View metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk
brought to you by CORE
provided by LSBU Research Open

Expanding Documentation, and Making the Most of 'the Cracks in the Wall'[1]

Annet Dekker, Gabriella Giannachi and
Vivian van Saaze

With the arrival of ephemeral, conceptual, performative, processual, networked and 'mixed reality' works of art, the document, by which we mean the physical or digital remaining trace of a work, has become a focal point of conservation and preservation strategies. The growing popularity of the document resulted in a proliferation, as well as in a dispersion, of documents. Questions, however, need to be raised as to how to value this growing body of work within the museological context. Here, we reflect on three artworks that have, for different reasons, challenged museological documentation and preservation practices regarding documentation, and suggest that a revision of museological processes of documentation, including novel strategies for the creation and management of documents, are necessary to take on board the growing complexity of what in fact may be considered a 'document'.

Problematizing the document

Documentation plays a significant role within the museological context. From the first discussions about the acquisition of an artwork, and throughout its entire existence in a museum, the artwork is

ject to various processes of documentation. In most museum practices, the core of documentation strate
ocused on the conservation of the artwork. Other documents, for example, flyers or videos that are produ
publicity and presentation, or ephemera that artists may generate alongside an artwork, are also kept,
e are often regarded as being of secondary importance and stored in 'documentation or 'acquisition fi
her than in the collection archive'. Building on past research (Dekker 2013; Giannachi 2017
nnachi et al. 2012a), we show here that secondary and auxiliary documents, as well as artists' ove
roaches to documentation, should be considered when thinking through the documentation of performa
works. Reflecting on the value of documents, including 'unauthorized documents', and expanding on
of audience documentation, this chapter also explores the potentiality, as well as challenges, that
urge and a dispersion of documentation cause to the museum. Standardized definitions of the 'docume
also questioned, to show that documents may include physical and digital attributes, as well as visual
ual documentation, and that they may, in time, become artworks.

Our first case study, Lynn Hershman Leeson's *Roberta Breitmore,* consists of the manufacture o
formed persona, interpreted by different people, technologies and platforms through an expanding num
ocuments which are usually identified as artworks. The second case study consists of a number of artwo
Tino Sehgal labelled by the artist as 'constructed situations', that attempt to escape documenta
gether, yet generate what has been regarded as unauthorized or 'illicit documents'. Finally, JODI's *T*
GE CONTAINS…, elucidates the challenges posed by a performance that requires the creation of docume
both its physical and digital components. What these artworks have in common is that they generate
erse body of documents whose status is unstable and, museologically speaking, still to be determined.

Traditionally, documentation is produced by museum professionals, such as curators, conservators strars, sometimes in collaboration with the artists. In the case of Hershman Leeson, the documents w erated by the artist over a prolonged period of time; in the case of Sehgal, they were generated by muse tors and interpreters; and in the case of} O DI, they were created by a group of documentalists, consis rt students, artists and researchers.

In this chapter, we explore how these (artistic) practices reconfigure the relationship between the artw the document and thereby challenge museological documentation. In the process, we question to w ent Suzanne Briets well-known work on documentation (2006 〔1951〕), in particular her distinc veen primary, secondary and auxiliary documents, can shed light on expanding these hierarchies umentation, and whether her classification still holds today. Elaborating on Briefs analysis, we discuss l se documents should be seen as inter-documents, environments that comprise primary, secondary, auxil uments, showing also how they can become, as in Hershman Leesons case, artworks in their own rig ally, we show how the valuation and subsequent hierarchy of museum documentation needs to chang ect the growing complexity of artistic and visitor or audience generated documents. This includes new w hinking about what the document and documentation mean, which may also require a reconsideratio r structure and role in the museum.

When the artwork is the document: Lynn Hershman Leeson

e first case study is *Roberta Breitmore* (1972-8).[2] In this artwork, the artist Lynn Hershman Lee raced the role of the fictitious persona of Roberta Breitmore for an initial period of six years.

ng surveillance technology (photography and moving image) and developing a graphic novel in collabora
n Spain Rodriguez, Hershman Leeson captured various moments in Robertas life, creating a set of docume
t were then re-formed, often through collage, including text and painting, into individual artworks. H
see how these documents, both primary and secondary, which were originally conceived of as a testim
he occurrence of the performance of *Roberta Breitmore*, together with a new set of documents produce
nt times, became both part of, and the totality of, the still evolving artwork known as *Roberta Breitm*
The chronology of the documents that form *Roberta Breitmore* reflects their creation, rather than
rrence of particular events in her 'life. From these, a number of biographical factors can be dedu
t may be interesting so as to interpret the construction of Robertas persona or role. For example, f
itled from Robertas External Transformation from Roberta (Robertas Construction Chart) (1975),
w that Roberta was born on 19 August 1945; she was educated at Kent State University where
ored in Art and Drama; she married Arnold Marx in 1969 and was divorced after three years; and
velled on a Greyhound bus to San Francisco and checked into room forty-seven at the Hotel Dante
umbus Avenue. At that time, Roberta was carrying $ 1,800, which corresponded to her entire life savi
hotel was also the site of Hershman Leesons artwork *The Dante Hotel* (1973), an early site-specific p
which Hershman Leeson rented a room in a run-down hotel on Columbus Avenue in San Francisco wh
tors would encounter evidence of its inhabitation by a fictitious character.

Hershman Leesons live performance started with Robertas arrival in San Francisco. Here, she underw
eries of external and internal transformations that can be traced through a number of documents.
erta Construction Chart #1 (1973) shows how Roberta was painted by 'Dior eyestick lighf, blus
ugh " 'Peach Blush" Cheekcolor by

ylon, and how her lips were shaped though ‘ “Date Mate” scarlet'. *Untitled from Robertas Exte nsformations (From Robertas Body Language Chart)* (1978) shows that she also had a vocabulary ures so that, for example, she would have tried to ‘avert attention by ‘avoiding your eyes' and that in a stiff and tense way

One such transformation was filmed by Hershman Leeson's friend Eleanor Coppola in 1974, with wh was working on *The Dante Hotel* and is now often exhibited as a still document dated 1975. A cking into the Hotel Dante, Roberta tried to find a roommate by placing an advert in some local pap uding the *S.F. Progress* (1974) and, later, on *The San Diego Union and Evening Tribune* (197 erta's meetings with potential roommates were documented, for example, in *Roberta and Irwin Meet First Time in Union Square Park* (1975). *Roberta Breitmore Blank Check* (1974) shows that she a financial existence, while *Untitled from Robertas Internal Transformations*, *Language from Rob cerpt from Robertas psychiatric evaluation)* (1978) shows that she suffered from severe alienation erienced difficulties in distinguishing dreams from reality. Finally, *Untitled from Adventure Series: M America (Roberta contemplating suicide on Golden Gate Bridge)* (1978) shows that, unable to integ ontemporary society, she contemplated suicide.

Looking at the individual documents, some of them could be described as primary, such as, among oth erta's check, her driving licence, a button from her coat, her dress. Others could be described as seconda the construction charts and the diary, for example. Finally, there is a growing number of auxil uments such as, to some extent, this case study. Brought together, and seen as an inter-document, th uments do not so much construct a persona as an environment. Being part of this environment of formance, both primary and secondary documents moved beyond being mere representations of a for vity to become part of it. Throughout this process, they also became autonomous artworks.

In line with John Seeley Brown and Paul Duguid (2000), who argue that information is meanin
ause it is so within a network, we regard documents as signifying forms that acquire meaning in rela
other documents. Moreover, we agree with Ronald Days comment '[documents] are meaningful sign
tion to other signs [...] within whose difference from one another and in relation to things and eve
gain their identity and their referentiality' (2014: 5). We suggest here that documents are not
osition to performance, but rather they emerge from and are part of the environment generated
formance. Not only do they acquire meaning in relation to it, they become a sign for it. This phenome
explains the potential performativity of performance documentation and a current obsession with replay
restaging documents. The document is implicated in its past, present and potential future performanc
During her lifetime, *Roberta Breitmore* became a multiple as Hershman Leeson engaged three wom
uding the art historian Kristine Stiles, to 'be Roberta. Hershman Leeson recalls that Stiles went ou
erta, and Hershman Leeson as herself because 'there was a rumour about Roberta' and she wan
ple to 'think that she existed' (2015). *So Untitled (Robertas Signature in Guest Book)* (1975) i
Stiles's, and not Hershman Leeson's, signature. All performers wore wigs and costumes identical to
s worn by Hershman Leeson when performing Roberta, and all underwent a series of transformati
e]ach had two home addresses and two jobs – one for Roberta and one for herself – and each correspon
n respondents to the advertisement and went on dates that were obsessively recorded in photographs
iotapes' (in Tromble and Hershman Leeson 2005: xiii). Finally, Hershman Leeson ceased performing
erta, leaving the three hired performers on their own. In 1978, an exhibition of Roberta's artef
tled *Lynn Hershman Is Not Roberta Breitmore/Roberta Breitmore Is Not Lynn Hershman* was presen
he M.H. de Young Memorial Museum in

Francisco during which a Roberta look-alike contest was run that led to an additional multiplicatio
ertas accompanied by a further expansion of documents. Noticeably, most studies of this artwork only r
Hershman Leesons performance of Roberta and rarely discuss the artwork as a multiple or a remedia
work.

After being exorcized at the Palazzo dei Diamanti in Ferrara (1978), Roberta was re-mediated as
robotic doll *CyberRoberta* (1995- 8), who was dressed identically to Roberta, and had a fictional pers
was, as in Hershman Leesons words, 'designed as an updated Roberta' who not only navigated
rnet, but was in herself a creature of the internet, a cyberbeing' (1996: 336). Roberta was also brou
in *Reconstructing Roberta* (2005) which shows an image of Hershman Leeson taken in recent y
gside the text 'botox injections three to six months - Cut and Lift, pin back xxxx Liposuction Elec
nulation Rejouvenation ////'. Additionally, Roberta appeared as a bot in the Second Life remake of
te Hotel, called *Life^A^n (Life to the Power of nf* or *Life Squared* (2007-), which turned a numbe
uments in the Hershman Leeson archive about the homonymous artwork now hosted at Stanford Univer
raries into a mixed reality experience where visitors could explore digital reproductions of fragments of
inal archive under Roberta's guidance in Second Life (Giannachi and Kaye 2011).[3] When asked
erta keeps on reappearing in her artwork, Hershman Leeson commented: Roberta 'just comes back
erent forms every now and then. For *CybeRoberta*, it was twenty years later as a surveillance syst
ch she originally was, but used the technology of that time; for *Life Squared* as an effort for immorta
igital space. She also came back thirty years later and appeared in a plastic surgeon's office'.[4] These
liations, produced through the reworking of other documents, testify to the fact that different technolo
rally re-formed both the body of the artwork and the environment that is *Roberta Breitmore.*

While the M.H. de Young Memorial Museum in San Francisco did not retain any documentation of
78 exhibition, *Roberta Breitmore* is now part of a number of collections, including those at the Museum
dern Arts, New York (MoMA), the Walker Art Center, the Whitworth Art Gallery, and the Donald R
ection. It also featured in a major retrospective about Hershman Leesons artwork that started at ZKM
n toured Germany and the United Kingdom in 2015. The artworks that form *Roberta Breitmore*
ally shown individually. However, at the ZKM retrospective, a number of them, including dresses, pho
ages of transformations, were exhibited alongside each other, making it possible for visitors to begin to r
n as inter-documents. MoMA displayed a number of artworks that are not ordinarily on display on th
site,[5] including *Robertas Room*, *Baker Acres* (1976), showing Robertas barren room at Baker Ac
ween Baker and Jackson, and *Kristine Stiles as Roberta Breitmore at Gallery Opening* (1976), an artw
t documents the gallery visit cited above, *Untitled (Robertas Signature in Guest Book)* (1975), which
vever, dated one year earlier. The same is true for the Walker Arts Center, which has a wide collectio
vorks that are grouped together online, including *Untitled from Robertas External Transformation f*
erta (Robertas Construction Chart) (1975), subtitled an Alchemical Portrait Begun in 1975 by L
shman, suggesting how *Roberta Breitmore* is related to processes of trans-formation, in the sense that
work literally migrates between forms and documents created through them. This online document
rs a 'meta-narrative[5], including the brief synopsis of Robertas life that we discussed above.

Most museums do not make public their own interpretation or documentation of the artworks in exhibitio
vever, reading their documentation offers an interesting insight into the challenges artworks often prod
museum curators. For example, former Tate curator Kelli Dipple noted in her justification for acqui
artwork, how each of the 'three complete editions[5] of the *Roberta*

itmore inventory,[6] in addition to one artists proof set, contained items from her personal rendition of racter, consisting of around 300 individual photographs, documents and artefacts'.[7] By documents, Di bably meant what, in line with Briets suggestion, we call secondary documents and by artefacts she proba nt what we call primary documents. In a further e-mail to Frances Morris, she also noted: 'due to ure of the project I was unable to settle on the best way to annotate the individual vs. collective artwo arted with the Roberta Construction Chart # 1 vintage print, but found that most explanation of work was indeed an explanation of the entire project of Roberta Breitmore'.[8]

Roberta Breitmore can be described as a body of work, formed by an environment comprising a serie s, people, documents and objects, which, over the course of Hershman Leeson's live performance, multip onentially, leading to an expansion of documents across a variety of forms and media. These are ra ibited together and so audiences usually perceive them as instances of a dispersed artwork rather than ody of work. Exhibited or interpreted together, as was the case at ZKM, they show a more complex anic aesthetic vision about the relationship between performance and documentation that allows us pass existing debates in the field which identify the two as dichotomous (Phelan 1993a) and rather m as inter-related (Jones 1997; Clausen 2005; Auslander 2006). However, reading them as inter-rela nlights the presence of substantial cracks in the wall', as ultimately, despite this expansion umentation, it is impossible to comprehend, or even grasp, the entirety of *Roberta Breitmore.*

Unauthorized documents: Tino Sehgal

contrast to such a richly documented artistic practice, is a growing body of artists who challenge exis tionships between the

work and the document by rejecting any form of documentation of their artworks. Our second case st
ses on one of the most rigorous and consistent examples, Tino Sehgals attempts to avoid any vis
uments and material traces resulting from his constructed situations'. His pieces are live encounters, o
cuted by hired (amateur) actors or dancers, carrying out instructions conceived by the artist and lear
ough rehearsals. As many of his artworks are now entering museum collections, his particular prac
llenges standardized documentation processes which museums rely upon (Laurenson and Van Sa
4:35). As Justin Graham and Jill Sterrett (1997) write: 'to the extent they exist, documentary tra
n the past shape the institutional memory of what the work can be'. In the case of Sehgal's artwo
ever, instead of relying on materialized memory, such as a score or photographs, knowledge of how
form his pieces is intended to be transferred from person to person, from body to body. The restrictio
production of all kinds of documents goes as far as to avoid any written set of instructions, written recei
l labels and announcements (Richards 2012). With only a few interviews available, several critics h
mpted to identify the motivations behind this restriction. According to Arthur Lubow, for example, Seh
akes art that does not require the transformation of any materials. He refuses to add objects to a soc
t he says is overly encumbered with them' (2010). Another explanation is provided by Dorothea
telmann who argues that for Sehgal the reason for prohibiting any form of documenting lies in preven
e translation of situations into a two-dimensional medium, thus preventing documentation from functio
kind of surrogate for the artwork. It is of crucial significance whether a situational artwork enters hist
memory or as a document' (2010: 134).

e ban on visual or written documents prevents the existence of a score or inter-document, yet emphas
the pervasiveness

ceived dichotomy between performance and document as mentioned earlier. This is addressed in one of es, *This is critique* (2008). In this artwork, the museum visitor is spoken to by, what appears to b eum guard stating three critiques of the artists work and initiating a discussion about his approach. he criticisms addressed by the interpreter is the artists refusal to allow photographic and video docum he artwork.

With respect to the artworks ephemeral character and the ban on document creation, it is not always c ch forms of material traces are considered to be problematic and which are not (Van Saaze 2015). S hors even display a certain hesitation to write about his artworks, while others indicate that their writ inconsistent to Sehgals practice. Art critic Stephanie Moisdon notes: 'One cannot write about Tino Seh works without committing a first anomaly, by attempting to give them a title, to describe or to list th t is, to enter into rivalry with the form of the artwork itself, which is the affirmation of what it 03). In a similar vein, one of Sehgals interpreters, Nico Colon, asks whether he is allowed to reveal mories: 'I guess as long as I' m not actively working for him, at this moment, I can be free to exp elf. So I am morally off the hook. It' s *my* experience, after all. The artwork is Sehgals, but I own experience. If *he* owned *my* experience, that would actually bother me' (in Jensen 2013, orig hasis). While visitors, interpreters and museum staff are asked not to take pictures of the artwo restingly Sehgals practice evokes an ever-growing body of visual and written documents outside the conf he museum. Echoing what Michel Foucault has called 'the incitement to discourse' (1978: 17) - nibition of a certain word or practice leading to a proliferation of that same word or practice - his artwo erate a remarkable amount of images. These 'illicit' or unauthorized pictures and videos taken du ibitions appear online and are shared through social media networking sites.

In addition to this emerging body of visual material, his practice has sparked an immense number of wit
orts from members of the audience, as well as from interpreters – all expressing a desire to share someth
heir experiences and memories. These tertiary documents, however, are not archived by museums as t
largely considered to be materials produced against the artists wishes or regarded as 'merely interpreta
n Saaze 2015). Yet, instead of rejecting them altogether, an emerging challenge would be to consider
ential of such unauthorized' documents and the role of members of the audience and interpreters
ributed memory holders enabling future enactments of Sehgals artworks. Especially considering
nerability of institutional memory in the absence of material traces, the visitors and interpreters accou
be of value with regard to the artworks perpetuation in the longer term. This in turn speaks to la
es of shifting notions of experts and expertise in a museological context as well as to questions as to w
relationship is between documents produced by artists or professionals and those generated by audience
n the general public.

Expanding documentation: JODI

e final case study of this chapter consists of a performance by JODI, *THIS PAGE CONTAINS…*, wh
performed on 1 October 2015 at the Stedelijk Museum in Amsterdam. The Dutch/Belgium duo, J
mskerk and Dirk Paesmans (JODI), are renowned for their subversive acts. Advertised as a performa
ing which 'the physical and digital worlds are both united and destabilized', JODI lived up to t
utation. With their artworks, JODI invert the visible and invisible in an attempt to come to grips with
puter environment. Their projects vary from net artworks, to

ne modifications, videos to performances, and the individual artworks are exhibited and performed
ous ways over the years. An interesting question emerges, how to document such variable artworks
re reference?

In an attempt to explore different forms and ways of documenting, we asked several 'documentalist
te a document of JODIs performance at the Stedelijk Museum.[9] The intention was to emphasize
ability in JODIs practice, while at the same time moving beyond traditional documenting practices.
to expand on existing documenting practices, derived from a three-year long experiment in creating
s of documents that was initiated by Dekker at the Piet Zwart Institute in Rotterdam.[10] This experim
developed as part of a course on how to document complex artworks. In the course, the meaning
e of documentation is analyzed by comparing different types of documents; paying particular attentio
different goals affect documentation and how this in turn influences the documents that are crea
ention is also paid to how documents are used by different kinds of institutes, organizations and individ
produce, collect and manage cultural material. Moreover, the students are asked to create their
uments: the first year MA students need to document the final work of their second year colleagues. W
osing a specific goal - from documents that are used for publicity and presentation, for funding, to t
le for re-enactment/preservation - the motivation is to capture the significant properties of the artw
is documented in whatever form they think is suitable.

The three-year experiment resulted in many different forms and methods, ranging from traditional arti
rviews, photography and video of an installation or performance, to elaborate concise code analysis,
icate web interface showing screenshots from the artists online research process via social media platfor
KEA- like manual, and a process-based flipbook. Although most students

ggled at first to get to the core of their colleagues artworks, through several talks and assessing
arch and its outcomes the students managed to capture what they thought was the essence of the artw
the intention of its creator. At the same time, while the documents showed what the actual artwork
formances were about, it was often argued – in a positive sense – that some of the results became
works.

One of the reasons for seeing these documents as new artworks was perhaps related to the amount of ti
e a month during one year, which was spent thinking, talking and reflecting on the assignment and
come. Another reason perhaps was that being artists themselves, the documentalists, found it difficul
ance themselves from their own practice as artists. However, instead of pondering over reasons, we as
selves whether these documents, rather than being secondary documents, perhaps showed signs of w
et termed auxiliary documents? Briet mentions that documents are contextual, and rather than delive
ains of an isolated event, they are reflective of the networks in which that object appears. This, accord
Briet, can in certain cases end in a genuine *creation*, through the juxtaposition, selection, and the compar
documents, and the production of auxiliary documents' (2006: 16, original emphasis). To overcome
ficial' situation of the classroom assignment in which documents were created, and to further explore
inction between secondary and auxiliary documents we used the performance by JODI as a case to s
multiple ways of creating documents, and in the process, address the meaning and potential (re)us
uments.

As mentioned earlier, a group of seven people was asked to document JODI's performance, which la
nty-eight minutes. Beforehand, there was a short brief about the content and set-up of the performa
the various possibilities of documenting the event. The use of the PA system was discussed, along w
itional

ts, placement of cameras and the possibility of screen-casting the performance from JODIs laptop.
ition, we talked about different forms of documenting and decided that each person, or duo, based on t
rests, would focus on one particular form.
The results ranged from a video reinterpretation (Michaela Lakova), a short text description (H
nual), a written account of the event that combined personal impressions with objective script logs (Lu
tich), an interview with JODI as part of the creation of a conservation record (Molly Bower and N
Doren), and a double screen video capturing the audience perception (Thomas Walskaar), to finding w
istribute the documents that were created (Julie Boschat Thorez). Except for the latter, all the docume
ame individual interpretations of the performance, in which some focused on the presentation itself, oth
he audience experiencing the performance, or attempting to capture the intentions of the artists. Som
e outcomes could be seen as stand-alone new artworks; for example, Lakovas video was a remix of s
he sounds and the content that were used in the performance, overlaid with a design that is reminisc
he title sequences. This translation was not a 'faithful' recording of the event and more of a subjec
rpretation of what was shown, indeed, in some ways, a new artwork. At the same time, the aesthetic
original performance were still clearly visible. Likewise, Battichs designed paper publication read lik
t novel, alternating between personal observations and exact timings. The precise notation of the timi
technical environment of how the performance was created and what was shown could be seen as a wri
e of the performance, potentially to be used to re-perform the performance. Moreover, his perso
ments and specific design of the text emphasised exclusivity and uniqueness, which was closer to a
work than a document of an existing artwork. Even the more traditional approach taken by Bower
Doren, following a museums method of documenting an artwork, in its final design

empts to show the multiple layers of understanding a mediated performance. Working with transpar
rs of information, each layer presenting a specific aspect of the performance, they tried to create a n
archical document in which technical and subjective approaches existed simultaneously
Moving beyond traditional methods of documenting, these documents had in common the quality of poss
g seen as extensions of the original artwork, the performance - which, also, in part, consisted of docum
erated through code that were performed to the audience. Suggestive of both secondary and auxil
uments, and still implicating some primary documents formed by the original code, it is in the multipli
ocuments and their shared environment that, like *Roberta Breitmore*, they become interdocuments.
The idea of the inter-documentary is further emphasized by the document that Boschat Thorez crea
ed on the idea that digital artworks are vulnerable over time and that their strength resides in
ibility of their dissemination over the internet, Boschat Thorez explained that collaboration and
tiplication of documents over a wide range of hardware and operating systems, belonging to differe
led people, should also be regarded as a strategy for sustaining memory over time'.[11] For her documenta
rt, Boschat Thorez created a digital folder that contained all the (digitized) documents that were mad
DIs performance, including screen captures from the laptop that were sent by JODI after the performa
ch she then distributed via various online networks - to be (re)used by anyone. It was an attemp
ect on the sharing of information far and wide as an alternative preservation method. It could be arg
this is merely a distribution method, and not a document. However, the way the information was selec
kaged, repurposed and contextualized reflect the characteristics of Briets notion of an auxiliary docum
the same time, shifting

thinking of documentation as a single interpretation, a set of instructions or guidelines, to a concep
hod from which new interpretations can be made, provides new ways to understand the meaning and va
ocumentation.

Conclusion

this chapter we have shown that artists creating what could be described as ephemeral, concept
ormative, processual, networked and mixed reality' artworks have expanded our understanding of wha
ument could be, and so challenged our evaluation of its relationship to an artwork and, in turn, to
umentation processes museums undertake. We have described the practice of Lynn Hershman Leeson, wh
work *Roberta Breitmore* is usually exhibited as a series of artefacts, and claimed that to understand all
icacies of the artwork it should perhaps be exhibited as an inter-document or environment. In describ
Hershman Leesons documents evolved over time, we have seen how they became artworks and
llenged the distinction between primary, secondary and even tertiary documents. We have reflected
gals refusal to enter practices of material documents, which has inspired questions as to what may or n
be a legitimate relationship between the artists game plan and documents produced by others. We h
shown, in the case of JODIs artwork *THIS PAGE CONTAINS* ..., that artworks can inspire crea
s of making documents and documentation. Our case studies have shown that Briets classifications
archies, which were developed for a library context, fall short in an aesthetic and museological cont
ough the lens of particular artistic practices, we have demonstrated that documents form part of a comp
amic and, above all, expanding environment. This finding challenges museums to revisit

ir documentation practices and reassess the value of documents and documentation for exhibition servation.

Acknowledgements

gracefully acknowledge the AHRC grant 'Performance at Tate' (AH/M004228/1) which funded research into Lynn shman Leesons *Roberta Breitmore. We* are very grateful to all artists presented in the case studies.