# Objects in time: artefacts in artists' moving image

Book or Report Section

Accepted Version

Butler, A. (2020) Objects in time: artefacts in artists' moving image. In: Murphy, J. and Rascaroli, L. (eds.) Theorizing Film Through Contemporary Art: Expanding Cinema. Film Culture in Transition. Amsterdam University Press. ISBN 9789462989467 Available at https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/82621/

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See Guidance on citing.

Publisher: Amsterdam University Press

## www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

**CentAUR**

Central Archive at the University of Reading

**Objects in Time: Artefacts in Artists' Moving Image**
**Alison Butler**

In his well-known essay 'On the Museum's Ruins', Douglas Crimp offers a provocative criticism of André Malraux's *Museum Without Walls*:

> Malraux makes a fatal error near the end of his *Museum*: he admits within its pages the very thing that had constituted its homogeneity; that thing is, of course, photography. So long as photography was merely a *vehicle* by which art objects entered the imaginary museum, a certain coherence obtained. But once photography itself enters, an object among others, heterogeneity is reestablished at the heart of the museum; its pretensions of knowledge are doomed.[1]

Something similar has happened with artists' film, but in reverse: having been admitted to the museum, artists have begun filming there. To name a few, films have been made in museums and galleries by Isaac Julien (*Baltimore*, 2000; *Vagabondia*, 2003), Gerard Byrne (*A Thing Is a Hole in a Thing It Is Not*, 2010), Fiona Tan (*Inventory*, 2012), Tacita Dean (*Section Cinema*, 2002; *Darmstädter Werkblock*, 2007), Heinz Emigholz (*Zwei Museen*, 2013), and James Benning (*Natural History*, 2013). Maya Deren's *Witch's Cradle* (1943) is an early precursor of the genre. A broader history of the museum in art cinema would include *Statues Also Die* (*Les Statues meurent aussi*, Alain Resnais and Chris Marker, 1953), *Russian Ark* (*Russkiy kovcheg*, Alexander Sokurov, 2002), and *Museum Hours* (Jem Cohen, 2012). When artists' films enter the museum, they become objects among other objects, and their encounter with these objects is necessarily recursive. Sometimes commissioned by the institutions concerned, they reflexively figure their own institutional relocation from the cinema to the gallery and explore what moving images can do that other exhibition strategies cannot. While they may be shown *mise en abîme*, within the museum that they depict, they are generally also exhibited more widely, relocating the museum to other sites. They tend not to be made with the intention of augmenting the museum's displays, as this would relegate them to the status of audiovisual aids, rather than artworks in their own right. Artists' museum films create dialogical relationships with curatorial practices of interpretation and display, asserting their independence by doing something besides explicating these practices. As interventions, they are positioned both as possible additions to the collection and institutional critique. In these works, the stance taken by artists towards their medium is as important as the stance taken

towards their subject matter: the self-conscious construction of the work as a media object determines how the museum object is represented in the film. In the two examples I will discuss here, Tacita Dean's *Day for Night* (2009) and Elizabeth Price's *A Restoration* (2016), the artists' understanding of the temporalities of analogue film and digital video underpin their poetic expression of the temporality of museum objects.

Museums deal with actual pieces of the physical world, extracted from their context. A great deal of critical debate ensues from this extraction, regarding the ownership and provenance of objects, their enmeshment in cultural and political systems, including colonial expropriation and the unequal distribution of wealth, their interpretation and explication, and their overvaluation and fetishisation. Within museum studies, the understanding of physical objects has been framed and reframed by intellectual fashions from poststructuralism to the 'material turn', as pieces of information, embedded in cultural systems, and as the stuff of human sensory experience.[2] But while the work of curators involves the contextualization of objects, their fundamental appeal may depend precisely on their decontextualization, as Andreas Huyssen suggests:

> Objects that have lasted through the ages are by that very virtue located outside of the destructive circulation of commodities destined for the garbage heap. The older an object, the more presence it can command, the more distinct it is from current-and-soon-to-be-obsolete as well as recent-and-already-obsolete objects. That alone may be enough to lend them an aura, to reenchant them beyond any instrumental functions they may have had at an earlier time. It may be precisely the isolation of the object from its genealogical context that permits the experience via the museal glance of reenchantment.[3]

Museum and film share a spatio-temporal stance towards the object: both remove it from its original time and place. Both André Bazin and Roland Barthes have theorized photography – and by extension, film – in such terms. Bazin says that photography gives us 'the object itself, but liberated from its temporal contingencies',[4] to which film adds duration, 'the mummification of change'.[5] Barthes claims that the photograph testifies not to reality but to the passage of time; although this is also true of film, the flux of images in a film is protensive rather than retentive, giving past time a future.[6] Drawing on Bazin, Stanley Cavell offers a lucid account of the dynamic of presence and absence in film, which derives from film's photographic basis:

[O]bjects participate in the photographic presence of themselves; they participate in the re-creation of themselves on film; they are essential in the making of their appearances. Objects projected on a screen are inherently reflexive, they occur as self-referential, reflecting upon their physical origins. Their presence refers to their absence, their location in another place.[7]

This last proposition is inherently reversible: their absence refers to their former presence, in another time and place. In different ways, museums and moving images are characterized by a tension between presence and absence, materiality and immateriality, time and timelessness. Paradoxically then, in the presence of material culture, what moving images have to offer is the absence of the object. Abstracted from its material continuity, the object takes its place in time, as something that used to exist, will exist in the future, and could, potentially, exist in other ways.

Speculating on what might constitute a new 'object-oriented filmology', Volker Pantenburg proposes three basic categories of film objects: the objects used in filmmaking, the object of the film itself, and the objects in films. With regard to the first two, he quotes Hollis Frampton on the immateriality of film:

The act of making a film, of physically assembling the filmstrip, feels somewhat like making an object: that film artists have seized the materiality of film is of inestimable importance, and film certainly invites investigation at this level. But at the instant the film is completed, the 'object' vanishes.[8]

When films made on celluloid are shown in galleries, their objecthood may be foregrounded by the inclusion of the projector in the space, setting up a tension between the film as an object and the objects in the film, or a doubled relationship between them. This reflexive quality is one of the key characteristics of the work of Tacita Dean.

Dean is an artist who makes film, rather than an experimental filmmaker, showing work primarily in galleries and only occasionally in cinemas. Museums of various kinds have featured in her work, and her involvement with museums reached its apogee in the spring of 2018, with the coordinated organization of three shows – 'Landscape', 'Portrait', and 'Still Life' – at the Royal Academy, the National Portrait Gallery and the National Gallery in London. Dean, who has made over 40 works on 16mm film, has been a prominent

campaigner for the preservation of analogue film in the last few years, and speaks forcefully about its importance as an artistic medium. At the same time, she also describes her films as 'painterly' and makes work in a way that is clearly intermedial, not only through its internalization of the conventions and concerns of painting, but also through a multimedia practice that crosses boundaries and challenges curatorial divisions in museum exhibition.[9]

In an important analysis of Dean's films, Erika Balsom argues that her deployment of celluloid serves a number of purposes, including thematising obsolescence, mining past or passing time for the indexical traces of forgotten or failed futures, and establishing the claim of the work to be included in a museum 'as a precious remnant of a cinema in ruins, with the film print elevated to the status of a collectable objet d'art'.[10] The two key concepts in Balsom's analysis are the semiotic category of the index and Walter Benjamin's theory of 'aura'. Indexicality is understood, via Mary Anne Doane, not as the guarantor of realism but as a pointer to past reality: 'Dean makes use of the indexical image and the nonsynchronous temporalities that reside within it'.[11] As for the aura, that almost indefinable form of authenticity and uniqueness, for this to be discerned in Dean's films requires a reversal of the effects of reproducible media as described by Benjamin, which Balsom suggests comes about as a result of technological change – the displacement of analogue media by digital – and engineered scarcity, in the form of limited edition production, so that film now becomes 'a privileged locus of historicity and takes on something it was once said to destroy: aura'.[12] While Balsom argues that there are several conceptions of aura, one linked to cultural value and traditional aesthetics, the other – explored by Miriam Hansen – evoking history and contingency, it is equally possible to see the relationship between index and aura in Dean's work as a progressive gesture and its recuperation, extracting cultural value from recovered time.

Dean's engagement with relics and the transient time they evoke is organized in a variety of ways throughout her work. An early group of films responding to the tragic misadventure of lone yachtsman Donald Crowhurst is structured around the notion of disappearance. *Disappearance at Sea* (1996) and *Disappearance at Sea II (Voyage de Guérison)* (1997) address their topic obliquely, through images of – and taken from – lighthouses. With their revolving Fresnel lenses casting a beam of light into the dark, these films place maritime technology in dialogue with the cinematic apparatus. The motif of circling circumscribes an absent centre, the missing body of Crowhurst, which was never found, and gestures towards the nature of his enterprise, attempting to circumnavigate the world. *Teignmouth Electron* (2000) engages more directly with Crowhurst's story,

documenting the wreck of the trimaran that he had built for his ill-fated attempt to win the *Sunday Times* Golden Globe race, but again, seems structured by an absent centre, as static shots plot a circular tour around the boat, marking the absence of its captain. The theme of absence appears early in Dean's work, in the short film *Ztráta* (*Loss*, 1991–2002), shot in a classroom in postcommunist Prague. In the film, a teacher writes the Czech words for 'absence' and 'presence' with chalk on a blackboard, then wipes them off. The terms seem like a knowing nod in the direction of psychoanalytic film theory, in which they feature significantly.

As Dean's body of work has grown, the theme of absence has given way to that of passing time. *Palast* (2004) and *Kodak* (2006) document phenomena as they enter obsolescence – communist architecture and analogue film. A series of portrait films, including *Michael Hamburger* (2007), *Merce Cunningham Performs STILLNESS (in Three Movements) to John Cage's composition 4'33"* (2007), *Craneway Event* (2009), and *Edwin Parker* (2011), document elderly men, mostly artists, in the last years of their lives. With these films, Dean's conception of her medium seems to pivot from its capacity to evoke a sense of loss to its preservative potential. In *JG* (2013), however, the motif of absence returns: the film pays posthumous homage to the writer J.G. Ballard, a friend of Dean's, and the artist Robert Smithson, whom they both admired; the encircling form of Smithson's *Spiral Jetty* (1970) again evokes the idea of turning around an absent centre. The structuring absence in these films is not the object, but the subject associated with it. The films do not attempt to recreate a point of view for their missing subjects, so much as leaving a space to show where they might have been.

The film *Day for Night* was made in the studio in Bologna where Italian painter Giorgio Morandi lived and worked for over 50 years, meticulously painting careful arrangements of the same objects, over and over again. After being discharged from the army following a breakdown in 1915, Morandi lived quietly with his sisters in the family home for the rest of his life. He was a prolific painter, but with very little variety in his work, producing countless versions of the same landscapes and still lives throughout his career. Minimalist but figurative, his pallid pictures resist inclusion in the international modernism of his day, without clearly opposing it either. Dean gained access to the studio just after its restoration and before its opening to the public as part of the Museo Morandi. Although the studio was reconstructed to look, as much as possible, the way it did during Morandi's lifetime, Dean approaches it with an awareness that it is essentially a reconstruction; this awareness is also evident in the showing of the film in exhibitions that have placed it

alongside Morandi's pictures, acknowledging the poetic parallelism of the project and inviting comparison.

The film is composed of twenty different static shots, each about 30 seconds long, showing old domestic objects displayed in a seemingly random order: ceramic vases, glass bottles, metal pots, bowls, boxes, jars, oil lanterns, and dried flowers. The static camera stands in for the stillness of still life but is not exactly equivalent. Morandi's art derives much of its charm from the suggestion of time stopped, whereas Dean's film draws attention to its movement. The duration of each shot is long enough to make time itself perceptible, but short enough to suggest its momentary passage. Relics of another time, having now outlived their owner, the objects are glimpsed in a fragile medium which grasps the transience of the moment, and which, ironically, they may also outlive.

[INSERT IMAGE 1 HERE (Tacita Dean, *Day for Night*)]

Dean filmed the objects singly and in groups, without rearranging them (in contrast to the photographer Joel Meyerowitz who photographed each object on its own in a carefully composed setting for his exhibition and book in collaboration with Maggie Barrett, *Morandi's Objects*). The objects are framed closely to resemble the painter's compositions, with no establishing shot to orient them in relation to each other (although there is some overlap between the spaces of some shots). In other respects, the film does not resemble Morandi's paintings, which are distinguished by their flatness and pallor; Dean's compositions have greater depth and tonal range, more light and shadow, and a distinctive, soft, grainy appearance that calls attention to her medium as much as Morandi's pastel colour blocks call attention to his.

Although Dean's film adopts the painter's proxemics, their meaning is subtly altered by the photographic medium. To cite Cavell again, 'a painting is a world; a photograph is of the world'.[13] The world of a painting is contained entirely within its frame, whereas a camera cuts a portion from a larger field, and, in doing so, implicitly acknowledges the existence of a larger world beyond the frame. The tight framing of the image, cutting out the rest of the studio beyond the tabletop, constitutes an explicit exclusion of the rest of the world. In other words, Dean's film amplifies Morandi's decision to reject the wider world in favour of a mise en scène entirely under his control.

While making the film, Dean discovered that what she had taken for stylization in Morandi's depiction of the objects, simplifying their forms, was actually a property of the objects themselves, as styled by the artist – boxes had been rewrapped and shiny bottles painted to reduce their reflectiveness. As Dean explains:

It seems Morandi liked to paint what he saw. He did not choose, as I had always imagined, simply not to paint anything about an object that he did not deem necessary, but instead transformed them beforehand, making them the objects he wanted to see. It was not about denying detail because the detail he liked, he kept. The miraculous opacity of his painted objects is already there in the objects themselves. His was a double artifice.[14]

This was a gift to the filmmaker in several respects: most obviously because the objects' actual resemblance to their painted likenesses lends support to the film's representation of the painter's world; but also because the artist's intervention has left a visible trace on the objects themselves, a material residue of his vision which can be captured on film. As Ed Krčma suggests: 'The paint that Morandi applied to his small bottles and jars comes to seem like attention materialized: an encrusted layer that makes manifest all the hours of extraordinary care and scrutiny he devoted to these objects'.[15] That this is one of the main concerns of Dean's project is confirmed by *Day for Night*'s companion film *Still Life* (2009), which shows pencil tracings on sheets of paper that were used by Morandi to mark the position of the objects he painted. Just as the pencil line indicates the position of an object that has been moved away, so Dean's two films indicate the place of a gaze that has been withdrawn.

Morandi's still lives have an enigmatic quality that derives from the paradoxical relationship between the object and the gaze: the humble, everyday household items he painted have no intrinsic meaning or value, but as the objects of his enduring attention, they acquire importance. In a genre rife with symbolism, however, Morandi's still lives obdurately resist signification: his things are just things. In a body of work that goes against the tide of art history, returning to figurative representation after the inception of abstraction, Morandi continually re-encounters the irreducible opacity of the object. The obverse of this is the constant renewal of the gaze, as a vector of meditative subjectivation. Hence John Berger's claim that 'what interests the artist is the process of the visible first becoming visible, before the thing has been given a name or acquired a value'.[16] The continued existence of Morandi's objects in a museum context poses an art-historical problem, as Krčma points out:

Indeed, the status of Morandi's objects is itself quite complex with regard to questions of purpose and purposelessness: once at the service of domestic routine and decoration, then living a different kind of life in the painter's studio, and now repurposed as part of

a museum display as signifiers of authenticity.[17]

Tacita Dean's two films about the artist form part of the Museo Morandi's programme of temporary exhibitions by living artists in dialogue with his legacy, implicitly acknowledging the need for an artist's gaze upon the objects. Dean's is one of the more subtle interventions: rather than imposing her own point of view, she imposes the ontology of her medium, delicately drawing attention to the absent gaze of her predecessor.

From this analysis, we can infer that Dean's understanding of the medium of analogue film is closely related to the human experience of time. Even when there are no human beings in her films, the material registration of objects measures their enduring existence against the time of the human subject who used them. Morandi's things are constructed in her film as 'memory objects' in the sense described by Huyssen: 'memory in and of objects is always based on a reciprocal interchange between self and object world, affective human perception, and the thing in question'.[18] In this reciprocal exchange, both subjects and objects project onto each other but the human gaze is necessary to activate memory and meaning as dimensions of the object: 'The object, as Benjamin had it in his Baudelaire essay (2003 [1939]), only opens its eyes once it has been touched by the human gaze'.[19]

My second example, by contrast, uses digital technology to explore the existence of objects in a posthumanist perspective, positing an alliance between ancient artefacts and contemporary technology that almost bypasses human agency. Elizabeth Price began making HD video installations as a way of working with large and varied collections of research material, including moving and still images, sounds, and texts. Her first works were conceived as part of an ongoing series entitled *The New Ruined Institute*, evoking an imaginary or virtual museum in which each video constitutes a room. This imaginary museum is modelled on the artist's working methods, which in turn are shaped by the digital tools she uses. Price collects research materials around a topic or idea in folders on her computer, and piles them on top of each other on a timeline in Final Cut Pro. In the final edit, most of the assembled materials are invisible, covered over by later additions but, unusually, Price does not clean up the timeline, leaving these caches of research as reservoirs of hidden meaning. Her artistic method is thus deeply enmeshed with digital technology.

*User Group Disco* (2009) is exemplary of this project. It is set in the virtual museum's Hall of Sculptures, although there is no visible architecture and nothing that would conventionally be recognized as sculpture. In high definition black and white, it presents a series of everyday objects from the recent past (domestic gadgets and utensils, executive toys,

erotic ornaments, a vinyl record, and a single doll's leg). The objects appear against a black background, often in extreme close-up, making it hard to identify or distinguish them, with a soundtrack of electronic music (including the 1980s synth-pop hit single *Take on Me* by A-Ha), while a narration appears in written text on the screen. This narration – woven together from a wide variety of found texts collected by Price – purports to come from 'the Human Resource' and addresses the viewer in the first person plural, in language that combines bureaucratic and technical jargon. In the absence of human actors, the narration seems to emanate from the classificatory system of the virtual museum itself – as if human civilization were being examined, after the fact, by an artificial intelligence. Price describes her narrational strategy as the deliberate creation of a disembodied, collective, and potentially nonhuman perspective:

> I tend to think of the narrators as plural, as in a group of voices, a chorus. That's partly because they have usually been derived from a group of varied texts, created by different authors. Also, if I conceive of the narrator as a 'chorus', as multiple voices, it can shift in logic or dynamic in a disturbing way that is not entirely human. In one work I thought of the 'chorus' as a committee […] in others it was a spectral girl group […] or a group of professional mourners.[20]

In *A Restoration* (2016), Price engages with the actual collections of two real museums, the Ashmolean and Pitt Rivers Museums in Oxford. The Contemporary Art Society commissioned the work after Price won its Annual Award in 2013. Price's two-screen HD video draws on the photographic and archival records of the two museums, particularly those relating to Arthur Evans, the archaeologist who, beginning in 1894, undertook the excavation of the Minoan palace at Knossos in Crete. The restorations carried out on the palace under Evans's supervision have been criticized for interpreting archaeological evidence too permissively, including commissioning artists to complete frescoes from small fragments, which they did in a distinctly Art Nouveau style. *A Restoration* responds to this 'complicated, febrile mix of different historical moments'.[21]

The film brings together a range of materials, including photographs from the Evans archive, images of objects from the collections of the two museums, and animations developed from the restored frescoes. A choral voiceover speaks on behalf of the notional Administrators, who seem to exist in a purely digital realm: 'We are cultivating a garden in a remote corner of the server', says a synthetic 'female' computer voice at the opening of the

film. The words appear simultaneously on-screen, as animated text, on pale pink or blue panels, over a dense flow of images. The narration describes how the Administrators assemble flora and fauna to make a garden and populate it, then an architectural structure, of labyrinthine form, into which flow objects from the two museums' collections, beginning with finds made at Knossos in the early twentieth century. A sequence towards the middle of the work shows a set of desktop folders filled with archival images. Documents float out of the folders and layer into stacks of images. This direct reference to the visual rhetoric of the virtual desktop links the museum intermedially with the computer, on the basis of their common approaches to collection and classification.

[INSERT IMAGE 2 HERE (Elizabeth Price, *A Restoration*)]

This classificatory approach is evident in a sequence devoted to the museum's huge collection of fertility goddesses: small, unfired clay figures, believed to have been used in marriage rituals for thousands of years from Eastern Europe through to Mesopotamia. These figures, we are told, were made to be broken, to signify the making of a contract. Classification is accompanied by reconstruction, as the Administrators explain that they are rebuilding Europe's oldest city, 'in satire and with love'. Departing from curatorial propriety, they fill the ruined palace with drinking vessels promiscuously gathered from across the museum collections, as if they are organizing a party. Among these is a fragile seventeenth-century glass goblet commemorating the moment in 1651 when Charles II hid in an oak in Boscobel Wood after the Battle of Worcester to evade the Roundheads – an act that led to the restoration of the monarchy. In the concluding sequence this symbolic object falls through the air and smashes on the ground.

Like the museums from which it takes its subject matter, Price's *A Restoration* confronts the problem of interpreting an anthropological collection, bringing objects to life through an understanding of their use value. Price's solution, a fanciful flight into a digitally enabled alternative reality, condensing histories and cultures into a single syncretic narrative, is in equal parts a satirical comment on the two museums and a celebration of the creative freedom of interpretation, or misinterpretation – a freedom that extends to the breaking of precious objects, although only in a virtual sense, for as the title of the work suggests, in a digital museum this is a reversible action. The work thus turns on the difference between real objects and virtual objects, to which only part of the definition of the term object applies – they have no material substance, but they can be acted upon. As if to emphasize the different orders of materiality at stake, when *A Restoration* was shown at the Ashmolean Museum in 2016, it was accompanied by a small exhibition in a glass vitrine, placed just outside the

screening space, of documents from Evans's Knossos restoration, ancient Mesopotamian artefacts shown in the film, and the Boscobel goblet itself.

Price's response to the improprieties of Evans's reconstruction is to go a step further. As the Administrators say: 'It is unusual, we think, for a restoration to be quite so indiscreet. But, we have resolved to extort its ribald energy, for our very own ends, and cultivate a further germination.' Her imagery extrapolates fecund and feminine forms from the frescoes, suggesting that the hypothetically female Administrators may be enacting a gendered revolt against the taxonomic order of the museum. The breaking of the Boscobel goblet also hints at other kinds of political radicalism. But perhaps the most subversive possibility suggested here is that objects themselves could stage a rebellion. As Marina Warner remarks: '*A Restoration* gathers up all its marvelous energies of sense and sight and sound against the comfortable security of humanist epistemology.'[22]

By comparing an analogue film with a digital video and finding distinctive and medium-specific ways of engaging with museum objects in each, I may seem to be arguing that the representation of the object is technologically determined. This would be an oversimplification. The rise of thing theory since the 1990s may be a reaction to the supposed dematerialization of objects in digital media, but as Huyssen points out, this is analogous to an earlier moment in the twentieth century when Walter Benjamin, the Surrealists, and others turned their attention to things as a defence against the effects of a burgeoning consumer culture, including cinema. In fact, both Dean and Price embrace the dematerializing and rematerializing effects of film and video as a way of representing objects in time.[23] Both artists engage with the museum object's special temporality, remediating it according to their understanding of their chosen medium. 'However fragmentary its condition', George Kubler writes, 'any work of art is actually a portion of arrested happening, or an emanation of past time'.[24] As an art historian, Kubler is primarily concerned with objects in time, but he also has some suggestive thoughts about time in the object, comparing artworks to stars, whose light travels from the past to reach us in the present. Barthes makes the same comparison between starlight and photography.[25] As a filmmaker, Dean mines the medium of analogue film for its expressive potentialities, which she shapes into poetic analogies between form and subject matter. Price is also interested in artefacts as markers of time but uses digital video to construct virtual time. She foregrounds both the archival materiality of her sources and the digital tools with which she manipulates them, even as she proceeds to dissolve temporal and spatial distinctions, extrapolating future possibilities from past time. Museums and films both de-contextualize objects, extracting them from their original location in space

and time, but unlike museums, films produce their own temporality. In artists' films about museum objects, time is not recovered but invented, on the basis of the encounter between an artefact and a medium. While this might be described as the dematerialization of the object by the medium, it may equally be considered as a rematerialization of the medium by the object. Perhaps bringing heterogeneity into the heart of the museum, to borrow Crimp's words, is a project worth pursuing.

References

Balsom, Erika, 'A Cinema in the Gallery, a Cinema in Ruins', *Screen*, 50.4 (2009), pp. 411–427.

Barthes, Roland, *Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography*, trans. by Richard Howard (New York: Hill and Wang, 1980).

Bazin, André, *What is Cinema?*, trans. by Timothy Barnard (Montreal: Caboose, 2009).

Berger, John, 'Giorgio Morandi', in *The Shape of a Pocket* (London: Bloomsbury, 2001), pp. 139–145.

Cavell, Stanley, *The World Viewed: Reflections on the Ontology of Film*, enlarged ed. (Cambridge, MA, and London: Harvard University Press, 1979).

Chi, Jennifer Y., *Restoring the Minoans: Elizabeth Price and Sir Arthur Evans* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2017).

Crimp, Douglas, 'On the Museum's Ruins', in *The Anti-Aesthetic: Essays on Postmodernism*, ed. by Hal Foster (Seattle: Bay Press, 1983), pp. 43–56.

Dean, Tacita, 'In the Studio of Giorgio Morandi', in Tacita Dean, *Selected Writings 1992–2011, Seven Books Grey* (MUMOK/Steidl: Vienna and Göttingen, 2011), p. 105

Dudley, Sandra H., ed., *Museum Materialities: Objects, Engagements, Interpretations* (Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2010).

'Film as a Medium', a discussion with Tacita Dean, Mathias Poledna, and Kerry Brougher, Paris Photo, Los Angeles, 2015, <https://vimeo.com/128053878> [accessed 23 February 2019].

Frampton, Hollis, 'For a Metahistory of Film: Commonplace Notes and Hypotheses', in *On the Camera Arts and Consecutive Matters: The Writings of Hollis Frampton*, ed. by Bruce Jenkins (Cambridge, MA: MIT, 2009), pp. 131–139.

Huyssen, Andreas, *Twilight Memories: Marking Time in a Culture of Amnesia* (New York and London: Routledge, 1995).

Huyssen, Andreas, 'Memory Things and Their Temporality', *Memory Studies*, 9.1 (2016), pp. 107–110.

Krčma , Ed, 'Tacita Dean and Still Life', *Art History*, 37.5 (2014), pp. 960–977.

Kubler, George, *The Shape of Time: Remarks on the History of Things* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1962).

Meyerowitz, Joel, and Maggie Barrett, *Morandi's Objects* (Bologna: Damiani, 2016).

Pantenburg, Volker, 'The Cinematographic State of Things', in *Cinematographic Objects: Things and Operations*, ed. by Volker Pantenburg (Berlin: August Verlag, 2015), pp. 9-21.

Warner, Marina, 'A Restoration', Exhibition Leaflet (Oxford: Ashmolean Museum, 2016).

Notes

[1] Crimp, p. 51 (emphasis in the original).
[2] See Dudley.
[3] Huyssen, *Twilight Memories*, p. 33.
[4] Bazin, p. 8.
[5] Bazin, p. 9.
[6] Barthes, pp. 89–90.
[7] Cavell, p. xvi.
[8] Frampton, p. 138, cited by Pantenburg, p. 20-21.
[9] See 'Film as a Medium'.
[10] Balsom, p. 414.
[11] Balsom, p. 419.
[12] Balsom, p. 423.
[13] Cavell, p. 24.
[14] Dean, p. 105.
[15] Krčma, p. 966.
[16] Berger, p. 144.
[17] Krčma, pp. 974–5.
[18] Huyssen, 'Memory Things and Their Temporality', p. 108.
[19] Huyssen, 'Memory Things', p.108.
[20] Chi, p. 46.
[21] Chi, p. 41.
[22] Warner, 'A Restoration'.
[23] Huyssen, 'Memory Things', p. 107.
[24] Kubler, p. 19.
[25] Barthes, pp. 80–81.