



Ross, A. (2016) (Un)spoken: The register and display of the artist's voice in the museum. *de arte*, 51(1), pp. 115-123.

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/211007/>

This is the author final accepted version of the above article, which has been published in final form at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00043389.2016.1176382>

Deposited: 25 February 2020

Enlighten – Research publications by members of the University of Glasgow
<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk>

UNISA Press.

Journal: RDAT, *de arte*

Manuscript ID: 1176382

Manuscript Title: (Un)spoken: The register and display of the artist's voice in the museum

By: Ross, A

2016

(Un)spoken: The register and display of the artist's voice in the museum

*Alexandra Ross**

** Alexandra Ross is a Postdoctoral Research Fellow at the Centre for Curating the Archive, Michaelis School of Fine Art, University of Cape Town.*

Abstract

This article is a two-fold exploration of the voice in relation to the documentation of artistic practice, whilst also focusing on the nuance and agency of the voice, its capture and presentation. Particularly in connection to the museum, this article posits the potential of approaching contemporary artworks displayed in a museum in an expanded and polyphonic manner. Drawing from a lineage of artistic example, it considers the possibilities and limitations of working with the voice and how to record and represent the interstitial, intimate or informal spaces of artistic production. The role of the museum as safeguard and mediator of artwork has been evolving apace to also accommodate the transparency of process, thus allowing for the revealing of institutional and artistic processes. With this reveal comes an enhanced understanding of the context in which an artwork was created and subsequently how it came to find itself within a particular collection.

Introduction

The museum as a physical and institutional construct is dedicated to the safeguarding of objects and their meaning for posterity. Architecturally, museums combine spaces for the safe, regulated and methodical storage of art and artefacts, with galleries for the display and contemplation of those objects. Once entered into the collection of a

museum, their relation to the context in which they were made understandably relies upon mediation and contextualisation by specialists.

For the purpose of this article, consideration is given to contemporary works of art where the artist is still alive. On entering the collection, the artwork can become removed from its context; not only from the studio and intention of the artist, but also the ecology and surrounding dialogue of its construction. Time and resources available are, of course, correlative to the opportunity a museum may have to gather and inject the surrounding narrative of an artwork into a museum collection. However, this article explores some strategies for engaging with the 'voice' of the artist, and the displaying of elements bound up in the oral and dialogical which may lend further meaning to the artwork. The gathering of such narratives would feed into both the short-term display and longer-term archiving of an artwork housed in a museum collection. In this article, the 'voice' of the artist is considered not only as the intention the artist had for the work and its surrounding creation, but also as the nuance contained in the sonic quality of the artist's voice itself, and the uniqueness of engaging with and displaying the artist's voice in its non-transcribed form.

In the process of physical conservation and protection, there can be a disconnect from the site in which the object was made, the studio and the wider environment in which it was created. Specifically with regard to works of art, the fact that artworks are rarely made with the intention to be housed in a museum can create a fissure between the creator and the conservator, and the site of creation and the institution working hard to preserve it. An artwork may have made its way into a museum collection through a process of transactions, a chain of personal relationships, commercial negotiations, occasionally ethically unsound acquisition processes, deaths/bequests, and multitudinous conversations and interpersonal exchanges. Once in the collection, it is not only the museum curator who mediates the meaning of the artwork. Rather, this is a multivalent process, involving many hands and voices in the presentation of an artwork to the public. In the case of an artwork housed in a museum collection while the artist is still alive, time should be taken to actively consult with the artist, so as to gather further meaning and context. It is posited that engagement with the artist would serve to avoid curatorial aphorisms in the interpretation and display of their work. Admittedly, this further complicates the already onerous task placed upon organisations which are, in most part, under-funded, over-stretched and hampered by layers of bureaucracy. However, this engagement can

occur with a soft touch or in a more in-depth manner, in order to fill this cleft between studio and museum.

This process of engagement is largely contingent upon the interest of the artist, on their willingness to contribute, and on their memory and recollection of the production of the work. Resources allowing, a remedy to an artwork being entirely spoken for by the institution and related meaning-makers (such as art historians, curators and critics) would be to approach contemporary artworks in a museum collection through close consultation with the artist. This is a complementary and parallel process to the activities already being undertaken by the institution, such as conservation, outreach, guided tours, exhibition-making and publications. This call to actively insert the artist's voice into the museum – both literally and conceptually – would feed into these ongoing strands of activity.

The nuance of the voice

Although not exclusively concentrating on the spoken element, the emphasis on the voice as oral testimony is the primary interest in this shift in focus, from art object to artistic practice. The proposed methods employed to gather information are largely spoken and relational, with attention being paid to the oral and aural practices of engagement, and the subsequent archiving and display of the material gathered. As regards the uttered, unuttered and unutterable, there are strategies for approaching oral testimony. In the publication, *Speech, place and action*, Jarvella and Klein observe in relation to the uttered compared to the unuttered:

Contrary to an assumption which seems widespread, that gestures are part of a separate system of 'non-verbal communication', only incidentally connected to speech, we find that gestures correlate closely with meaning on several levels of language organisation ... The speakers' choice of words, verbs for example, is constrained by the system of English grammar and its historically in-built manner of dividing and grouping experience with the world. The choice of gestures, in contrast, is much freer and is able to reflect the complexity of the representation of experience. (Jarvella and Klein 1982:275)

The above quotation exposes the power of language, and the potency of words selected from our arsenal of vocabulary and linguistic fluency. However, it also acknowledges the symbiosis between the body and the words uttered. Therefore, the

body is so tied to the voice that it is not negated from the experience – rather, it is inextricably tied to it as the site of production and vessel of knowledge. Moreover, within the body as object there are housed culture, memory, heritage, sensorial recollection, language(s) and the residue of experience, that when opening one’s mouth, the vocalisation carries echoes of their presence.

The value of the spoken is illustrated by Heinrich von Kleist (1966) in the context of the French maxim *l'appétit vient en mangeant* [appetite comes through eating] parodied to read as *l'idée vient en parlant* [the idea is formed through speaking]. The notion that an idea comes through speaking is a persuasive argument when Von Kleist furthers this thought with a description of what occurs when he speaks to his sister, a non-specialist in his field: ‘I mix inarticulate noises, I draw out my sentence connectives, I use appositions where they are not strictly necessary and I use other rhetorical tricks that will draw out speech: in this way I gain the time to fabricate my ideas in this workshop of reason’ (Von Kleist 1966). This *workshop of reason*, of thinking through the process of articulation and utterance, links the vessel with the content emitted therefrom; i.e., the words uttered and ideas posited into the world.

As such, the body as a vessel plays an important role in this process. To quote Widenheim and Kelly (2011:6) from *Dialogue – on the politics of the voice*:

The voice as material may be considered to be fleeting, continually shifting, without clear contours – as if in the making – and yet so present. Perhaps it can be said that the voice by nature refers to an event rather than a thing in itself. This in combination with an intrinsic power perspective – the dialectic between the speaker and the listener – forms the basis for the political implications of the voice.

In line with the above, it is the fleeting and in-process nature of the voice, and that which is largely bound up in the oral, that are of interest in this expanded approach to artworks housed in a museum collection, rather than the principally edited and measured delivery of concepts and human exchange in their written or transcribed form. ‘Writing is nothing but the representation of speech; it is bizarre that one gives more care to the determining of the image than to the object’ (Rousseau in Derrida 1976:27). Derrida (1976) thus highlights the tension between the illustrative representation which writing often plays in relation to the spoken word and its removal from the nuance of the original utterance. These textual counterparts provide

a layer of communication of the concepts gathered. However, the retention of the nuance and the specificity of the exchange can afford a more rounded framework of reference for understanding or entering into dialogue with an artwork.

The voice of an artist (in a conceptual rather than literal sense) within the museum speaks to the inclusion of the artist in the process of engaging with themes raised by their artwork, and how these are presented to the public. This may occur in a more overt manner through the use of video interviews or audio guides, created by the artist to navigate the installation of an exhibition, or it may take place in a more subtle form as an invitation to artists to have a longitudinal relationship with the organisation, by sharing information on the evolution of their practice or related works. The value of the oral, when compared to its written or transcribed counterpart, captures the elements embedded in the voice of the artist (such as cadence, accent, personality, rapport between conversants and other elements of the exchange), which, if transcribed, are ‘flattened’ to fit the printed page.

Methodologically speaking, of particular note in conversation, is the fact that trust, rapport and intimacy represent a willingness to divulge knowledge and share ideas. An aspiration of the encounter is to engender or activate such moments of intimacy and intensity. Signals such as whispering or drawing close indicate sharing between the participants in a conversation, and are evidence of the exchange moving into a more intimate realm with more intimate content.

A performative voice can instead call the other into an intimate relationship – it can performatively effect intimacy. This happens not by speaking about intimacy, but through vocal qualities and vocal performance – through the performativity of the voice ... the uncanny quality of performative voices, as they are haunted by the media from which they emerge – and as they haunt that media. (Neumark 2010:95–96)

There are coded subtleties in the timbre of one’s voice which reveal rapport (or lack thereof) in the exchange at hand. Attention to these details may unlock many facets of the speaker, other than simply the words uttered. In the introduction to *Language and symbolic power*, it is stated: ‘As competent speakers we are aware of the many ways in which linguistic exchanges can express relations of power. We are sensitive to the variations in accent, intonation and vocabulary which reflect different positions in the social hierarchy’ (Bourdieu 1991:1). This touches on the role of the voice within

conversation and ties back into Widenheim and Kelly's (2011:6) observation of the *dialectic between the speaker and the listener*; of the dynamic of not only one who is speaking, but also one who is listening, and the fundamental reciprocity required in such an exchange. Embedded in dialogue is power and authority of voice, drawing attention to the moment of encounter, and to the uniqueness of the utterance and the fragility of its capture. Therefore, the aim of this research is to draw attention to the potential that the layering of voices and the representation of the nuance(s) of the encounter – not solely through writing, but also through live conversations, and audio and video recording – may have in creating a more meaningful context for the 'reading' of an artwork in the museum.

Reviewing the terrain: The legacy of audio arts and artist-led approaches to the documentation and presentation of the voice

In oral exchange paraplexes are inevitable, but the handling of these in the editing or presentation process can provide the context and elucidate the subtlety contained within the flow of dialogue. Providing that a space of trust has been created in relation to the recording of the spoken exchange, these slippages in speech allow for the capture of elements that probably would not have made it to the pages of exhibition catalogues, having been deemed extraneous to the meaning of the work, or circumstantial rather than integral to the writing of the artwork into an art historical context. However, as pioneers such as Bill Furlong of Audio Arts would underscore, it is the capture of the nuance of the exchange and the voices of artists, curators and critics which serves to expose the processes surrounding the creation of an artwork.

Often, in conversation, slips of the tongue can be revealing, especially for those who think as they speak. Thus, engaging with artists and related collaborators (both on and off the record) to reflect on their creative process and reconsider artworks, will afford them the opportunity not only to document aspects of their practice, but also to think through and recollect (*re-collect*) the threads of conversation and the processes involved in relation to their artwork. Speaking through ideas has the potential to unlock that which would not have been revealed through a controlled, edited, written exchange.

Oral testimony is, of course, rooted within a rigorous history of the social sciences, with techniques such as conversation analysis following periods of ethnographic fieldwork undertaken to observe and capture data from a community of

interest. However, it is not a critique of the recorded content that is at the core of this quest to realign the emphasis in approach: rather, a method of engagement is proposed, akin to that undertaken in projects such as Audio Arts – an excellent exemplar, from practice, of the capture of the spoken, and of process-centric, dialogically orientated publishing. Crucially, their process did not focus exclusively on engaging with artists. Rather, they recorded interviews, conversations and meetings with many specialists involved in art, and exhibition-making and critique. This allowed a network of experience and viewpoints to feed in and construct a framework for understanding an artwork or artistic process.¹ Artist Bill Furlong's vast Audio Arts cassette-based magazine and project, now housed in the Tate Archive, is an example of how conversation within artistic practice has been valued, documented and preserved.

Employing a thoroughly hospitable approach are artists Rirkrit Tiravanija and Matthew Ngui, who cook inside the museum and whose work adeptly creates or locates spaces for convivial exchange. Employing the leveling device of the dining table and the shared language of food, their approach affords an opportunity to bring people together. There is also an element of barter currency involved in the exchange, with food serving to reward, remunerate or thank people for taking the time to engage with the themes under discussion, and contribute to their work. Moreover, much can be learned from the methods employed, both creatively and technically, from the practice of artists who embrace audio recording of the voice – examples include Vito Acconci, Michael Snow, Jenny Holtzer, James Webb, Hanna Tuulikki and Hiwa K, to name but a few. In short, to quote Steward and Labelle (2010:187),

digital technology has revolutionized possibilities for production, distribution, collaboration, and interdisciplinary synthesis in ways that were not possible previously. The voice has been extended into new discourses and sign systems that also shed new light on those that came before.

The role of the archive in contemporary art has had to be radically reconsidered. Indeed, there is already a strong lineage of artists working with art collections to reinterpret or *re-present* the archives employing methodologies relating to their art practice. An excellent example is artist Joseph Kosuth, whose involvement at the Brooklyn Museum, New York, saw him pulling out items from their formerly ethnographic collection, and reframing them as specimens of art, thus creating a vast

installation. Also, the work of the collaborative duo, Bik van der Pol, at the Van Abbe museum in Eindhoven, entitled 'Pay Attention', displayed alternating presentations of items in the museum collection in different locations across the venue.

There is a fine line between protecting the artifact and revealing its meaning, or rather its multiple meanings. Further, there should be a refined process for archiving memory and the incorporeal. With oral testimony, a creative and sensitive approach regarding transcription, translation and editing is vital. Garrulous and verbose or pithy and succinct, participants and the artwork-related oral testimonies that might be captured are diverse, thus creating a desirable polyphony circumnavigating artwork and artistic practice. This is an inclusive rather than exclusive approach which acknowledges the importance of artistic, institutional and curatorial voices in the creation of an expanded understanding of an artwork. The knock-on effect can be felt in the writing of the history of an institution or an artwork in a collection, further contributing to our understanding of an artistic practice, and audience engagement with the work.

In the museum, it is still a nascent process to find the time and resources to engage with, and document, the surrounding narratives of art production in order to meaningfully and strategically fit these into the collection itself. Rather than resting ancillary to the collection, its use is vital and urgent in that it has to capture the thoughts, recollections and anecdotes of artists and related collaborators while they are still alive.

Viewing an artwork in a museum as part of an infinite loop of practice and encounters is reliant on the appreciation that curating has moved into the semantic shift of *the curatorial*. The notion of the curatorial is not only a semantic shift, but also an indication of a move away from curating conducted by a Curator (with a capital 'C'), 'who works at some remove from the process of artistic production to one that embraces a greater number of voices and stages' (Farquharson 2003:8). This development repositions the gaze away from the title of Curator, and discussions on object histories and exhibition-making, towards *the curatorial*, in acknowledgement of its largely in-process nature. Flowing through the veins of the curatorial is a sensorial relationship with the space for presentation and critique, and the relationships the body/bodies have with this space.

Curatorial theorist Jean-Paul Martinon (2013:3) draws a comparison between the concept of *the curatorial* and Wagner's *Gesamtkunstwerk* or Sciabine's

Mysterium, identifying these as the ‘ultimate curatorial event ... an attempt to think “the curatorial” a century or so before the word began to acquire meaning’. Within the framework of the curatorial, the exhibition is not the sole method of display and critique, actively seeking more discursive formats for engagement which do not absolutely rest on the exhibition as medium. Instead, an holistic and inclusive approach is taken which, by its nature, is multi-channel in construction. The curatorial recognises the importance and presence of artists, critics, editors, academics, educators and theoreticians, whose practice through critiquing, creating or contextualising art feeds into and builds upon the curatorial and its understanding. Thus, the voice of the artist, when placed within the framework of the curatorial, is not solely that of the artist; rather it is located in, and contingent on, a polyphony of related practitioners.

Regarding the process of archiving memory and the idea of recollection or *re-collection*, it has been stated that ‘[a] good and accurate memory that can store and retrieve knowledge and experience used to be one of the most desirable attributes of learning and the acquisition of knowledge’ (Gibbons 2007:1). The ability to recollect, (re-collect) information from memory once bore testimony to an individual’s intelligence and standing within a community. However, over time, and with the development of technology which enables us not only to store but also retrieve such information, this ability was no longer *prima facie* evidence of intelligence. The unlocking of information through the medium of conversation, in an attempt to both harness memories and capture history, is woven through this proposed research methodology, through a longitudinal series of conversations in relation to the artworks housed in a museum collection. To quote Ritchie and Wren (1998:10),

this feeds into the idea of talk as a kind of paradoxical experience where to speak, in a public sense, is, in fact, to come into being socially, and yet the product of such an act is ephemeral – unless we happen to be running a tape recorder or some other mechanism that freezes it.

This process of documenting and archiving memory is, and should be, a collective and collaborative process, between the multiple voices making up a patchwork of overlapping practices. Collective memory is acquired through the acceptance of polyphony and the fragmented memories making up a mosaic history. In terms of archiving a future memory, ‘[t]he liquidation of memory has led to a general frenzy of

recording. Within a single generation the imaginary museum of memory has expanded beyond all belief' (Nora 1984:63).

A proposed alternative

One of the core functions of a museum is to protect and preserve the items in its collection. This duty of preservation extends not only to corporal objects, but also incorporeal associated elements which invest the work with value and meaning. Accordingly, value must also be attributed to the oral testimony of artists and relevant specialists. The legacy of institutional critique and relational aesthetics has given rise to a space within the museum for dialogue, in a variety of forms. Museums now employ conversationally orientated events to tap into and add a dialogical layer to their programming. Examples include the Palais de Tokyo commissioning a space 'Three Conversations' by designer Constance Guisset; the project 'In Site of Conversation' at Tate Modern; and the Guggenheim's 'Conversations with Contemporary Artists' series. These are just a few examples of dialogical practices employing a largely conversation-orientated approach. These aforementioned exemplars from practice span the staging, capture and presentation of dialogue respectively.

Taking this line of argument a step further, like the museum, the artist and the creation of their artwork does not exist in a vacuum. As such, the focus rests not only on artists, but also on curators, gallerists, writers and educators who engage with the artist or museum in relation to the acquisition of the artwork(s) for a collection. This process takes time and can either occur as an in-depth scrutiny of the context in which particular artworks were created prior to their arrival in the museum, or can manifest in a more general investment in dialogue with the artist and institutional practitioners of the museum, with a view to unpacking and revealing the various stages involved. Roundtable events, one-to-one recordings, sensitive transcriptions of conversations, video interviews and publications can capture and present the aspects which are revealed through engaging in dialogue with the artist and related practitioners.

Through longitudinal conversations with the artist, the museum and other related practitioners thus far silenced, overlooked or edited, certain elements can be captured and filtered into written accounts of the history not only of the artwork in a collection, but also the artist. Conversation lies at the heart of this process of engagement and information gathering. Conversation is distinguishable from other

forms of inter-human communication by certain attributes relating to the moment of the encounter, namely uncertainty as to outcome; any questions/answers or statements/responses stemming from a close listening to other participants in the conversation; and a flow and rapport which accommodate interruptions, digressions, and even silence (Ross 2014:61).

A museum is not an hermitically sealed entity, and as such is contingent on many organisations and professionals working with the building itself, and its staff. This article explores certain considerations in relation to capturing, displaying and archiving the voice of the artist, with particular care given to oral exchange and dialogically bound material. These considerations relate directly to current post-doctoral research being conducted at the South African National Gallery (SANG). Thus far, the research has allowed for an organic survey of the terrain, in order to focus on key artworks in the collection. Through a series of discursive events (roundtables, salons, ‘in-conversations’ and ‘dialogues’), the author will continue to explore methods for gathering and presenting narratives and perspectives on artworks housed in the collection. While the dialogical processes aimed at collating information relating to artworks can apply to temporary exhibitions and artworks held in the permanent collections of museums, it is to items in the permanent collection of SANG that the focus now shifts. This is in order to gather and record material that can subsequently be housed in the archive of the collection and enhance understanding of artworks for future exhibitions, publications or educational activities. During this process, due consideration will be paid to how best to situate such material within the archival system, in a methodical, accessible and meaningful way.

Although elements of institutional critique are filtered through this exploration, it does not have institutional critique as its core intention. Rather, the rationale is born from a desire to move the focus away from the artwork and towards the artist and their expanded practice, in relation to the creation of artwork. By doing this, the greater context of the production and meaning of the work will be revealed and captured, and will thus filter through into the writing of the history of a collection. Furthermore, as a curatorial strategy, allowing the artwork to speak for itself is not only a misnomer, but also silencing. It is silencing in so far as it cuts off further channels into the work that can be provided by the artist who, if still alive, can be sited alongside voices from the institution, curators, art critics or educators.

The inclusive approach presented here with regard to participant selection is a

result of Becker's (1982) acknowledgement, in his seminal publication *Artworlds*, of a community of participants whose combined activity results in the totality of what the audience is presented with, and thus constitutes art and, indeed, the curatorial. Including voices such as editors, theorists, educators, artists and technicians creates a more accurate picture of how an artwork, exhibition or project comes into being and continues into the future (Becker 1982).

An attempt to capture and present such polyphony within the museum means walking a fine line. Gathering together different voices to create a more accurate picture of the creation and display of an artwork has within it an inherent tension. 'Just like subjective identity constructions, collectives are relational, and are generated by dynamics of antagonistic interaction that manifest themselves via the experience of difference and translation, and shape option-finding processes' (Schlieben 2010:19). Eminently more egalitarian, polyphonic and (crucially) dialogically orientated, this perspective naturally opens up the process of curating and slips over theoretical jurisdictions and cultural practitioners. If viewed as a network of encounters, conversations and recordings, despite the preciousness and distinctiveness of every conversational encounter there should be no panic to record the conversation. Such conversations sit within a plane of polyphonic discourse, and a frantic attempt to capture them may crush them, or, like a butterfly, may scare them off. This also acknowledges the frustrating futility of attempting to capture *everything* in relation to the creation of a work of art.

Following Becker's argument, the museum sits adjacent to other facets of the art world and does not exist in isolation. Drawing the museum closer to the studio, as it relates to the exhibit of contemporary art, allows the voice of the artist to be included. This research draws attention to the severed but real dialectic relationship between the studio and the museum. The intention of this research is to expose the conceptual disconnect between the artwork on display in a museum, and the artistic context of its creation; remedying through extended and documented dialogue. This research coincides with a timely exhibition at SANG, entitled 'Studio'. Although exploring artworks within SANG's collection in relation to the national school art curriculum, this exhibition provides fertile material and context in which to situate such dialogical events.ⁱⁱ

The relative agility of other structures in the art world (fairs, biennales) do not bear a similar weight of expectation as museums do. Conservation and documentation

procedures add layers of bureaucracy and demand ethical standards, meaning that access to collections and creative engagement are hampered. When this is compounded with the time constraints and staff shortages, it is understandable why there are so few examples of creative experimentation with the dialogical and longitudinal engagement with those artists whose artworks they so painstakingly look after for posterity. Issues surrounding institutional collecting process; the context of the creation of the artwork; the development of artistic practice as a longitudinal process as opposed to a series of objects; and the site of display when compared to the site of construction can all be exposed and thus given voice through documentation (audio/visual) and curated discursive events.

Of course this approach has application outside the museum, and indeed has key exemplars from art fairs, biennales and project spaces from which to draw, combining approaches from practice and artist-led methodologies relating to the capture of the voice. Recent examples include Art Basel's extensive programme of talks, many of which were recorded and can be accessed on their website with the 'Conversations & Salon' schedule programmed by Mari Spirito. Frieze Art Fair in London is another example where a key component is associated discursive events highlighting the nexus between the making, display and sale of artwork, with the inclusion of the artist in discussions on their work. Furthermore, the 2016 Cape Town Art Fair featured a series of talks exploring vitally relevant socio-political themes which adeptly traversed the museum, auction house, art studio and public arena. The art fair is distinguishable from the auction house in which the presence of the artist is only barely felt; in no small measure due to the fact that any reported record sale prices do not drop into the pockets of the artist, but rather those of the vendor (Thornton 2009). However, many galleries provide ample opportunity to engage with the artists in their stable, with the 2015 Talking Galleries symposium in Barcelona including presentations by artists Lisa Ruyter and Doria Garcia, alongside gallerists and dealers.ⁱⁱⁱ Often positioned under educational, outreach or public programming activities, these events provide the context in which an artwork may be approached not only within an art-historical framework, but also from the perspective of the artist. Sally Tallant, former Director of Education at the Serpentine Gallery in London, proposed that such activities be approached in terms of integrated programming. Within this concept, the organisation of such events and projects does not rest upon a single department – rather, these forms of dialogue span across the institution and are

considered vital in the overall presentation of the work and engagement with the public(s) (Tallant 2009).

In the context of contemporary artworks acquired by a museum for inclusion in their permanent collection, drawing the studio (the site of creation) closer to the museum (site of long-term conservation and display) allows the object to sit within a wider frame of reference, which crucially includes the voice and intention of the artist. As considered in this article, there are approaches and examples from which to draw, not only to document the dialogical within the museum, but also to approach the capture and presentation of the voice as material form in a sensitive manner, so that it features alongside the collection of artwork to which it refers.

Notes

ⁱ Audio Arts has had a strong methodological influence on the author, and key arguments at the heart of this article extend from the author's recently completed PhD research entitled 'Continuous curatorial conversations: An exploration of the role of conversation within the writing of a supplementary history of the curatorial'. The research included one-to-one recorded conversations with four key people involved in Audio Arts: William Furlong, Mel Gooding, Jean Wainwright and Zoe Irvine (see www.continuous-curatorialconversations.org for each audio recording).

ⁱⁱ Events to take place monthly from April–September 2016 in the South African National Gallery.

ⁱⁱⁱ Art Basel: www.artbasel.com/basel/the-show/; Cape Town Art Fair 2016: <http://www.capetownartfair.co.za/programmes/>; Frieze: www.friezeprojects.org/index.php?/talks/; documentation from previous talking galleries: <http://www.talkinggalleries.com/tg-tv/>

References

- Becker, H.S. 1982. *Art worlds*. California: University of California Press.
- Bourdieu, P. 1991. *Language and symbolic power*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Derrida, J. 1976. *Of grammatology*. Trans. C. Spivak. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Farquharson, A. 2003. I curate, you curate, we curate. *Art Monthly* 269: pp.7-10.
- Gibbons, J. 2007. *Contemporary art and memory: Images of recollection and*

-
- remembrance*. London: I.B. Tauris.
- Jarvella, J.R. and W. Klein, eds. 1982. *Speech, place and action*. Sussex: John Wiley and Sons.
- Martinon, J.P. 2013. *The curatorial: A philosophy of curating*. London and New York: Bloomsbury.
- Neumark, N. 2010. Doing things with voices: Performativity and voice. In *Voice: Vocal aesthetics in digital arts and media*, ed. H. Neumark, R. Gibson and T. van Leeuwen, pp.95-118. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Nora, P. [1984] 2012. Realms of memory. In *Memory*, ed. I. Farr, pp.61-66. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Ritchie, C. and J. Wren, eds. 1998. Talk. In *Public*. Toronto: Public Access, York University.
- Ross, A. 2014. Continuous curatorial conversations: An exploration of the role of conversation within the writing of a supplementary history of the curatorial, PhD thesis, University of Dundee.
- Schlieben, K. 2010. The crux of polyphonic language, or the thing as gathering. In *Manifesta Journal* 8: pp.16-20.
- Steward, A. and B. LaBelle. 2010. Vocal textures. In *Voice: Vocal aesthetics in digital arts and media*, ed. H. Neumark, R. Gibson and T. van Leeuwen, pp.147-172. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Tallant, S. 2009. Experiments in integrated programming. *Tate Papers*, issue 11. <http://www.tate.org.uk/download/file/fid/7285> (accessed 13.06.2016).
- Thornton, S. 2009. *Seven days in the art world*. London: Granta Books.
- Von Kleist, H. 1966. On the gradual formation of thoughts in the process of speech. Trans. C. Harbsmeier. [www.hf.uio.no/ikos/english/research/projects/tls/publications/Kleist\[1\].pdf](http://www.hf.uio.no/ikos/english/research/projects/tls/publications/Kleist[1].pdf) (accessed 13.06.2016).
- Widenheim, C. and M. Kelly, eds. 2011. *Dialogue – on the politics of the voice*. Stockholm: IASPIS.