 buildings listed above: the missing art pieces and the new up-to-code additions. They also add new ones. The most obvious one: its colours. Since its demolition in 1937, the pavilion existed only as a set of black and white images, and the reconstruction upgraded its status. If the colourisations of Hollywood films were controversial in 1992,<sup>8</sup> the same process applied to architecture had a long and contentious history spanning from the vanished bright pigments that covered Greek temples to the 1965 repainting of Villa Savoye's walls.<sup>9</sup> Other noticeable changes included the conspicuous letters spelling "España" on the right side of the main façade's cornice and the large banner attached to the three flag polls with the country's name French spelling, "Espagne", vanished from the reconstructed building. Similarly, Manuel Azaña's quotes, Spanish Prime Minister at the time, reminding visitors about the war against fascism going on a few kilometres south, were also gone.

The list keeps growing: political propaganda, sculptures and paintings, updated construction materials and accessibility regulations, missing letters and lost colours; one is tempted to ask if there is anything left of the original building. Are these differences unconscious mistakes or absentminded omissions? We will like to argue differently. One of the effects of designing an already designed building is that the number of design decisions decreases. On the other hand, their reasoning becomes more evident, often explicit. Additions and omissions articulate the pavilion historically in the present and discuss the building's value

at the time. Each difference is material evidence that sites the pavilion in the moment of its reconstruction. Together, they seize hold of the pavilion as it flashes up in 1992, making it resonate with the historiographical controversies of modern architecture and the political struggles of Spain's transition to democracy and Barcelona's conclusion of the 1992 Olympics urbanism renewal.

Looking at the reconstruction through its inaccuracies allows for shifting the attention away from the original building to focus on the significance of the differences instead. What does the new building tell us about the time it was built? How can we make sense of these changes? A sort of Rosetta Stone to unlock their significance can be found in the reconstruction texts. There, Hernández León, Espinet and Ubach claim that Josep Lluís Sert designed the original building with the administrative support of Luis Lacasa and Antoni Bonet-Castellana for the site supervision.<sup>10</sup> These words define the pavilion's provenance, a statement of authenticity from the experts on the buildings' history, and a traditional way to confirm the piece's originality despite its modifications. But more importantly, it is also a claim that transforms the building into an argument on a historiographical controversy around the project's authorship. Assigning it to Sert, placing Lacasa in a secondary administrative role at the same level as Bonet-Castellana, was a way to approach the building's reconstruction, to define what needed to be reconstructed, to determine the building's historical value.

Already in 1976, the historian Carlos Sambricio had argued that the minimisation of Lacasa's role in the design of the 1937 pavilion did not reflect his contribution and failed to understand the nature of his collaboration with Sert.<sup>11</sup> His position directly responded to the architect Oriol Bohigas's claim that Lacasa's participation was more theoretical than real.<sup>12</sup> Sambricio admitted that the pavilion's design was indebted to Sert's formal interests but located its ideological grounds in Lacasa's reclamation of architecture's political engagement through its production.<sup>13</sup> Lacasa's interest in assemblage and construction transformed the building into propaganda—diplomacy with images. The seamless integration of Josep Arnau's collages and Azaña's quotes in the building's façade originated in Lacasa's interest in architecture's political performance. This approach significantly impacted the building's design, at the scale, at least, of Sert's formalism.

The authors' attribution of the original building to Sert aligns with Bohigas's thesis. Yet their consistency in following that hypothesis also confirmed Sambricio's position. Upgrading the construction details to contemporary standards implied that the details' historical value was not worth preserving. The project's significance was not in the assemblage of the façade but somewhere else: in the design's overall formal decisions. The vanished banners, posters and quotes pointed in the same direction: the history of modern architecture associated with the reconstruction existed separated from the Spanish Republic's war propaganda. Rebuilding Sert's pavilion rendered Lacasa's Agit-Prop invisible, which only made its absence more present.

The reconstruction became material evidence for a more significant controversy, focusing on the roots of modern architecture in Spain and its relationship with the Second Spanish Republic. Specifically, around the letters separating two acronyms: GATCPAC (*Grup d'Artistes i Tècnics Catalans del Progrés de l'Arquitectura Contemporània*

funded by Sert in Barcelona in 1928 to promote modern architecture in Catalunya) and GATEPAC (*Grupo de Artistas y Técnicos Españoles para el Progreso de la Arquitectura Contemporánea* founded two years later in Zaragoza expanding the effort of promotion to Spain of which Lacasa, but also the entire GATCPAC, was part of). The relationship between both groups, which often embodied traditional rivalries between Barcelona and Madrid, had in the 1937 pavilion a cornerstone: the groups' most important completed building, a result of the collaboration of key characters of both groups. Was it a GATEPAC or GATCPAC's building? The reconstruction seems to take sides.

In 1960, Bohigas described the GATEPAC as a mere subsidiary of the Catalan group's activities, citing Sert's essential role in promoting modern architecture South of the Pyrenees and the Catalan group's control of the journal *AC*, officially a GATEPAC publication yet edited by the Catalan branch of the group.<sup>14</sup> The claim triggered a debate that, over the years, was nuanced through further scholarship on the group's history in journals such as *Cuadernos de Arquitectura* and *20 Construcción de la Ciudad* in the early 1970s, and in the 1975 facsimile edition of the GATEPAC magazine *AC* and the compilation of Luis Lacasa writings that same year.<sup>15</sup> It will be excessive to associate the missing banners spelling "España" and "Espagne" with the C and the E that separate GATEPAC from GATCPAC. The articulation of Catalan and Spanish identities after the end of the Francoist dictatorship is a more plausible reason to explain why the authors avoided placing a large "España" on top of the reconstruction. Still, its absence outlines territorial and personal alliances that aimed to locate the pavilion within specific lineages of modern architecture.

A common trope in the groups' histories written at the time is Sert's guiding force within the GATCPAC, the figure behind Le Corbusier's invitation to lecture in Spain and the collaboration between the group and the French architect for the Plan Macià urban transformation of Barcelona between 1932 and 1935. Meanwhile, Lacasa, appears as the student of the Dresden urbanist Paul Wolf, familiarised with the municipal *Siedlungs* and promoter of German urbanism, aligns with the *Deutscher Werkbund* and declares his admiration for Heinrich Tessenow while explicitly despising Le Corbusier as a "charlatan and journalist".<sup>16</sup> Mirroring the CIAM's internal struggles, these dialectical portraits construct the pavilion, or rather, its reconstruction. The new building takes sides. Lacasa's technocratic interest, his implication on the Spanish Republic's policies, vanished in favour of Sert's Le Corbusieran formal influence. The new building belongs on the French side of the CIAM. Clean of words and images that would have grounded its architecture in the 1937 Spanish government's cultural policy, the reconstruction embraces Eugène Viollet-le-Duc's motto and re-establish it in a complete state which may never at any given moment existed. Different from the walls of Carcassonne, however, the new building does stand for the building it was meant to reproduce. The missing pieces are too evident. The new construction cannot replace the original; instead, it makes its absence more present.

Another copy built not far away might help clarify the relationship between this ghostly presence and the new pavilion. In 1983, Eulàlia Serra and Ignasi de Solà-Morales built a replica of Marcel Duchamp's *La mariée mise a nu par ses célibataires même* (*Grand Verre*).

The piece was part of the exhibition *Duchamp*, curated by Gloria Moure for the *Fundació Joan Miró* in Barcelona and, later on, travelled to the *Sala de Exposiciones de la Caja de Pensiones* in Madrid. Surprisingly, it was exhibited without disclosing its provenance, and its status was neither acknowledged in the catalogue.<sup>17</sup> According to the authors, Duchamp's ambiguous relationship with originality, which the *Grand Verre* was an example of, might validate the copy as an original<sup>18</sup>. Three other original copies of the *Grand Verre* existed at the time, two of them authenticated by Duchamp, and a third one, completed shortly after his death, validated by family, friends, and experts.<sup>19</sup> Would Duchamp have signed this fourth copy with one of his witty '*pour copie, conforme: Marcel Duchamp*'? the question is as impossible to answer as inevitable to link this copy to Solà-Morales' subsequent professional trajectory reproducing works authored by others.<sup>20</sup>

In fact, it was Solà-Morales himself who acknowledged the importance of Duchamp's work in conceptualising his own replicas. In the book on the 1986 reconstruction of Mies van der Rohe's Barcelona Pavillion, Solà-Morales brings up Duchamp's use of copies to explain how the relationship between the original pavillion and its reproduction ratifies the end of the Romantic conception of the original work of art.<sup>21</sup> Solà-Morales' text also lists 26 design changes introduced in the new building, offering a second connection to Duchamp: the *inframince*—a set of subtle, almost invisible cosmetic modifications that individualises an object obtained initially from an industrial mass production process.<sup>22</sup> As Stefan Banz has noted, the differences between the 16 replicas of *The Fountain by Richard Mutt* that Duchamp produced are not mistakes but rather carefully designed decisions that often include chance in their production.<sup>23</sup> These minute differences allow Duchamp to construct the ambiguous relationship with authorship characteristic of his work. They are inconspicuous details that, seemingly by chance, make each piece unique work of art, the places where the Benjaminian *aura* resists the process of reproduction.

Banz's proposition brings new light to the reconstruction of the *Pabellón de la República Española*. The changes in the design are what make it an original. Together, the two pavilions are the beginning of a chain of originals that are both unique and linked to each other. Arjun Appadurai and Miguel Tamen have used the expression *career* to describe the assemblages of several originals.<sup>24</sup> Bruno Latour prefers the word *trajectory* to describe this kind of sequence of works.<sup>25</sup> Both terms refer to a concatenation of copies whose individual *quality*—a combination of material quantifiers like conservation, continuation, sustenance and appropriation of the original—enhances its originality and triggers new copies, like the lesser-known reproductions of the pavilion.

One of them can be found in the room of the Museo Reina Sofia dedicated to *Guernica*—a painting first exhibited in the pavilion in 1937 and one of the most critical pieces in the museum collection.<sup>26</sup> When the museum director, Manuel Borja-Villel, reorganised the collection in 2008,

*Guernica's* room added several Josep Arnau's collages, Luis Buñel's films projected in the pavilion courtyard in 1937 and a scale model of the pavilion to contextualise the painting.<sup>27</sup> Reduced in size, dwarfed by the symbolic weight of Picasso's denunciation of the Luftwaffe bombing of the civil population, the reproduction added

another piece to the chain of pavilions that reproduced and responded to the 1937 and 1992 structures. Turning inside-out the claim that the building without its contents was incomplete, the presence of the model in *Guernica's* room confirmed the works of art could not be exhibited without the pavilion; they required its presence.

It was not a new approach. In 1955, William Sandberg, director of the Stedelijk Museum in Amsterdam, unsuccessfully attempted to add similar link to the chain of copies. That year, as Rocio Robles Tardio has noted, Sandberg was able to extend *Guernica's* last tour through Europe for a year months before the MoMA and Picasso agreed to suspend its circulation due to its fragile state of conservation.<sup>28</sup> The project, a cross-institutional effort involving the *Société des Expositions del Palais des Beaux-Arts* in Brussels and the *Nationalmuseum* in Stockholm, attempted to recover the context in which the painting was first exhibited. Sandberg had visited the Spanish Pavilion in person in 1937 as part of the Netherlands' representation at the International Exposition. Despite Sandberg's efforts, which included contacting Sert and Dora Maar and locating the pieces of Alexander Calder's *Fuente de Mercurio*, the partial reconstruction was never built. Instead, *Guernica* was exhibited in the Stedelijk Museum annex for temporary exhibitions—a new wing completed by Sandberg in 1953 following the anti-monumentalism architecture of the Spanish pavilion. It was in the catalogue, jointly produced by the Dutch and the Belgium museums, where the images of the original building opening the publication reminded visitors that the painting was inseparable from the propaganda machine that was the Spanish pavilion.<sup>29</sup>

Twenty-one years later, in 1976, some of the protagonists of the pavilion historiographical controversies continued Sandberg's effort. After the death of the Spanish dictator Francisco Franco in 1975 and following Spain's refusal to participate in the Venice Biennale after the Biennale's explicit criticism of Augusto Pinochet's coup d'état in Chile in 1974, the Biennale offered its main pavilion of the Giardini to host ad-hoc Spanish participation.<sup>30</sup> The curatorial team, which included architects and historians such as Víctor Pérez Escolano, Vicente Lleó Cañal, Antonio González Cordon, Fernando Martín Martín, took the opportunity to review the relationship between artistic production and social reality in Spain between 1936 and 1976. With Oriol Bohigas's office MBM in charge of exhibition design, the *Pabellón de la República Española* became the starting point of the exhibition chronology. This time, Josep Arnau's posters, Calder's mercury fountain and reproductions of other art pieces originally occupying the pavilion made it to the exhibition. The building was not rebuilt. Instead, it was presented through original drawings and images. The catalogue entry thanked Sambricio and was explicit about the extent of Sert and Lacasa's collaboration. It also described the building as war architecture, whose primary purpose was to address the fair host, France, and force it to take the Republican side at a crucial moment in the Civil War.<sup>31</sup> In this case, only Lacasa's Agit-Prop agenda made it to Venice. Sert's "rationalist code" was a ghostly presence of the pavilion presented through its contents.

Starting in the building that once stood in Paris, this *trajectory* illustrates how the building was made public through texts and images. They all have in common the tension between the sacralisation proper of a museum piece and its performance as a popular icon. Each

attempt to resolve this dichotomy reveals a mix of cultural diplomacy and exhibition politics behind the values associated with the pavilion. Sometimes described as a relic of the past, others as a ruin of the present, the oscillation presents a work of architecture that can be restaged endlessly. Each iteration original and reproduction meet in a diachronic pavilion that exists in unlikely locations multiple times. In this context, the building at the intersection of Jorge Manrique street and the Cardenal Vidal I Barraquer Avenue in Val d'Hebron become another piece of the *trajectory*, one that, following the meaning the word *replica* has in romance languages, both responds to previous pavilions and question those not here yet. RA

---

--

---

--

## Notes

**01.** **MUÑOZ, Alfonso**, “Lo efímero permanente. El Pabellón de 1937: de París a Barcelona”, *Arquitectura Viva*, 1992, no.9, pp. *42-45*.

**02.** **Ascension Hernández Martínez** analysis of the reconstruction on her seminal essay on architectural clones. HERNÁNDEZ MARTÍNEZ, Ascension, La clonación arquitectónica, Madrid, Ediciones *Siruela*, 2007, pp.*102-103*.

**03.** **BUSQUETS, Jordi**, “Picasso, Miró, Calder, González...” *El País*, May 17, 1991 https://elpais.com/diario/1991/05/17/cultura/674431213\_850215.html#?prm=copy\_link. (retrived February 8, 2022).

**04.** **MENDELSON, Jordana, EL Pabellón Español Paris, 1937, Barcelona, Ediciones de la Central, 2009, p. 16.** *RIVERA, David, Dios esta en los detalles.* La restauración de la arquitectura *del Movimiento Moderno Valencia, General de Ediciones de Arquitectura, 2012, p. 180*

**05.** **GÜELL, Xavier, Ed., Espinet & Ubach, Barcelona, Ediitorial Gustavo Gili, 1996, p. 73.**

**06.** **The historian Carlos Sambricio** located the original documentation of the Pavilion in the Archivo de la Memoria Historica de Salamanca and was first displayed in the ehibition “Racionalismo madrileño - Luis Lacasa 1920-39”, Colegio Oficial de Arquitectos de Madrid, March, 1976.

**07.** **GÜELL, X., op. cit., p. 73.**

**08.** **The aggressive push to colourisation** classic films through the 1980s and 90s famously including an attempt to colourise Orson Welles’s Citizen Kane encounters fierce criticism from prominent figures from the film industry such as Roger Ebert, James Stewart, John Huston, George Lucas, and Woody Allen. The argument against inserting colour back into a masterpiece was probably best argued in the documentary Colorizing, Hollywood’s New Vandalism (1986), Siskel & Ebert, Buena Vista *Television, 1986; air date unknown*.

**09.** **Josep Quetglas** has discussed at large the inaccuracy of the colours used in the 1965 and subsequent restoration of the Villa Savoye. QUETGLAS, Josep, Les Heures Claires, Proyecto y *Arquitectura*

*en la Villa Savoye, de Le Corbusier y Pierre Jeanneret, Barcelona, Massilla, 2008.*

**10.** **Espinet/Ubach, Juan Miguel Hernández León,** ‘Reconstrucción del pabellón español en la Exposición Universal de París de 1937’ *On*, 1993, no.140, pp. 106-119.

**11.** **SAMBRICIO, Carlos Ed., Luis Lacasa, Escritios 1922-1931, Madrid, COAM, 1976, p. 73.**

**12.** **Oriol Bohigas writing on** the topic is vast — the first article dates from 1953 (BASSÓ BIRULÉS, Francesc, BUXÓ, J.M., BOHIGAS, Oriol, “El problema de la Vivienda” *Quadernos de Arquitectura* 1953, no.15/16, pp.141-180) — and it is part of a larger scholarly effort on the genealogy of modern architecture in Catalunya that was compiled in BOHIGAS, Oriol, *Arquitectura española de la segunda republica, Barcelona, Tusquets, 1970, and updated in BOHIGAS, Modernidad en la arquitectura de la España republicana, Barcelona, Tusquets, 1998.*

**13.** **Sambricio’s position is well-know and was articulated in a years-long explicit polemics** with Bohigas. The best summaries of are probably the introduction to the compilation of writings by Lacasa (SAMBRICIO, C. Luis Lacasa, *Escritos 1922-1931, cit.*, pp. 7-75.) and the article SAMBRICIO, Carlos “Luis Lacasa vs Jose Luis Sert: el Pabellón de España *en la Exposición de 1937”*, *Las exposiciones de arquitectura y la arquitectura de las exposiciones La arquitectura española y las exposiciones internacionales (1929-1975) Actas preliminares, Pamplona, T6 Editores, 2014.*

**14.** **BOHIGAS, Oriol,** “Homenaje al G.A.T.C.P.A.C.” Cuadernos de arquitectura *1960, no.40, pp. 43-45.*

**15.** Cuadernos de arquitectura y urbanismo *90 special issue on GATCPAC, (1972).* 2C Construccion de la Ciudad 15-16 Josep Torres Clave Arquitecto revolucionario (1975). SOLÀ-MORALES, Ignasi de, *ROCA, Francesc A.C.* Documentos de Actividad Contemporanea, *Barcelona, Gustavo gili, 1975.* SAMBRICIO, C. Luis Lacasa, *Escritos 1922-1931, cit.*

**16.** **SAMBRICIO, Carlos,** “Oriol Bohigas’s Arquitectura española de la segunda republica”, *Revista de Occidente*, 1972, *no.115, p. 115.*

**17.** **MOURE, Gloria Ed., Douchamp, Barcelona, Fundación Caja de Pensiones, 1984, p.135.**

**18.** **SERRA, Eulàlia** and SOLÀ-MORALES, Ignasi de, “Cómo hemos hecho la réplica del ‘Grand Verre””, *De diseño*, May-June 1984, pp.44-47.

**19.** **Before 1984,** three full-size replicas of the Grand Verre were known: Ulf Inde’s copy from 1961 for the exhibition Art in Motion at the Moderna Museet in Stockholm and validated by Duchamp; Richard Hamilton’s reproduction from 1966 for the exhibition The Almost Complete Works of Marcel Duchamp for the Tate Gallery in London, also signed by Duchamp; and a the replica produced at the Seibu Museum of Art in Tokio in 198, after Duchamp’s dead, for the exhibition *Marcel Duchamp.*

**20.** **After 1984,** Solà-Morales will develop a successful professional carrer building partial and entire replicas of disappeared buildings that include the 1986 copy of Mies van der Rohe 1929 German Pavion for Barcelona, the 1992 restauration of the Pati Llimona in Barcelona historic district, and 1998 reconstruction and extension of the Gran Teatre del Liceu burned to *the ground in 1994.*

**21.** **SOLÀ-MORALES, Ignasi de, CIRICI,** Cristian, RAMOS, Fernando, Mies Van Der Rohe: Barcelona Pavilion, *Barcelona, Gustavo Gili, 2000, pp. 38-39.*

**22.** **BANZ, Stefan, Marcel Duchamp: Richard Mutt’s Fountain, Colson, Les presses du réel, 2019, p. 224.**

**23.** **Banz** lists nine versions of the Fountain each one with its own distinctive physical features: The 1917 one never exhibited at First Annual Exhibition of the Society of Independent Artists at the Grand Central Palace, that ended up at Gallery 291 where it was photographed by Alfred Stieglitz; a reduced version of Fountain attributed both to Duchamp and Rose Selavy in the 1938 Boîte-en-valise; a urinal exhibited in 1950 Sidney Janis’ gallery in 1950 selected by the gallerist on behalf of Duchamp at his own discretion; Ulf Linde’s copy from 1963 and signed by Duchamp in 1964; The hand-made eight reproductions of the 1917 urinal Duchamp commissioned Arturo Schwarz in 1964 and signed 15 years later. *Ibid.* pp.248-249.

## Bibliography

• ALIX TRUEBA, Josefina, *Pabellon Español, Exposición Internacional de Paris, 1937* (catalogo de exposición), Madrid, Museo Nacional Centro de Arte Reina Sofía y Ministerio de Cultura, 1987.

• BANZ, Stefan, *Marcel Duchamp: Richard Mutt’s Fountain,* Colson, Les presses du réel, 2019.

• BENJAMIN, Walter, *Illuminations, Essays and Reflections,* New York, Schocken Books, 1968.

• BOHIGAS, Oriol, *Arquitectura española de la segunda republica, Barcelona, Tusquets, 1970* *Entusiasmos compartidos y batallas sin cuartel, Dietario de recuerdos II,* Barcelona, Anagrama, 1996. *Modernidad en la arquitectura de la España republicana, Barcelona, Tusquets, 1998.* *Epistolario 1951-1994,* Murcia, Colegio Oficial de Aparejadores y Arquitectos Tecnicos de la Region de Murcia, 2005.

• BOZAL, Valeriano Ed., *España. Vanguardia Artística y Realidad Social, 1936-1976,* Barcelona, Editorial G. Gili, 1976, pp. 26-44.

• COSTA, Xavier, Ed., *Ignasi de Solà Morales, Intervenciones,* Gustavo Gili, 2006.

• FREEDBERG, Catherine B. *The Spanish Pavilion at the Paris World’s Fair of 1937,* New York, Garland Publishing, 1986.

• GÜELL, Xavier, Ed., *Espinet & Ubach,* Barcelona, Ediitorial Gustavo Gili, 1996,

• HERNÁNDEZ MARTÍNEZ, Ascension, *La clonación arquitectónica,* Madrid, Ediciones Siruela, 2007.

• MARTIN MARTIN, Fernando, *El pabellón español en la Exposición Universal de Paris de 1937,* Sevilla, Servicio de Publicacciones la Universidad de Sevilla, 1983.

• MENDELSON, Jordana, *Documenting Spain: Artists, Exhibition Culture, and the Modern Nation,* University Park, Pennsylvania State University Press, 2005. *EL Pabellón Español Paris, 1937,* Barcelona, Ediciones de la Central, 2009.

• MORENO, Joaquim, *Arquitecturas Bis (1974-1985): From Publication to Public Action,* PhD Dissertation, Princeton, Princeton University, 2010.

• MOURE, Gloria Ed., *Douchamp,* Barcelona, Fundación Caja de Pensiones, 1984.

• QUETGLAS, Josep, *Les Heures Claires, Proyecto y Arquitectura en la Villa Savoye, de Le Corbusier y Pierre Jeanneret,* Barcelona, Massilla, 2008.

• RIVERA, David, *Dios esta en los detalles. La restauración de la arquitectura del Movimiento Moderno* Valencia, General de Ediciones de Arquitectura, 2012.

• ROBLES TARDÍO, Inés, *Informe Guernica, sobre el lienzo de Picasso y su imagen,* Madrid, Ediciones Asimétricas.

• SAMBRICIO, Carlos Ed., *Luis Lacasa, Escritios 1922-1931,* Madrid, COAM, 1976.

• SCHWARTZ, Hillel, The Culture of the Copy, Striking Likenesses, Unreasonable Facsimiles, New York, Zone Books, 1996.

• SOLÀ-MORALES, Ignasi de, *Intervenciones.*

• SOLÀ-MORALES, Ignasi de, CIRICI, Cristian, RAMOS, Fernando, *Mies Van Der Rohe: Barcelona Pavilion,* Barcelona, Gustavo Gili, 2000.

• SOLÀ-MORALES, Ignasi de, *ROCA, Francesc, A.C. Documentos de Actividad Contemporanea,* Barcelona, Gustavo Gili, 1975.

• VV.AA., Art contra la guerra : entorn del Pavelló Espanyol a l'Exposició Internacional de París de 1937 (exhibition) Palau de la Virreina, Novembre–Desembre 1986. *Las exposiciones de arquitectura y la arquitectura de las exposiciones La arquitectura española y las exposiciones internacionales (1929-1975) Actas preliminares, Pamplona, T6 Editores, 2014.*