

# Performance after performance: on the material legacies and their possibilities for transmission

## Daniela Salazar

Instituto de Historia da Arte, Universidade NOVA de Lisboa, Portugal

Orcid: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9661-6306>

## Hélia Marçal

Department of History of Art, University College London, United Kingdom; Instituto de Historia da Arte, Universidade NOVA de Lisboa, Portugal

Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0476-5233>

## Abstract

What is the material legacy of performance artworks? What are the possibilities for those legacies, and how much of that depends on the artist's involvement in the historicisation and institutionalisation of their own works? This paper will reflect on the legacies of performance art and its memories and on the ways the museum and the artist work in the co-production of their material manifestations. It will explore this theme through two complementary perspectives – one of a curator, and one of a conservator, also bringing together the agencies of artists, institutions, and objects themselves. In bridging the workings of the exhibition and the museum's backstage, we aim to provide an integral approach to the material lives of performance artworks and to the manifold of material manifestations of their legacies.

**Keywords:** Material legacy; Reenactment; Museum; Memory.

## Acknowledgements

Thank you to Cláudia Madeira, Rita Macedo, and Margarida Brito Alves for all the meaningful and intellectual exchanges without which this research would not be possible. Thank you to Cildo Meireles for the generosity and availability to participate in this research. The fieldwork research that led to writing this paper and our PhD dissertations were supported by the Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia [Foundation for Science and Technology] [SFRH/BD/90040/2012] [PD/BD/105900/2014].

**PERFORMANCE AFTER PERFORMANCE:**

ON THE MATERIAL LEGACIES AND THEIR POSSIBILITIES FOR TRANSMISSION

**Introduction**

Long gone are the days when performance art seemed to be, by its very nature, in direct contrast with collecting and conservation practices. It is not that performance art was kept out of collections and museum spaces; indeed, traces of performance artworks have inhabited the museum and its various structures since the emergence of the genre in the 1950s (Calonje 2015). With the advent of the acquisition of performance art by museum collections, it is essential to interrogate the legacy of performance artists and their practice in the making of the material future possibilities of those artworks. But, if the idea of legacy is somewhat intertwined with that of a potential future, it is also connected with the inevitability of the artist's ultimate disappearance. In this sense, it becomes crucial to understand the potential futures of performance artworks that are either dependent on contexts or on the artist's involvement for their historicisation and care. What are the possibilities for the legacies of those works?

In this paper, we will explore the material futures of performance artworks in the Deleuzian terms of their *potentiality*. The article focuses specifically on artworks that have the potential of being collected as performance, i.e. as a set of actions that are collected with the intention of being activated in the museum space, and that, so far, have resisted being collected by memory institutions. In this process, we will discuss the place of reenactment in the museum, and how reenactment practices can contribute to the memorialisation of artworks, the preservation of artists' legacies, and the opening of potential futures for these artworks. In the context of this paper, we also expect to challenge perspectives about the legacies of performance art after the performance. Indeed, albeit self-evident that much of what a legacy entails has to do with the ways in which artists and their practice are memorialised, the notion of 'material legacy' seems to be somewhat troubled when we resituate practices of re-enactment in the collecting institutions, putting them at the centre of an inquiry on conservation and memory.

In focusing on performance art practices that, so far, have not been collected, we will be able to discuss the place of memory in the public sphere, and to contextualise the museum, or the collection, as a practice of potential. Specifically, in the case of this paper, we will be illustrating our argument with two artworks by the artist Cildo Meireles (b. 1948, Brazil): *Fiat Lux* (1973-9), and *Inserções em Circuitos Ideológicos: Projeto Cédula* (1975).

While Meireles' *oeuvre* encompass one of the most representative themes of post-war Brazilian avant-garde art - the relationship between «the sensorial and the cerebral, the body and the mind» (Brett and Todolí 2008, 10), some of his artworks, including the two that are being explored in the context of this paper, address political and ethical paradigms, which are, at the same time, specific to the Brazilian culture and representative of practices of oppression and, in varying degrees, visible across various geographies. The activist nature of most of Cildo Meireles practice adds a layer of reflection to the analysis of the potential material futures of these artworks in dialogue with memory institutions<sup>1</sup>.

*O Sermão da Montanha: Fiat Lux*, or «The Sermon on the Mount: Let There Be Light» was a performance work that Cildo Meireles presented in Rio de Janeiro in 1979, in which 126,000 matchboxes were piled up in a mirrored room whose floor was covered with black sandpaper. Five performers, representing bodyguards, then would protect the pile of highly flammable material for 24 hours. This artwork was a metaphor for the flammable times of the dictatorship, where fear was intense and constant (Calirman, 2012).

*Inserções em Circuitos Ideológicos: Projeto Cédula*, or «Insertions in Ideological Circuits: Banknote Project», exists at the intersection of activist practice, performance and mail art. The artist made use of existing circulation systems (in this case, the circulation of money in the economy) to disseminate political messages. The artist stamped political messages (like 'Quem matou o Herzog?', (Who killed Herzog?)) into banknotes only to return them to the economy and, therefore, creating an underground circuit for the circulation of political statements.

Material remains of all of these three artworks currently exist in museum collections. *Fiat Lux* is usually represented by photographs of the inaugural event, and the latest iteration of this artwork is a collectible box, which includes matches, flyers, and sandpaper. Remains of *Inserções em Circuitos Ideológicos: Projeto Cédula* are part of several collections, including Tate, in London (United Kingdom). The degree in which collecting institutions activate these artworks as performance somewhat changes, and those changes are propelled by the interactions between the collecting institution and the artworks. Throughout this paper, the materiality of these works will lead us to understand the limits and possibilities of creating display devices for complex performance-based works, while also making apparent the modalities of participation afforded by museums to the artist and his collaborators in light of the artworks' technical specificities.

Both the activist nature of these works and their material lives play with the idea of *potentiality*. Can the legacies of these performances move from perspectives of endurance and representation, and become materialised, or *actualised* (after Deleuze), in many changing, transient, forms of embodied practice? Is there a way to memorialise these legacies while also allowing them to act?

The paper will first start by discussing the futures of performance, followed by an exploration of the potential of reenactment in destabilising the material formulations that activist performance practice has, so far, had in memory institutions. We will further this argument by suggesting that, through reenactment practices, we see the legacies of performance artworks being actualised in multiple bodies, which are materialised through the relationship artwork-artist-society. Finally, this paper will bring to the fore a proposal for a model of interaction between institution and artist that can bring new perspectives on the legacy of artworks by living artists, one that reflects the inherent changeability of artworks, the artist's values in making them, and the institution's responsibility of keeping them and make them thrive.

### On the futures of performance art

The possible futures of performance art, or the mere possibility of it having a future, are within the widely debated topics emerging from Performance Studies in the last years (Reason 2006). The

recent trend towards performance art incorporation in museum collections can attest how the growing interest in performance art preservation has its repercussions in practice (Wheeler 2003). Despite the outstanding advances of scholarly work regarding performance art's transmission for future generations, there is an evident knowledge gap regarding the conservation of highly contextual performance-based artworks, such as politically-driven works, created in dictatorship, revolutionary or (post)colonial contexts. That is the case of the two artworks by Meireles that we are exploring here.

Artworks that intertwine with activist practice can have many material and conceptual formulations. Their ability to continue to activate social worlds, or to act, is both material and context-specific. The closest definition to the political discourse being proposed by Cildo Meireles through these works has been proposed by the Cuban artist Tania Bruguera (b. 1968, Cuba), who refers to these artworks as 'political-timing specific'. This term makes clear these artworks' positioning in time and space, and how that time and space are built into the political. In an essay in *Art Forum*, Bruguera defines 'political-timing specific' artworks as part of a genre that «not only confronts power with its own tools but creates a temporary juncture where those in power do not know how to respond to others' defining what is political» (Bruguera 2009, n.p.n.). The artist defines it as a form of political resistance, that can only happen in the liminal space between a crisis and the adoption of mainstream power moves. She states:

The window opens and closes very quickly: You have to enter with precision, during a brief moment when political decisions are not yet fixed, implemented, or culturally accepted. Political-timing-specific artworks happen in the space between the imaginary of a new political reality and politicians' existing control of that imaginary. Political-timing-specific art exists within the time it takes for those in power to react. (Bruguera 2019)

For the art historian and art critic Claire Bishop, the term 'political-timing specific' seems to be particularly evident in Bruguera's early works such as *Homenaje a Ana Mendieta* (Tribute to Ana Mendieta) (1985–96), created after the death of Mendieta<sup>2</sup>, or *Memoria de la postguerra* (Postwar Memory) (I in 1993 and II in 1994), where Bruguera juxtaposed the period of crisis that led many artists and intellectuals to leave the country during *el periodo especial* (1989 – the end of the 1990s) with the trauma of postwar (Bishop 2019) Works by other artists also clearly speak to the space in-between a crisis and a process of assimilation (Bishop 2019)<sup>3</sup>, like Cildo Meireles' *Insertions into Ideological Circuits – Project Banknote* (1970). In an interview, Cildo Meireles talked about the relation of this work with time, stating that «the work only exists in the present continuous, when it is circulating» (Balbi 2019, n.p.n.), making evident the relationship between art and politics by means of aesthetical operations that are, indeed, timing-specific. In discussing how politics intertwines with his artistic creations, Meireles further mentions that the totality of his *oeuvre* is neither absolutely conceptual nor absolutely political:

I despise any form of pamphleteering in art, which is the risk we run when art is politically biased. So I don't think the political situation was my generation's motivating element, and even less so in my case. I do, however, acknowledge that some of my work is political (...). While my works are not politically motivated, they may become political at certain moments, or under certain circumstances – regardless of my will. When I made my first *Inserções em Circuitos Ideológicos* I

stopped drawing for about five years. At that point, I was living in New York (1971–3) and went to see an exhibition of Matisse's work at MoMA. My eyes welled up. I began to rethink the importance of art and to reflect on the role played by museums in the democratisation of culture. (Meireles and Morais 2008, n.p.n.)

The expression of *Insertions into Ideological Circuits – Project Banknote* is, therefore, intertwined with time while also unfolding both in significance and materiality as time goes by and the political landscape changes. The artist has revisited this work in 2012 and in 2019. In 2012, Meireles stamped the banknotes with sentences that read «Porquê Celso Daniel foi assassinado?» [*Why was Celso Daniel killed?*] and «Porquê Toninho do PT foi assassinado?» [*Why was PT's Toninho murdered?*]<sup>4</sup>, echoing the deaths of these politicians linked to the scandal of *Mensalão*. In 2019, Meireles questioned the suspicious death of Marielle Franco in 2018<sup>5</sup>. A stamp featuring Franco's picture was also put side-by-side with the profile of a woman embodying the symbol of the republic, juxtaposing ideals of activism, struggle, and democracy itself.

The actualisation of *Insertions* by Meireles, on the one hand, responds to what Bruguera came to define as 'political-timing specific', with the artist's legacy being intertwined with the multiple possible iterations of this work across time. On the other hand, in redefining the discursive prompts in this work, Meireles also reframes its aesthetic possibilities in the museum: how does the expanding life of *Insertions* relate with that of the remains of past actions that are now in museum collections? Can the legacy of this artwork exist in a given, static, format, or is its legacy intertwined with that of circulation devices, economic reproduction, and new agents in forms of political violence and oppression?

### Collecting the political, or the legacies of performance

Part of the process of preserving artworks like *Insertions into Ideological Circuits* is to account for the changes in how the artworks change over time, and to accept that their materiality needs to convey a moment in time and a situation that keeps challenging any type of normativity. To give an example, Cildo Meireles' banknotes that ask «Who killed Herzog?» provide a glimpse into a past political action, functioning almost as a historical document of a practice that no longer exists. The banknotes that ask «Who killed Marielle Franco?», on the other hand, are a site of political statement and protest, which gain ever more relevance in the context of the current ruling. In keeping with the form, but reframing temporality in the actual object, Meireles is bringing the artwork to a site of ongoing political action, activating it once more. Tania Bruguera also reflects on this dichotomy in her *Art Forum* article. In her own words:

Form is defined in political-timing-specific art by the political sensibility of the time and place for which it is made. Thus, political consequences become the artwork's meaning and content. Form and content are interdependent, linked to the specificity of a political moment. Any political change requires a reevaluation of the form used to produce political art. (Bruguera 2019, n.p.n.)

We already see how art institutions sometimes struggle to acknowledge a work that, by the means of its production, needs to have its materiality revitalised and updated. When these artworks are incorporated in museum collections, with few exceptions, they are usually transformed into

fixed and institutionalised entities, which do not respect *liveness* from the original context of creation (cf. Madeira, Salazar and Marçal, 2018). That is the case, when they are incorporated as installations, or when performance is presented as documentation (Calonje 2015, Madeira et al. 2018). In both cases, decisions are often made *a priori*, with, until recently, institutions struggling to consider reenactments as means for transmission, due to their association with the idea of fake or appropriation (Lepecki 2016). Whenever they are indeed acquired and shown as performance, issues relating to where and how the artwork can be activated, and what are the consequences of its activism/activation become ever more important. These works, as mentioned by Claire Bishop, function differently in different contexts and times, and some of the things they ought to activate simply do not exist in some parts of the world:

(...) there is a certain awkwardness to translating political timing specificity to our own milieu. It seems obvious that such interventions will look very different in Cuba, China, and Russia than in so-called liberal democracies, where culture is less micromanaged and dissent has (at least until recently) been viewed as healthy. This difference is manifest in the respective terminologies by which we label opposition: The dissident in authoritarian regimes is referred to here as an activist. Political timing specificity sits between these positions, dissident and activist, yet differs from both, because it seeks to expose contradiction rather than to express indignation or propose solutions (Bishop 2019).

Although the un-transposability of the milieu of activist practice to other temporal or spatial geographies would be particularly relevant when thinking about some political-timing specific artworks – such as *Tatlin's Whisper #6 (Havana Version)*, created by Tania Bruguera in 2009 and now part of the collection of the Guggenheim Museum - some artworks by Cildo Meireles contest this proposition. That is the case of the performance/ installation *Fiat Lux*. This artwork operates through the ambiguity of being inserted in a museum or gallery space, which is deemed safe, clean, neutral, while also posing substantial danger, risk, and discomfort to everyone that enters such space. The sandpaper on the floor, which causes the visitor to create a scratch sound with each step, is juxtaposed with 126,000 matches that are placed right at the centre of the gallery. Sentences from the *Sermon of the Mountain*, induce an act of judgement about the righteousness of audiences, who read those words while also looking to themselves in the mirrored surface. The performers, posing as security officers, not only restrain the movements of visitors by impact their fruition of the space of the matchboxes, but they also exert psychological pressure, making clear to anyone that steps into that space that they do not belong there, and that they are being watched, and will be restricted if need. This space, this artwork, is not for them.

Having been created in 1979, in the middle of the oppressive dictatorial regime in Brazil, this artwork emerged and developed in a very particular political context. Certainly, the feelings of fear, surveillance, risk are not comparable to the ones felt by the visitors who attended the inaugural event of *Fiat Lux* in Rio de Janeiro. But, while the temporal and emotional specificity of this work is at play in defining its possible material legacies, we argue that it should not be seen as an impediment to practices of memorialisation.

This artwork is currently absent from museum collection, having mostly been shown as ephemera and photographic documentation. Could the political context of the emergence of this

work be the reason why it, so far, has been absent as an installation in the retrospective exhibitions related to Meireles' *oeuvre*? And how do these absences impact the potential of the legacy of *Fiat Lux*?

The question of what to acquire and in which ways comes to the fore. Is it for museums to acquire artworks that are to be shown in places where they still work in that liminal space between protest and dissent? Would that mean that the works can only be put on display in contexts where they maintain that practice? What happens to these works when they cease to activate some sort of political action? And who is to decide if the context is right, and if the artwork worked or not as a political device? These questions have direct repercussions in how the artwork is managed as part of a collection, the conditions for lending the work, and the possibilities for its many futures.

The risk posed by displaying *Fiat Lux* - which, in itself, is also about risk - is undeniable. Health and Safety measures could easily justify the need to withdraw 126,000 matchboxes from a contained, interior space, with some very valuable artworks in adjacent rooms. Moreover, it is possible that the behaviour Meireles incites in the people who come into the space of *Fiat Lux* is not desirable by many venues. *Fiat Lux* is, after all, a space of unpredictability, a space where authority (and autocracy) and fatality are intertwined. The visitor is quickly left with no ground on how to operate within and with this installation. The fear of causing a spark and burning the all building, or of being reprimanded by the very threatening security guards that are keeping the order in such space, would create a sense of fragility that could make even the most confident museum visitor apprehensive (cf. Meireles 2009). It is through this dichotomy between order and resistance, that Meireles contests what means to be safe in a museum. In this process, however, the artist is also framing his legacy as one of contestation and activism, questioning the museum as a place for those practices.

In reflecting on the place of the museum in practices of contestation and protest, or how the museum and other collecting institutions can foster the legacy of these projects, allowing them to both continue to be *act*-ivated and participating in *act*-ivist forms of artistic practice, we are exploring the notion of reenactment in the context of performance studies.

## On Reenactments

Performance art reenactments consist of informed embodiments of a performance artwork after the 'original' event. Perhaps due to the clear subjective perspective of their becoming, reenactments, on one hand, can also be seen as a false testimony of the performance event (or an unauthentic one) (Bishop 2019). On the other hand, theorists in the field of Performance Studies consider reenactments as «an activity that preserves heritage through ritualized behavior [sic], adding fruitful contributions to history as long as they are not based on a premise of 'retrievable original meaning and artistic intentionality» (Jones 2012, 16). Rebecca Schneider, for example, one of the main precursors of the development of the concept within the field of Performance Studies, refers to reenactment as to a revision and, in that sense, as to an «act of survival» (Schneider 2011, 7). Although the idea of reenactment as a way to pursue the survival of this genre is particularly

relevant for the current discussion about performance art conservation, it is essential to understand how they differ from documents.

Reenactments differ from performance art documents both at the time of their creation (documents can be produced during the event, while reenactments are always created *a posteriori*) and in the way they are embodied. While documents tend to follow what is considered to be the traditional logic of 'the archive', the inscriptional forms of reenactments are less tangible and, for that reason, often considered more transient and subjective (Reason 2007, Calonje 2015). Like documents, performance art reenactments can be seen as another partial text – having the original event as referent – that need to be confirmed by an act of reception. Similarly, they can also be regarded as embodied mnemonic resources of the performance artwork. If documents exist as material remains of the performance artwork, from photos and videos to narratives, technical or legal documents, reenactments can be considered embodied versions of the work. They can be considered as the only way to restore the *practice* of the performance art event, which is only recovered and iterated through what André Lepecki, drawing on Deleuze's terminology, calls '*actualisation*' (Lepecki 2016).

*Actualising* practice, making it current, and consolidating the embodied knowledge that emerges from it, is essential in the case of performance art. Performance art is transmitted through practice, as there is no way to communicate a particular gesture, an aesthetic gaze, or the experience of entering a repressive environment, in any inscriptional form. In this sense, as documents cannot capture what is not written, not said or not seen, embodied knowledge is a complement to the archive, which is made of all the inscriptional forms that can be captured and stored. This embodied knowledge, balanced between the unsayable and the unsaid (Agamben 2002), the disruptive anarchy and the rhizomatic growth, has been called *repertoire*. Diana Taylor, Performance Studies theorist and founder of The Hemispheric Institute of Performance and Politics, coined the term *repertoire* in opposition to the notion of the archive — broadly understood as 'stable' inscriptional form of memory (Taylor 2003, 20). In this sense, if one considers these conceptual demarcations, reenactments can be seen as a way to transmit the unstable and precarious repertoire of performance-based artworks. While documents tend to express the colonial views of the power systems they represent (Foucault 2002), reenactment also serves as a means to recover alternative and suppressed narratives, which are often concealed by archives more concerned with amplifying their own (official) version of history.

Reenactments thus influence not only the way performance art is preserved or historicized, but also demand a sense of perspective regarding official and neoliberal uses of history. To use André Lepecki's words, reenactments work as 'chronopolitical operations', essential to oppose the «neoliberal impetus to never look back, as if any longing for the past was a mere expression of infantile, regressive, or naïf nostalgia» (Lepecki 2016, 27). In this sense, more than providing a glimpse of the past, they act as sites of critical study of our past interactions in a local and global perspective, as an instrument to resist (or counter-resist) official and normative narratives. This view would be in line with what the Performance Studies theorist Louis van den Hengel calls the act of *return*. Van den Hengel proposes that the afterlife of performance art can be seen as memory devices that can be expressed «through particular bodies and individuals», and yet, «cannot be

contained in any single place but rather operates by way of affective interconnections or creative encounters» (van den Hengel 2017, 127). In this sense, as van den Hengel puts it, memory itself «works as a performative practice» (van den Hengel 2017, 127). It is, therefore, possible to think of reenactments as the potential to develop the 'still non-exhausted creative fields of impalpable possibilities' of the past performance artworks (Lepecki 2010, 31). But in which ways can reenactments be utilised to activate the performative momentum promoted by *Insertions*, or the political environment instigated by *Fiat Lux*? Moreover, how can reenactments in museums participate in the construction of the legacy of 'political-timing specific' artworks inside and outside their collections?

Practices of memorialisation expressed through reenactments indeed promote some of the possibilities that emerge from the process of going back and yet, being always in the present. This form of 'chronopolitical operation', as Lepecki puts it, is also one that assists museums in reframing procedures of care around these political-timing specific artworks, contesting, in the process, the limits of the material legacy of performance art. There are, however, other aspects in museum practice that are not quite so explicit and that create structures of fixation that hamper the possibilities for these artworks to change. If we adopt a Foucaultian and Agambenian perspective about the museum, this project of reenactment can directly oppose the prospect of these institutions as confinement devices. In this sense, the legacy of artworks such as *Fiat Lux* and *Insertions into Ideological Circuits* is inevitably prone to become static, self-contained, and controlled by the museum. On the other hand, museums and other memory institutions can continue the steps pioneered in the 20th century, and that led to the collection of installations, video art, or other performance-based artworks that directly contradict existing processes, procedures, and structures. Indeed, if museums, inasmuch as reenactments, suffer from an inherent anachronistic nature, existing in a liminal state between the past and the future, would not be the case that such intrinsic liminality could be *actualised* through forms of activism? Is the museum not already recognised as an inherently politicised place of experience?<sup>5</sup> And, if so, can the purpose of experience in museum, which has, so far, been formatted around forms of curatorial practice that are somewhat intertwined with forms of economic growth and the creation of social capital, be reformatted to acknowledge the potential of memorialising activist practice in artist's legacies?

## Conclusions

The present essay intends to interpellate the concept of legacy through the multiple perspectives, not only in the way that the artist conceives the futures of their works, but also the way that these legacies are activated or transformed by both the institution and the artist. The works of Cildo Meireles bring to this discussion an important gaze through the dichotomies of the spaces of emergence of legacies of activist artistic practice in the museum as part of the public sphere.

In the way of trying to define what the artists legacies mean in the contemporary artistic practices pertaining to activism and performance, we intertwined the notion of legacy with that of survival; and such survival, we propose, is operated through reenactment. In this essay, we have explored the potential of reenactment for recovering counter-narratives of the legacy of

performance art in museums, which are usually seen as contained and static spaces. Reenactments appear as memory practices, which, instead of repeating (oppressive and male- and Western-centric) historical narratives, diffract history in different bodies, perspectives, and memories. In this sense, reenactments are forms of preservation that recall embodied and inscriptional archives, often resulting in interchanging spaces between conservation and curatorial practices. They are forms of contestation in themselves, therefore, they remember both the liminality and insubordinate nature nurtured in the original event, and multiply the instances of political dissent, adapting the form of the performance to acknowledge various political circumstances. These elements comply with and embody the possibility of an actualisation and (re)activation of these political and artistic legacies, while fostering their potential of transformation and interpellation with each exhibition context. The concept of legacy, therefore, rests here in a performative domain, one that embraces the constant mutation of the meanings of artworks, and engages with the idea that the original event is precisely that: the start of a life full of expected and unexpected transformations, of turning points that lead to unstable and successive acts of recreation.

## Bibliography

Agamben, Giorgio. 2002. *Remnants of Auschwitz: The Witness and the Archive*, trans. by Daniel Heller-Roazen, New York: Zone Books.

Balbi, Clara. 2019. Em Nova Exposição, Cildo Meireles questiona morte de Marielle. In *GZH Cultura e Lazer*, URL: [//gauchazh.clicrbs.com.br/cultura-e-lazer/noticia/2019/09/em-nova-exposicao-cildo-meireles-questiona-morte-de-marielle-ck0zqmjkd00oh01mtlaq1b9mm.html](http://gauchazh.clicrbs.com.br/cultura-e-lazer/noticia/2019/09/em-nova-exposicao-cildo-meireles-questiona-morte-de-marielle-ck0zqmjkd00oh01mtlaq1b9mm.html) (accessed in 12 February 2020).

Bishop, Claire. May 2019. Rise to the occasion. *Art Forum*, n.p.n. URL: <https://www.artforum.com/print/201905/claire-bishop-on-the-art-of-political-timing-79512> (accessed in 12 February 2020).

Brett, Guy (ed.). 2009. *Cildo Meireles*, Barcelona, MACBA.

Bruguera, Tania. May 2019. Notes on political timing specificity. *Art Forum*, n.p.n. URL: <https://www.artforum.com/print/201905/notes-on-political-timing-specificity-79513> (accessed in 12 February 2020).

Calirman, Claudia. 2012. *Brazilian Art During Dictatorship: Antonio Manuel, Artur Barrio, and Cildo Meireles*. London: Duke University Press.

Foucault, Michel. 1977 [1975]. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. by Alan Sheridan London: Penguin Books.

Foucault, Michel. 2002 [1969], *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, trans. by A. M. Sheridan Smith. London / New York: Routledge.

Jones, Amelia. 2012. The Now and the Has Been: Paradoxes of Live Art in History. In *Perform, Repeat, Record: Live Art in History*, ed. by Amelia. Jones and Adrian, pp. 9-25. Heathfield, Bristol: Intellect Books, Ltd.

Lepecki, André. 2010. The Body as Archive: Will to Re-Enact and the Afterlives of Dance. *Dance Research Journal*, n° 42(2): 28-48. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S014976770001029>.

Lepecki, André. 2016. *Singularities: Dance in the Age of Performance*, London and New York: Routledge.

Madeira, Cláudia, Daniela Salazar, and Hélia Marçal. 2018. Performance art temporalities: relationships between Museum, University, and Theatre. *Museum Management and Curatorship*, 33(1): 79-95, doi: 10.1080/09647775.2017.1419828.

- Marçal, Hélia Pereira. 2017. Conservation in an era of participation. *Journal of the Institute of Conservation*, 40(2): 97-104, doi: 10.1080/19455224.2017.1319872.
- Meireles, Cildo, and F. Morais. 2008. Interview: Material language – Cildo Meireles I. In *Tate Etc.*, edited by Bice Curiger and Simon Grant, 14. Available at: <http://www.tate.org.uk/context-comment/articles/material-language>.
- Reason, Matthew. 2006. *Documentation, Disappearance and the Representation of Live Performance*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Schneider, Rebecca. 2011. *Performing Remains: Art and War in Times of Theatrical Reenactment*, New York: Routledge.
- Taylor, Diana. 2003. *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas*. Durham / London: Duke University Press.
- Van den Hengel, Louis. 2017. Archives of Affect: Performance, Reenactment, and the Becoming of Memory. In *Materializing Memory in Art and Popular Culture*, ed. by Laszlo Muntean, Liedeke Plate and Anneke Smelik, pp. 125-142. London / New York: Routledge.
- van Saaze, Vivian. 2015. In the Absence of Documentation: Remembering Tino Sehgal's Constructed Situations. *Revista de História da Arte*, 4: 55-63. URL: <http://revistaharte.fcsh.unl.pt/rhaw4/RHAW4.pdf> (accessed 13 November 2019).
- Von Hantelmann, Dorothea. 2014. The Experiential Turn. In *Living Collections Catalogue*, ed. by Elizabeth Carpenter, n.p.n. Minneapolis: Walker Art Center.
- Wheeler, Britta B. 2003. The Institutionalization of an American Avant-Garde: Performance Art as Democratic Culture, 1970-2000. *Sociological Perspectives*, 46 (4): 491-512.

---

NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Memory institutions are, in this context, a set of different places and discourses, which have the main goal of mediating these futures and the role of the memory in the transmission, actualisation and (re)activation processes of this artworks and his practices (in the case of Cildo Meireles). In this sense, the museum where his works are incorporated, but also the place of an exhibition, its archive and, also, the public sphere are memory repositories of their contexts, practices, materials and historical and cultural dissonances.

<sup>2</sup> According to Bishop, Bruguera also actively reenacted works by Ana Mendieta during years after Mendieta's death, actively inscribing her works in art history. See Bishop 2019.

<sup>3</sup> In her essay, Claire Bishop identifies 'political timing specific' art as being characteristic of Latin American actions created during the recent periods of dictatorship. She provides examples such as Brazilian collective *3Nós3*, the Chilean group *Colectivo Acciones de Arte*, or the Cuban collective *Arte Calle*.

<sup>4</sup> Celso Augusto Daniel (1951-2002) was a Brazilian politician from the Workers political party (PT). He was the mayor of Santo André, and was murdered on the 18th of January of 2002. All of the witnesses of his kidnapping and murder died between 2002 and 2005. Antônio da Costa Santos (1952-2001), known as 'Toninho do PT' was a Brazilian politician from the Workers political party (PT), mayor of Campinas. He was murdered on the 10th of September of 2002.

<sup>5</sup> Marielle Franco was a politician, activist, and outspoken critic of police brutality. She was murdered by two individuals, who shot her and her driver multiple times in the middle of a traffic jam.

<sup>6</sup> If it is true that the practice of reenactment evokes other ways of thinking the museum practices by questioning its temporalities or the crystallized knowledge and histories, it is also responsible for reinforcing this tendency of a place of experiences that is growing in the museum institution, not just as a living place, but a place of this new 'experience economy'. This topic falls beyond this essay's scope. For more on this see Von Hantelmann (2014).