

## THE EXHIBITION AND THE EXHIBITION EXHIBITION, EXHIBITION

ADAM CARR

### *The Exhibition: a Walkthrough of the History of Display*

To exhibit means to display something publicly, particularly a work of art or, outside of the visual arts, an anthropological object or, in fact, any item of interest, in an art gallery or museum. While this has been occurring for centuries globally, in the loosest sense, the earliest roots of exhibitions could be said to be found in the early development of mankind, when cave paintings were employed to convey meaning and to communicate with other human beings on a regular basis.

While the format of the exhibition and the display to which we are more accustomed today (that is, art works, objects outside of the visual arts and related material presented in a place designed for the purpose) has been in place since the inception of the museum and gallery space, its transformation over time, with its varying and diverging form and its multi-faceted and, at times, contradictory meaning, has rarely been analysed, let alone, challenged.

Perhaps the history of the exhibition (its staging and methods of display, in particular) has been so little studied because few radical changes, whether formally or conceptually, have occurred. However, why is this so, one might ask?

The defining moment of the exhibition arrived when the presentation and display of a selected group of items transposed from a private activity to a public one; where, fundamentally, a display of objects confronted an audience and established a sphere in which the public would specifically visit a place in order to experience such a display. Before this shift, however, the homes of the bourgeois were the sites where early signs of the exhibition began to manifest, as art and other objects collected and acquired during their travels were displayed within.

Evidence for the early transformation of a private display to a public one can be seen in the Cabinet of Curiosities, also known as the *Wunderkammer* (the Cabinet of Wonder) – depending on its origin. These cabinets provide a historical backdrop to the public display of art as it is acknowledged today, and a significant precedent to the museum. Known for their display of objects belonging to natural history, geology, ethnography, archaeology, in addition to works of art, they were seen to instil knowledge, educating those who viewed them.

Ferrante Imperato, an Italian apothecary, is an early example of someone who used the Cabinet of Curiosities to show his collection of natural history during the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Arranged and ordered with minimal gaps between objects, utilising every inch of available space, Imperato's display (which

included his collection of minerals and fossils, his herbarium, shells and sea creatures and his library of books) embodied all that is central to and defines the Cabinet of Curiosities: while seemingly overflowing and without any apparent order, the placement and grouping of objects reflected particular classifications based on each of their origins.

Other notable examples of the Cabinet of Curiosities are those of the Danish physician and antiquary, Olaus Wormius. During the late sixteenth and through to the mid-seventeenth century Wormius displayed a variety of objects, including a collection of taxidermy, native artefacts, fossils and books.

For the viewing public, Imperato's and Wormius's cabinets provided entertainment, education or even solace. While they grew from chiefly separate yet related interests (Imperato specialising in herbarium and Wormius in fossils), they are the first examples of how a visual display of objects simultaneously creates meaning and delivers knowledge. Indeed, in addition to appealing to a viewing public through curiosity, the displays broke new ground for scientific research when they emerged as successful and highly innovative vehicles for pedagogy. The cabinets of this period not only set a new paradigm for the exhibition of objects (which would, of course, later be revisited, critically re-examined and also entirely revised and discarded), but also demonstrated that any exhibition has the capacity to educate and to communicate with a viewer. Perhaps most of all, however, they claimed an entirely new form of visual entertainment that was also enriching.

While the Cabinet of Curiosity was central to the development of exhibition making and the presentation of art – and perhaps these two crucial elements of the visual arts would not be the same today without them – in reality, access to them was limited to very few. Essentially, the cabinets were more private than the museum – they were the product of an individual's acquisition of objects of interest, which, as it seems by extension, captured only a select public's attention. Interestingly, if we think about what the museum is defined and distinguished by, it could be said that those cabinets established and maintained by collectors like Imperato and Wormius were museums in themselves.

Building on this innovation of engaging the public with works of art and other objects of interest, a separation occurred around the late seventeenth century whereby both the concept and manifestation of an exhibition of works of art were reaching a much larger audience. The exhibition was gaining recognition as a place for the public to visit. Notably, it was the Paris Salon (held initially at the Académie des Beaux-Arts – the Academy of Fine Arts – then at the Palais du Louvre, later moving to the Palais des Champs Élysées – that brought about this change.

Sociologically too, the salons were of great historical importance as they played a key role in the shaping of a public sphere. They were first established on the premise that they would exhibit the works of recent Académie des Beaux-Arts graduates; however, the salon outgrew this remit. The focus shifted nationally when it moved to the Palais du Louvre and accepted works by a wide variety of artists.

Vital though they were to the history of the presentation of art and the staging of exhibitions (and indeed for modern-day display strategies and exhibition making as a whole), the actual display used throughout each salon did not diverge from that of the Cabinets of Curiosity, as outlined above. Whether at the first public presentation, at the Palais du Louvre (to cater for a larger audience) or at the salons, established later by the Impressionists, the works of art (then comprising just paintings and sculptures) were placed floor-to-ceiling on every space available – a so-called wallpaper effect. The lack of space between one piece and another with this sort of presentation suggests a desire to fuse together the works of art to shape a perceivable whole. The viewer is thus compelled to consider the entirety of the space before singling out any individual work. It seems that few rules were put into place for establishing a display; the only discernible one being, perhaps, to celebrate as many works of art as possible, potentially even (albeit only retrospectively) to the detriment of each work as a single entity.

The flooding of galleries with works of art in the seventeenth century appears entirely devoid of any consideration, sense of selection or logical arrangement, though ironically, the sheer number of works shown in the salons was, in fact, the result of choice by an appointed jury. Considering this again in relation to the present day, the wallpaper effect seems to relate to the use of the exhibition as an artistic medium, which we see much of today and which will be addressed later in this essay. However, like all that is evolutionary, the format and display of the exhibition that we see today did not arrive suddenly. The display as an entity described earlier was still prevalent throughout the seventeenth and right up into the twentieth century. In this light, it could be the most dominating force of display in the history of the exhibition (though with some changes evident in regard to the selection of art works – and the criteria thereof) and crucial in altering the way in which art is perceived, interpreted and understood. Although it seems the wallpaper effect gave rise to a critical judgment: why would one artist be placed so high up, so out of sight, while another's works of art were positioned where they could be fully viewed and considered? Presentation and the decision-making process behind it must have been becoming a point of discussion.

In 1855, a submission of the French Realist figurehead, artist Gustave Courbet, was partially rejected by the Exposition Universelle in Paris due to lack of space. As a result, Courbet took matters into his own hands, displaying the snubbed paintings in his own adjacent gallery, which he named the Pavilion of Realism. This led to a shift not only in how the public perceived and interpreted works of art, but also for the exhibition as a paradigm and format. No longer did the public consider an exhibition to be based on a selection of works by different artists with contrasting styles. The arena of the exhibition now represented a more refined and considered model, displaying works by a single artist. Thus, the focus shifted from a group of artists to an individual one and a more studied approach to presentation ensued. Artists began to take more control over the manner in which their works were both displayed and arranged, cognizant that works of art were now being interpreted in relation to each other, and aware that the consequences of display and its effects on the viewer were now considered important. This meant that the trajectory of an artist's career and any changes it may have undergone were now evidencing. Thus, while the group exhibition had the advantage of bringing a great variety of artists together, and, albeit

perhaps unintentionally at this stage, casting a wider net of meaning, the monographic exhibition was here to stay, paving the way for a display format that was about giving more space between works of art, individualising them on the stage of the exhibition and thus orientating the viewer's gaze differently, and with more focus.

Still, however, this process continued to unfold at a relatively slow pace. The display of exhibitions never truly or suddenly broke away from past practice; shifts were always slight in that they remained undetected by the viewer, not acknowledged nor engaged with, at least until much later in history.

A notable example of a clear desire to change known display strategies and the overall installation of exhibitions was demonstrated by the artist El Lissitzky, who made this as much a part of his work as the paintings for which he is most celebrated. El Lissitzky, a key player in the Russian avant-garde, focused on the environment of the exhibition space, forming a dialogue between his pieces and the space in which they would be exhibited. His *Proun* environment, for example, conceived in Grosse Berliner Kunstausstellung in 1923, demonstrates the use and treatment of the exhibition space as a medium in itself. Using the gallery space as a starting point, El Lissitzky had the work of art escape from its traditional frame to merge with the very structure that supported it – the wall. In turn, he addressed the work of art three dimensionally, forming an installation that immersed and enveloped the viewer. This, ultimately, made the architecture of the space a part of the work of art itself, whereas previously it was the art work that was of primary importance; the space in which it was exhibited now took on a significant role in its own right. Soon recognised as a designer of exhibitions, in addition to retaining his established status as an artist, El Lissitzky would extend his engagement with the exhibition space and display of art. He went on to design a room for the exhibition of abstract art at the Internationale Kunstausstellung in Dresden in 1926 and the following year, the Abstraktes Kabinett at the Landesmuseum of Hannover. The latter, however, demonstrates the extent of his pioneering influence in the display of art. His contribution to Hannover was made possible by the museum's then director, Alexander Dorner, somebody whose career was also built on a desire continually to open new avenues in the interpretation of art, art display and the museum. Dorner clearly acknowledged that in order for the display of art to be refreshed, and for art and the museum to engage with a public in new ways, help would be needed from artists. This was something he saw El Lissitzky fulfilling and delivering, and which – with Dorner's help – he did.

If El Lissitzky eschewed the customs of exhibition display for a refreshed and more advanced model, Marcel Duchamp was to take it further still. Duchamp, responsible for nothing short of revolutionising art and people's concept of it (which is still true today) also re-examined and transformed the exhibition. In 1938, he organised and curated the *International Exposition of Surrealism* at the Galerie des Beaux-Arts in Paris. For this, rather than simply selecting a number of works by other artists and exhibiting them, he conceived the display of the exhibition in its entirety, following an invitation from the poet Paul Éluard and Surrealist leader André Breton to do so. In much the same way as he approached his art, Duchamp, at ease in his role of curator/exhibition designer, revised and revamped the whole exhibition concept. His vision saw the Galerie des Beaux-Arts transformed as twelve hundred coal

bags were suspended from the ceiling of every room, covering lights and darkening every space. New meaning was generated for the art works displayed, allowing the public to read them differently in these new and alternative conditions.

Duchamp's move served as a framework for other participating artists to engage with, inspiring Man Ray, for example, to request that all of the gallery lights be turned off (those not already blocked by Duchamp's coal bags) and for flashlights to be handed to the viewing public. While it might seem that Duchamp's act was concerned solely with forming a total work of art, in a similar spirit to El Lissitzky before him, his intention was to establish a physical closeness between the audience and the works of art on display. By staging the works in the way that he did, Duchamp disregarded most of the then accepted conditions of viewing and threw away the rules of engagement with art that had been firmly established by the Paris salons.

Duchamp's exercise in combining the visual and the cerebral with respect to art viewing broadened the concept of art, the exhibition space and – crucially – display, and was given a second opportunity to manifest itself in 1942. Held in the Whitelaw Reid Mansion in New York, the first international presentation of Surrealism *First Papers of Surrealism* was the occasion and, once again, André Breton invited Duchamp to play a part. This time, his input was the installation *Sixteen Miles of String*, focused on a ball of white string, displayed along the gallery over the artworks. Duchamp used this to weave a three-dimensional web throughout the exhibition space, in some cases almost entirely obscuring the displayed works (all by other artists – mostly paintings hung on temporary display screens). This created a barrier between the works and their audience, Duchamp's intention being to reposition the viewer's body in relation to the works on display.

Conventions of art viewing were turned on their heads. While some artists may well have complained that Duchamp's installations compromised observation of their creations, his work, in fact, aided the evolution of art beyond anything those artists could ever have imagined, forcing viewers to bring themselves physically nearer to the works to enable closer scrutiny of them. Perhaps as well, Duchamp's design, or rather redesign, of the exhibition – both the space and the staging – was making clear the curatorial implications of bringing works of art by different artists together. That is, that works of art will always form a dialogue and a web of inter-relationships when displayed and viewed as such.

By now art had moved well away from the salon and Beaux-Arts style of display, including the framing of art works which, as it could be remarked due to their size, are as much part of the work as the painting or drawing itself, while others might mention the frame's ability to arrest the work and shape the viewer's judgment of it. Artists and curators had become more familiar with the concept of the display as a vehicle for communicating ideas inherent in the art works by suggesting to the viewer a certain way of looking at an exhibition and evaluating the works therein. The placement and arrangement of works in exhibitions had also become more organised. They were now installed according to various styles and other classifications, so that the exhibition (specifically the group format) was called upon to deliver a theme, an argument, a concept and curatorial vision – in sum, a discourse of display. Exhibitions had turned

from mere event spectacles to a means of expression, enabling serious discussion and debate and communicating to the public with as much insight and meaning as the works of art within them. This was, of course, thanks to the historically important examples above, which provided the building blocks for this change to take place.

While display strategies diversified over time, artists and curators were also exploring the conceptual and pedagogical roles of exhibition making. Exhibitions were established as an artistic material in their own right. One of the most significant examples, an exhibition by Yves Klein, focused, as El Lissitzky had done, on the phenomenological aspects of exhibition viewing, revealing how a particular method of display can both influence our comprehension of art works and enable a specific experience to transpire.

The change of art's presentation and the way in which it could, in itself, become a work of art was soon taken to extremes. For his solo exhibition at the Galerie Iris Clert in Paris in 1958, Klein opted to exhibit nothing at all, at least in a traditional sense. Rather than installing objects in the gallery, as would be done in any other exhibition, Klein instead removed those that existed. He disassembled the space and painted everything white, leaving only a large display cabinet standing in the corner of the gallery. The full title of the exhibition, *La spécialisation de la sensibilité à l'état matière première en sensibilité picturale stabilisée, Le Vide* (*The Specialisation of Sensibility in the Raw Material State into Stabilised Pictorial Sensibility, The Void*), is most commonly shortened to *The Void*. While discussing the object of art by using the immaterial and abandoning any supposed skill of traditional artistic practices, in favour of the art as idea, Klein, through visual reduction, rendered the exhibition format as a work of art. The concepts surrounding this artistic and ideologically shifting act, were picked up again to great effect in 1961 by Swedish artist Claes Oldenburg, who, by way of his work *The Store*, merged art and the exhibition with everyday life as never seen previously. *The Store* was an actual fully functional store opened by Oldenburg in New York's Lower East Side. A range of goods were displayed for sale (even the cash register) as art objects, all of which contributed to establishing the exhibition of art as a work of art, totally upending any preconceptions of what is, or what could be art, as well as how it could be displayed.

Other artists soon made their own contributions to the diversification of the identity of the exhibition, while analysing and re-analysing it critically as part of their work. French artist Daniel Buren would become seminal in this way. Stripping away painting's illusionistic and expressive qualities, Buren focused on the mechanically produced instead, with his now classic 8.7-centimetre stripes, alternating between white and a particular chosen colour. While using the idea to challenge the practice of painting, he also employed it to tackle a larger subject: the presentation of art and the exhibition space itself. His work was always conceived in, and achieved in tandem with, the exhibition space, placing his motif on gallery walls and often elsewhere in the building, floor to ceiling. As such, his work was seen as a part of the very fabric of the space. By drawing attention to that which is commonly overlooked, his approach exposed the mechanism of display and the conditions and conditioning impinged on a work of art by it.

Another significant example in this regard is the American artist Michael Asher. One of his earliest pieces, at the San Francisco Art Institute in 1969, involved the use of the gallery's modular wall panels to divide the space into two, making a regular audience see the space differently. Further, it threw into question the relationship in general between the viewer and any art work and exhibition space. More recently, in 2008, at the Santa Monica Museum of Art, Asher rebuilt every temporary wall that had ever been constructed in the museum – each one a faithful reflection of the original structure. Through the installation, visitors experienced first hand how the museum space moves and changes with each exhibition. Asher's most recent work saw the Whitney Museum of American Art open around the clock without closing for three days.

The start of this essay made mention of the scarcity of any real examination of exhibition display. Around the time Buren and Asher emerged – as well as other artists who similarly made the format of the exhibition work – a series of essays by Brian O'Doherty was published in *Artforum* which would become an important milestone for this very discussion. First published in 1976, O'Doherty's texts, as the gallery space became more sparsely minimal in appearance, pointed out that the gallery space was not a neutral platform but a historical construct. At this time, museum directors, curators and also artists, were displaying art works with much more "empty" space around them. In addition, art was being shown under much brighter, some might say stark, lighting and, generally, the exhibition display was articulating art with a lot more deliberation. The aspiration here lay in providing art with a so-called neutral backdrop and, in turn, an ideal platform on which to "perform". However, O'Doherty's writings sharply reminded the art world that the arenas for exhibitions would always be inextricably bound with and condition the reading of the works shown within them, and that this new language of display, which was about stripping down everything in the exhibition space around the art to a bare minimum, might be doing the exact opposite of what was intended. It might be that the empty space was registering more and more with the viewer and influencing the way they saw the works on display in turn.

In further developments in the presentation and display of art, as well as in terms of the conceptual framework within which it was shown, exhibition curators increasingly took inspiration from the pioneering achievements of artists in how they changed the game. After Alexander Dorner – who, as mentioned, encouraged the experimentation of art and the understanding of display through his collaboration with El Lissitzky – Swedish museum director, Pontus Hultén, would augment new possibilities for art and for audiences, starting with his tenure at Moderna Museet, which began in 1960. Also notable was the landmark exhibition, *When Attitudes Become Form* (curated by Harald Szeemann for the Kunsthalle in Berlin in 1969), which brought together art from a number of categories that were formerly not mixed: Minimal Art, Conceptual Art, Arte Povera and Land Art among them. The exhibition Szeemann curated in 1988, *A-Historische Klanken (A-historical Sounds)* for the Boijmans van Beuningen Museum in Rotterdam, would play more forcefully with this idea, displaying together in the same room works from diverse artistic canons, varying periods of art history and with vast formal and conceptual differences, seemingly pitting them against each other. To amplify possible connections between these disparate works, Szeemann had the whole exhibition shown under the same clear lighting conditions, allowing viewers to make associations between the works of art in a way not considered previously.

Of course, numerous other exhibitions – all in different ways – played a part in the development of the exhibition, the display of art and its interpretation.

One could cite the advent of the large or, as it is sometimes known, mega exhibition – for example the *documenta*, notably its fifth edition (1972). Curated by Harald Szeemann, it promoted the idea of works of art being conceived for and in the site in which they were shown. Szeemann invited the artists to address context and to look at the exhibition as an event, developing a new paradigm for exhibition-making in turn.

A number of exhibitions initiated by American curator, author and art dealer Seth Siegelaub during the 1960s and '70s gave way to a new definition of art and conceptual art through highly inventive unorthodox exhibition models based on conceptual art itself and, in so doing, uniquely used art to shape exhibition structures and modes of display.

In 1989, *Les Magiciens de la terre* at the Centre Pompidou in Paris, was championed for its inclusion of art from non-Western domains, seen earlier in such shows as *Canadian West Coast Art: Native and Modern* at the National Gallery of Canada in Ottawa in 1977, though with much deeper impact here. In 1986, the exhibition *Chambre d'Amis*, curated by Jan Hoet, invited artists to produce works for 70 privately owned flats in Ghent – pushing art and its display into everyday life.

More recently, American artist Fred Wilson's exhibition, *The Other Museum*, at White Columns, New York, in 1990, made a significant and unique contribution by introducing the concept of parody: he simulated an ethnographic display to ridicule the way in which art from non-Western cultures was being presented and represented in museums.

In 2000, *What if: Art on the Verge of Architecture and Design*, curated by Maria Lind for the Moderna Museet in Stockholm, also proved seminal for new ways of display and for understanding art newly too. Lind invited artist Liam Gillick to design the layout of the exhibition, which experimented with display strategies and included Lind's own work. The exhibition *I promise, it's political* held at Museum Ludwig, Cologne, in 2002 was the result of curators Dorothea von Hantelmann's and Marjorie Jongbloed's close examination of performativity in art. The exhibition and the works of art it included broke down the frontality of art to involve the audience more closely. More recently, *Magritte and Contemporary Art: The Treachery of Images* at Los Angeles County Museum of Art in 2006-2007, invited John Baldessari to design the exhibition installation; he produced an ambitious, humorous and somewhat eccentric design that was as much about pointing to and using aspects of Magritte's work as it was a revelation for art installation, exhibition display and the audience's conception of these factors.

Of special interest to this essay is the way in which revision of the display of art meant that the viewer was increasingly implicated as part of the exhibition itself. Refreshing an audience's belief of how exhibitions should be treated, thought about and engaged with – both mentally and physically – would awaken their own role-play in the exhibition and transform art too; although, of course, this would not be possible without artists – and particularly their art works – disrupting established and unquestioned rules of engagement.

In terms of visual involvement and making the viewer aware of themselves in the gallery space and in the works of art, a major historical precedent to all of the examples examined so far rests in the concept of anamorphosis – a distorted projection or perspective requiring the viewer to move physically to a certain position in order to reconstitute and ‘correct’ the image they see. Hans Holbein’s painting *The Ambassadors* (1533), which can be seen today in the National Gallery, London, is one of the best-known examples of this effect. The painting depicts a double portrait (which in itself causes closer perusal), and at the bottom of the picture is a distorted and abstracted skull – or at least that’s what it seems to be, at first glance, from a front-facing vantage point. It leads the viewer to take a few steps either to their left or right, thus shifting him or herself to a position (generally to the side of the painting) where the skull appears no longer morphed but accurately rendered instead.

Studying the evolution of the exhibition, in particular the display of art and its repercussions on an audience, it seems that the desire to break out of customary routines has been regular. The results of the revision of space and display by artists, most of whom were making this part of their working practice, led the presentation of art and its exhibition to become increasingly refined. Perhaps the building of gallery spaces, the architectural aspect, the recurring hanging heights for works of art and for interpretive wall texts and the display apparatus – that is, all that we see being used and employed today and all that the current era of art display can be defined by – will move out of the frame of art and be replaced anew in future to fulfil other beliefs. Though beyond this, no matter how radically display strategies are changed by artists or how subtly they are affected and transformed by taste or fashion, other influences outside the arena of art – economic and political, as well as cultural idiosyncrasies – will be closely bound up with it and will always habitually shape context and be a part of the conditioning of display.

#### *The Exhibition*, Exhibition, Exhibition

The primary impetus and thinking behind *Exhibition*, *Exhibition* shares much of the above in that it stems from a desire to change the rules of the game of art display with a particular emphasis on the viewer. Yet it sets out to do so not by eschewing convention entirely, but rather by playing on, with and within established parameters. Fundamentally, this investigation has only been made possible through the inclusion of works of art that have been cited for their ability to amend the convention of exhibition display in such a way that questions the viewer’s position and, moreover, any previous encounter they have had with art and with exhibition viewing. It brings together works of art characterised by their investigation and use of symmetry and concepts of doubling; works produced in different versions with some conceived by different artists; pieces that literally meddle optically with the viewer and that are calculating and deceptive; pieces that destroy preconceptions of art viewing; pieces that encourage in the audience an uncommon path of movement in the gallery space. Resonating with these themes, the exhibition additionally looks at and displays art works produced in series, showing the possibilities contained in one idea, as well as possible artistic progression, development, change and variation through time.

Vitaly, all of the art works will be displayed in an exhibition format that in itself will be premised on and follow these very ideas, creating a dialogue between the display

and the overall identity of the exhibition and the works it includes, part of which has been inspired by the particular art works included, which, implicitly or otherwise, require such a display.

For the exhibition, the space has been divided into four equal parts, using four walls of two different lengths, separating it into two identical galleries, each with a dividing wall in the centre. As a whole, it might appear that four separate presentations are taking place, though, as it unfolds during one's view of the exhibition through the works featured and the way in which they have been placed and arranged, it seems that the two spaces in each gallery are identical and indeed in permanent correspondence. Forming an effect similar to that of a 'spot the difference' game, where a partially mirrored arrangement of pieces will be installed in each exhibition, the viewer is encouraged not only to look closely at the art works displayed, but also, collectively, to detect and attempt to solve the differences between the two rooms. The space is arranged so that at the end of one gallery, in the second part of one exhibition, the viewer is made aware of the beginning of another gallery space – one that houses a second exhibition involving a different group of artists with the same set of unconventional rules of a partially mirrored display. The graphic design aspects of the exhibition elaborate on this notion. For example, the introductory wall to the first exhibition is replicated identically, except for the list of participating artists, on the wall leading to the second.

The exhibition also addresses the space in which it takes place as it responds to site. The Manica Lunga – in English, the long sleeve – derives its name from the unusual dimensions of its structure which spans some one hundred and twenty metres in length, while being relatively narrow in width. As a consequence, it poses a curatorial challenge, the character of the apparently domineering space being something this exhibition sought to confront and use creatively. In addition, the exhibition observes and plays on the fact that the entrance of the space is also the exit, which is itself at odds with the regular formation of gallery architecture in which the viewer is guided around a space aware of a defined start/entrance and finish/exit, most often positioned at opposite ends of the space. This is something the exhibition seeks to confuse and blur further, beyond the pre-existing form of the Manica Lunga.

By inviting a number of artists to join in this investigation and by including pieces that defy the normal conditions of exhibition viewing, *Exhibition, Exhibition* attempts to slow down the process, making people question their own position and relationship to the art works on display and the space. It sets a challenge to the path most commonly taken in exhibitions, which, as mentioned previously, is usually marked with a beginning and end point, so that it is followed by visitors from start to finish. *Exhibition, Exhibition* changes direction, insisting instead that visitors constantly go back and forth between each space in each exhibition to re-assess, re-interpret, revisit and, ultimately, play a fundamental role in the exhibition and its possible undoing. Guiding the viewer towards a form of detective work, *Exhibition, Exhibition* aims to inspire previously unexplored ways of seeing and interpreting, offering a refreshing approach to and a realignment of how they engage with exhibitions. Involving and challenging the viewer directly, it presses them to ask questions continually during their visit, and beyond.