

## EXHIBITION COPIES AS AN ANACHRONISTIC HISTORICAL MODEL AND AS A COMPONENT OF ARTISTIC PRACTICE

*In principle the work of art has always been reproducible.  
Objects made by humans could always be copied by humans.*

Walter Benjamin (1936) 1980, 474

People do not talk about exhibition copies. They are indeed presented in museums, public collections and art galleries, yet they stand suspect of being derivative and deficient, meant to compensate for losses, and are hence not considered for themselves, but tolerated as necessary compromises. Sometimes a system of signage in museums and art galleries rather shamefacedly admits that what is being exhibited is a reproduction specially produced for this purpose – and is thus not an »original« work of art. Why and when an exhibition copy became necessary, who commissioned it, who produced it and what material and medial basis underlie it, is something exhibition visitors learn only in the rarest of cases. In addition, a systematic investigation of the status and value allotted exhibition copies on the part of exhibiting institutions, collectors, artists and recipients, as well as on the part of the art business, has up to now been lacking<sup>1</sup>.

A marginalised phenomenon will, therefore, be considered here<sup>2</sup>, given that, for itself alone, the notion of the »exhibition copy« can already be argued over quite splendidly. Are pictures specially produced for exhibition purposes in actual fact copies? Should the discussion be about reconstructions, adaptations, recreations, imitations, remakes, re-enactments or replicas instead? Or would the term »transformation« be more applicable, because it is capable of best denoting the interactions between what has been lost and the reconstruction, the »mutual creation of a culture of reception and one of reference«?<sup>3</sup> And are those forms of appreciation via artistic recreation to be summed up under the notion of the »exhibition copy«, a process the Ghent Altar by the brothers Jan and Hubert von Eck underwent through Michiel Coxcie in 1558? In addition, it remains unexplained whether it is permissible to invest an exhibition copy with the character of art. May it sign itself up for the status of art? Or is it nothing but a historical document submitted subsequently? To categorically exclude it from art would mean insisting that an aesthetic picture must be always unique and must come from the hand of an artist responsible for the idea, that is to say, authentically, in order to gain acknowledgement as a work of art<sup>4</sup>. Does the concept of the »copy«, therefore, already imply an outmoded retention of the notion of the »original« in art, as it formed in early modernity and established itself in the thinking of the 19<sup>th</sup> century?<sup>5</sup>

### THE CONCEPT OF THE »ORIGINAL« IN ART

It is possible to declare in retrospect that it was not until the middle of the 15<sup>th</sup> century, when the storage of knowledge in book form became possible with the mechanisation of writing, that the »original« took on a significance of its own. As Hubert Locher could plausibly argue, a change of perspective is needed if we want to specify the mutual dependence of the »original« and the »reproduction« in its historicity and

dialectic permeation<sup>6</sup>. Under the interim title »Die Reproduktion treibt das Unikat hervor« [The Reproduction brings out the unique Piece], H. Locher describes how a new development came into books from the 15<sup>th</sup> century onwards: artistic picture reproductions, produced as woodcuts and copper engravings, were placed alongside mechanised writing. With the result that »[i]t is only when a process for the technical reproduction of pictures is established, and simultaneously a concept of the original creative power of artists, that – through the contrast – pictures as unique pieces become at all conceivable, after their material form previously counted for centuries – in the same way as writing – in principle as more or less faithful, precious, beautiful notation of a visual concept and hence self-evidently as technically reproducible«<sup>7</sup>. The appreciation of the »unique piece« or the »original« in art thus arises courtesy of the possibility to reproduce writing and pictures – and with that, the application of new techniques of reproduction.

If the oppositional character of the »original« on one hand and the »copy« or »reproduction« on the other is, therefore, not a given *per se*, but results from a medial experience of difference typical of the era, it has to be investigated today to see whether it still has validity, whereby in particular the present-day medial processes of production, distribution and presentation of knowledge are to be kept in mind<sup>8</sup>. In the age of digital reproducibility, data and databases capable of being copied without loss of quality have become a matter of course; neither specialised knowledge nor expensive equipment are needed for the copy-and-paste function. In the face of the ubiquity of copying, Dirk van Gehlen concludes:

»The digital copy as a form of duplication blurs the boundary between master and imitation; original and copy are not to be differentiated any longer. Databases, songs and films can be duplicated and distributed without any loss of quality – when they have been once, and that is the second, decisive innovation, released from their analogue data carriers (vinyl, paper, film) and digitalised. The digital copy and the liberation of information from its data carriers form the two fundamental challenges of the age, which is described as the age of digitalisation – and also of copyright«<sup>9</sup>.

While film, video and the so-called media arts have to pay the price of changes in the context of storage and distribution of data via further copying and format changing in as far as they want to claim space, presence and visibility over a long period<sup>10</sup>, a materially based art, as a matter of principle, rejects compliance with the change in medium as has been permanently effected in the digital age. Art, which owes its social recognition to the traces an individual has tangibly left behind at a specific historical point in a material, cannot be reduced to »information«, which could possibly be detached from »an analogue data carrier«<sup>11</sup>, digitalised, transferred to another carrier medium and distributed further.

An art based on material and on objects is structurally incompatible with a digitalised, data-based information society, making it at once irritating and fascinating. It bears witness to its historically determined genesis, to a process of development which may lie far back in the past, to the intellectual and manual skills someone possessed, but also to the idiosyncrasy and intractability of the material used, qualities which remain legible in it, to the function which it previously exercised, to the place where it became perceptible and effective, to the influence which it exerted on its addressees, and to all the hands into whose ownership it has gradually passed. In short: it acknowledges its indissoluble connection to space and time<sup>12</sup>.

### **»KABINETT DER ABSTRAKTEN« 1926 AND 1968**

Art, which gains access to museums and collections by dint of its connection with space and time, so that it is preserved there from being forgotten or from decay, today still defines itself – in as far as it is not a case of multiples, which in their own way bear witness to their genesis via their respective duplication techniques –

through its uniqueness. However, one proviso is that a reconstruction is part of an artistic concept. It is just this uniqueness which is counteracted or suspended by the exhibition copy, where it demonstrates that an aesthetic image, which came about at a particular moment in history, possibly in a »shining hour«, can be imitated with deceptive accuracy under changed circumstances and reproduced through mechanical-manual or technical processes. Such a reconstruction, which essentially brings the status of the unique work of art into question, can be the price for a damaged or lost work of art not becoming forgotten, but having a place assigned it in art history. As long as the substitute allows the work of art to lead some sort of subsequent life by presenting it in the circumstances of an exhibition, integrated into a narrative pattern and able to be perceived multisensually in spatial contexts, a process of historicisation continues which is not just based on fragments of memory fixed in text or on the medial traces of photographs or films. Reconstructions generate accounts of history by changing our view of what preceded them. Their quality of posteriority, now objectified, allows thinking about anteriority.

In this vein, the »Kabinett der Abstrakten«, commissioned by Alexander Dorner, the director of the fine arts department of the Hanover Provinzialmuseum, designed by the artist and architect El Lissitzky in autumn 1926, with its relevance for the history of exhibitions and its orientation towards visitor participation, met with total destruction, partly based on cultural vandalism and partly during the »Entartete Kunst« [Degenerate Art] campaign by the National Socialists<sup>13</sup>. On the initiative of Lydia Dorner, the widow of A. Dorner, and given impetus by the exhibition »Die Zwanziger Jahre in Hannover« [The Twenties in Hanover], the call for a reconstruction of the »Kabinett der Abstrakten«, sorely missed since 1937, found a voice in 1962. Not least for reasons of anticipated recompense, a restoration was inaugurated in 1968 by the then director, Harald Seiler, in room 41 of the Niedersächsisches Landesmuseum Hannover and realised under the supervision of the architect J. L. Bayer. This restoration was transferred in 1978/1979 to the by then completed Sprengel Museum in Hanover, where it has been housed to date.

While building plans and descriptions by El Lissitzky were consulted for the reconstruction and realisation of the exhibition copy, photographs of the exhibition were the pre-eminent source. Alongside compromises affecting the spatial situation – the integration into the museum tour envisioned by A. Dorner is missing, and with it the narrative of the Weimar period; the room originally had two entry and exit points and one window – the greatest omission is the loss of the colour concept. Where the extant construction drawings indicate that the frames of the display panels were once presented in blue and red, the reconstruction of the »Kabinett der Abstrakten« limits itself to precisely that spectrum conveyed by the black-and-white photographs: black, white and grey.

Where El Lissitzky once spoke about the optical dynamic generating the colour effect enlivening visitors, the character of the historical photographs handed down as models now produces the exact opposite. It causes immobilisation of the gaze and generates the sense of an ideal historical circumstance culpably lost under National Socialism, of a nostalgic protective shield against the unattainable perfection of which the reconstructed space has to be measured. The loss of colourfulness can be explained by the state of the documentation. We may bemoan it, but it can, with just as much justification, be interpreted as an additional, and no less precious, historical level, which may not be denied some authenticity. Has the »Kabinett der Abstrakten«, which distinguished itself in the 1920s through a collaboration between architect and exhibition curator, as well as through a linking of production aspects with those of an aesthetics of reception, as notably progressive, not enjoyed an augmentation in terms of additional dimensions of media and institutional history in the 1960s? Is this exhibition copy not also a testimony to the aggressive destruction of an ambitious exhibition display by National Socialist cultural politics? A revenant swathed in grey and black? A sign of grief and loss? A result of the '68 generation's protest culture in the then Federal Republic and of that culture's passionate engagement with the National Socialist past?

## THE EXHIBITION COPY AS AN ARTISTIC PRACTISE

With every exhibition copy there is connected the notion of a lost work of art, a testimony to the past, being able to return to the present with the aid of a material reconstruction, in as far as the dimensions, the materials and the production process of the copy match the original. To this extent, every exhibition copy is an anachronism – in the sense of Georges Didi-Huberman's use of the term to envisage an art-historical model of thinking and acting which allows an escape from the rigid chronology of before and after G. Didi-Huberman invests the copy with the potential to »open the past up to the anachronism of objects, which art history has left unnoticed«<sup>14</sup>. The copy, according to G. Didi-Huberman, is based on the process of reproduction and is, therefore, not the result of creative imitation, of an *imitazione*, which does always contain a spark of *invenzione*, but the result of a »manual non-invention«<sup>15</sup>. The copy is, according to the traditional, art-historical understanding, a »non-work«<sup>16</sup>, as it reproduces what is already there instead of creating something new; and it constitutes itself via the loss of an origin<sup>17</sup>. These criteria apply just as much to exhibition copies: they are a manual non-invention; and they are, according to the traditional understanding, doubtless a non-work because they do not proceed from any genuinely artistic process of creation, which harbours the struggle over aesthetic choices and the risk of failure, but they are the reproduction, exact in every detail, of a result, of a finished end-product. In addition, they are an index of the loss of what we may call the idea of an origin, for which they are simultaneously a substitute. As in the duplicate, so is also manifested in the exhibition copy a model of temporality and value which the »humanistic discipline«<sup>18</sup> of art history resists: there is no recognisable »original« – and hence no testimony to the talent, inspiration and inventive capacity of an artist.

For this reason, the exhibition copy offers a welcome point of connection for all those who have been striving since the 1960s to establish in art a production model beyond the traditional invocation of uniqueness, the glorification of authorship and the focusing, in the manner of Giorgio Vasari, on the exaltedness of the artist's personality<sup>19</sup>. Artistic practices which allot the concept a higher status than the finished object and integrate the processual, the ephemeral, the group-based or the collaborative production process, provoke a new view on the exhibition copy. Accordingly, Lucy R. Lippard formulated the thesis that, with Conceptual Art, the idea had come so much into the foreground that the form in which it materialised had become secondary<sup>20</sup>. With that, L. R. Lippard refers to a central declaration from Lawrence Weiner, which runs:

»1. The artist may construct the piece. 2. The piece may be fabricated. 3. The piece need not be built. Each being equal and consistent with the intent of the artist, the decision as to condition rests with the receiver upon the occasion of receivership.« (Lippard 1973, XVII).

Such a perspective allows artists to regard the idea and the execution of an artistic work as separate from each other and to allot them to different production phases. According to such a way of thinking, it is legitimate to realise an artistic conception several times, or, as the case may be, to have it realised – and, in fact, for the purposes of exhibition. Bruce Nauman has made generous use of this possibility. Hence, he has, for instance, had copies made of »Neon Templates of the Left Half of My Body at Ten Inch Intervals« (1966), a fragile and scarcely transportable neon sculpture bought by David Whitney, so that these can travel to exhibitions instead of the »original«. Making the contractual status clear, maintaining ownership conditions and accommodating the interests of collectors are all things B. Nauman regards as an essential component in his artistic work<sup>21</sup>:

»Due to the sculpture's popularity and fragility, the practice of fabricating replicas for temporary exhibitions was developed. Loan agreements required potential borrowers to meet four criteria. First, artist Bruce Nauman requires that the original neon must be in existence and in working order. Second, the current owner of the artwork must agree to the loan before an exhibition copy is fabricated. Third, the credit line for the

loaned artwork specifies that the work on view is an exhibition copy and acknowledges the owner of the original. The final criterion requires the destruction of the copy at the conclusion of the exhibition. Borrowers were asked to provide photographic documentation that the destruction had taken place<sup>22</sup>.

With this approach to a solution, B. Nauman reacts pragmatically to the fact that art is, on the one hand, still collected for its uniqueness, and on the other, however, gains its value in large part from being present in exhibitions. The »original« is collected, the »copy« is exhibited, a process where the borrowers have to commit to destroying the »copy« after the close of the exhibition. B. Nauman, who since the 1960s has been reflecting on the rules of art and the social role of artists and has made them the benchmark for his artistic praxis, thus clearly commits himself to the position that artists cannot limit themselves to producing works of art in a studio. Artists are, much rather, professional »exhibition artists«, consequently responsible for the presentation and discursive contextualisation of the aesthetic images they circulate – right up to the legal parameters. Consequently, Bruce Nauman has »copies« produced, which do not differ from the »originals« in their dimensions, their materiality and their effect, but are better suited in their composition to the demands of the art business than are the »originals«, because they do not have to be preserved and protected from damage, but are meant to be used<sup>23</sup>. Hence, the proposition might be mounted that the exhibition copy matches the institutional framing of art since 1960 structurally far better than the »original«, which is attributable to the value system, the medial conditions and the presentation forms of early modernity.

Exhibition copies illustrate to a greater extent than »originals« the process of transformation an object undergoes when it temporarily immerses itself in a space of aesthetic sanctity – and it is precisely this latter that allows itself to be interpreted as what makes a work »authentic«. Oskar Bätschmann, who has studied the historical genesis of »exhibition artists«, describes the role of institutions which exhibit art as follows: »In the sanctified spaces of the art-system – the galleries, the exhibition halls and the museums – a magical transformation takes place: That of objects into works of art, that of actions into artistic activities and that of the actors into artists«<sup>24</sup>. The magical transformation of a trivial object into an auratic work of art, which takes place in exhibition spaces, and the reverse transformation into a profane object which has fulfilled its purpose and hence is to be disposed of after the close of the exhibition, can be exemplarily traced in exhibition copies.

However, it becomes obvious that the reverse transformation often does not succeed as unproblematically as anticipated. Where copies have been once elevated to the rank of a magical object, it is difficult to deny them this status after the close of an exhibition, to make them once again profane, or even to destroy them completely. This is not solely to be explained by commercial interests, but can be traced back just as well to the enthusiasm for a successful reconstruction which has made a space of experience accessible in a way that documents cannot – and also to the fear of losing something precious. Thus B. Nauman himself, otherwise known for acting consistently, deviated after a while from the practice he had himself conceived. In 2005 and 2006, he authorised two exhibition copies of »Neon Templates of the Left Half of My Body at Ten Inch Intervals«; in 2007 he turned them over to the National Trust for Historic Preservation<sup>25</sup>. He justified this by saying that the gas mixture in the neon tubes used was meanwhile no longer being produced and also could not be conserved long term, so that it was to be feared that the »original« would wear out and soon fade away. By contrast, the exhibition copies, which had been made later, could still go on shining for a while<sup>26</sup>.

Thus, since 1960 exhibition copies have had their place in the field of so-called expanded sculpture, to which Rosalind Krauss gave its name in her essay »Sculpture in the Expanded Field« in 1979<sup>27</sup>. R. Krauss focused on temporary demarcation of places. As a side issue, she also mentions the artistic praxis of reconstruction<sup>28</sup>. Above all, and this is decisive for the approach to exhibition copies chosen here, she indicates that media (as much as genres too) may not be viewed in isolation in the field of expanded sculpture: »For

within the situation of postmodernism, practice is not defined in relation to a given medium – sculpture – but rather in relation to the logical operations on a set of cultural terms, for which any medium – photography, books, lines on walls, mirrors, or sculpture itself – might be used«<sup>29</sup>.

Medial interactions<sup>30</sup>, for R. Krauss a feature of »expanded sculpture«, are equally characteristic of exhibition copies. In the main, photographic documentation forms a vital basis for the reconstruction of a destroyed or lost work of art. Additionally there are, in as far as they have been passed on, concept drawings, sketches of ideas, descriptions of works and bills, which allow insight into materials and production processes, utterances by contemporary witnesses and sometimes filmic records too. Thus, every exhibition copy has its own history; every reconstruction is specifically motivated; every remake has traversed different processes of intermediality. Now it is a matter of material reconstruction, now a performative re-presentation; now a duplication, as intended or choreographed by the artist, now a re-staging which an exhibiting institution has commissioned. It follows, then, that each exhibition copy needs a minutious individual analysis. It is not to be assessed in general terms; rather, the respective conditions, contradictions, decisions, solutions and deficits have to be discussed.

And not least, each exhibition copy should be viewed differently in the knowledge of the respective artistic practise and of the period-specific preconditions of production and reproduction it refers to. With the intermedial processes of exchange, which are linked in the main to an alternation between two- and three-dimensionality, there enters a »logical operation with a series of cultural concepts«<sup>31</sup>, which can safely be termed an »authenticity effect«<sup>32</sup>.

Translation: Stan Jones

## Notes

- 1) This article is based on reflections which were first advanced under the title »Die Ausstellungskopie im Kontext intermedialer Austauschprozesse« [The Exhibition Copy in the Context of Intermedial Processes of Exchange] in the conference proceedings Die Ausstellungskopie. Mediales Konstrukt, materielle Rekonstruktion, historische Dekonstruktion (Tietenberg 2015, 7-19).
- 2) The Tate Gallery of Modern Art held a workshop on exhibition copies on 18 and 19 October 2007 entitled »Modern Inherent Vice: The Replica and its Implications in Modern Sculpture«. – See also: Latour/Lowe 2011, 275-297; Fehrmann et al. 2004a; Burskirk 2003, 59-106; Exhibition Bremen 1999; Preciado 1989; Hutter 1981; Waetzold/Schmid 1979.
- 3) Böhme 2011, 9. – Fehrmann et al. 2004b, 9-10 who prefer a concept of transcription, describe this process as a form of »metaleptic reversal of the cause-and-effect relationship [...], where the ostensibly primary original is only subsequently validated as the original via practices of repetition and readaptation – and indeed by the fact that these practices reveal themselves as secondary processes.« (translation by Stan Jones).
- 4) Here the demarcation between painting and photography was of central importance. See Justin 1974; Wolf 2002.
- 5) Copies, in the form of mouldings, were a fixed component of artists' education in academies until well into the 19<sup>th</sup> century; they were collected by art museums and exhibited. Copies were not distinguishable from »originals« in the way in which they were exhibited, and were not received differently either. On the »copy critique« which – in parallel with the use of the photography medium – ensued in the 19<sup>th</sup> century in art history and led to a devaluing of copies and the plaster mouldings of antique sculptures, see Bartsch et al. 2010; Prost 2011.
- 6) Locher 2008, 39-53.
- 7) Locher 2008, 41 (translation by Stan Jones).
- 8) See Mensger 2012.
- 9) van Gehlen 2011, 15 (translation by Stan Jones).
- 10) As an example, the project »Living Archive – Archivarbeit als künstlerische und kuratorische Praxis der Gegenwart« [Archive work as present-day artistic and curatorial praxis] can be mentioned here. On this topic, Stefanie Schulte Strathaus, film historian and curator at the Arsenal – Institut für Film und Videokunst e. V. in Berlin, has said: »At the same time, it became clear to us that our films were increasingly lying fallow, because nobody was showing them on celluloid any more, while there is a growing interest on the part of exhibition curators and among educators and researchers, who do, however, need other forms of projection. You could indeed demand that they learn to deal with the originals, but we do not share this celluloid fanatics' attitude. We think the optimum would be digitalisation and producing new copies to make them secure and accessible.« (Translation by Stan Jones) Schulte Strathaus/Holl 2012, 148.
- 11) van Gehlen 2011, 15.
- 12) W. Benjamin has nothing else in mind when he speaks of authenticity as a »historical testimony« and, with that, of aura. See Benjamin 1980, 22.



- 13) See Tietenberg 2016, 48-59.
- 14) Didi-Huberman 1999, 13 (translation by Stan Jones).
- 15) Didi-Huberman 1999, 13 (translation by Stan Jones).
- 16) Didi-Huberman 1999, 9 (translation by Stan Jones).
- 17) Here, Didi-Huberman mentions the loss of uniqueness resulting from reproducibility, the footprint in the sand signalling the absence of the foot, and the death mask.
- 18) Didi-Huberman 1999, 13.
- 19) Repetition has been treated as an independent phenomenon since the 1970s and as a new art form since the 1980s. – The self-reference of art and the so-called »art about art« took a central place in art-historical research. See Rebbelmund 1999; Gelshorn 2012.
- 20) Lippard 1973, VII.
- 21) The Leo Castelli Gallery was initially involved in the production process and the drafting of the contract; in recent years the artist and his assistants have taken over this task.
- 22) <http://theglasshouse.org/learn/the-conservation-of-bruce-nau-mans-neon-templates/> (23.01.2019).
- 23) At this point, there appears an analogy to the floating license system of software developers.
- 24) Bättschmann 1997, 227 (translation by Stan Jones).
- 25) Both the original and the two copies have been incorporated into the Philip Johnson Glass House Collection.
- 26) <http://theglasshouse.org/preservationatwork/artrestoration/brucenauman/> (23.01.2019).
- 27) Krauss 1979; published in German: Krauss 2000, 331-346.
- 28) Krauss 1979, 41-42.
- 29) Krauss 1979, 42.
- 30) See Hickethier 2013, 13-27.
- 31) Krauss 1979, 42.
- 32) On the history of the term, see Noetzel 1999; Knaller 2006, 17-35; Daur 2013.

## References

- Bartsch et al. 2010: T. Bartsch / M. Becker / H. Bredekamp / Ch. Schreiter (eds), *Das Originale der Kopie. Kopien als Produkte und Medien der Transformation von Antike* (Berlin, New York 2010).
- Bättschmann 1997: O. Bättschmann, *Ausstellungskünstler. Kult und Karriere im modernen Kunstsystem* (Köln 1997).
- Benjamin (1936) 1980: W. Benjamin, *Das Kunstwerk im Zeitalter seiner technischen Reproduzierbarkeit* (zweite Fassung). In: W. Benjamin, *Gesammelte Schriften. Abhandlungen*. Bd. I. 2. Hrsg. von R. Tiedemann / H. Schweppenhäuser (Frankfurt am Main 1980) 471-508.
- Böhme 2011: H. Böhme, *Einladung zur Transformation*. In: H. Böhme / L. Bergemann / M. Dönike / A. Schirrmeyer / G. Toepfer / M. Walter / J. Weitbrecht (eds), *Transformation. Ein Konzept zur Erforschung kulturellen Wandels* (München 2011) 7-37.
- Burskirk 2003: M. Burskirk, *Original Copies*. In: M. Burskirk (ed.), *The Contingent Object of Contemporary Art* (Cambridge MA 2003) 59-106.
- Daur 2013: U. Daur (ed.), *Authentizität und Wiederholung. Künstlerische und kulturelle Manifestationen eines Paradoxons* (Bielefeld 2013).
- Didi-Huberman 1999: G. Didi-Huberman, *Ähnlichkeit und Berührung. Archäologie, Anachronismus und Modernität des Abdrucks* (Köln 1999).
- Exhibition Bremen 1999: *Originale echt – falsch. Nachahmung, Kopie, Zitat, Aneignung, Fälschung in der Gegenwartskunst* [exhibition catalogue Neues Museum Weserburg] (Bremen 1999).
- Fehrmann et al. 2004a: G. Fehrmann / E. Linz / E. Schumacher / B. Weingart (eds), *Originalkopie. Praktiken des Sekundären* (Köln 2004).
- 2004b: G. Fehrmann / E. Linz / E. Schumacher / B. Weingart, *Originalkopie. Praktiken des Sekundären – Eine Einleitung*. In: Fehrmann et al. 2004a, 7-17.
- van Gehlen 2011: D. van Gehlen, *Mashup. Lob der Kopie* (Berlin 2011).
- Gelshorn 2012: J. Gelshorn, *Aneignung und Wiederholung. Bilddiskurse im Werk von Gerhard Richter und Sigmar Polke* (München 2012).
- Hickethier 2013: K. Hickethier, *Mediale Wechselwirkungen – Modelle des medialen Zusammenwirkens*. In: I. Höger / Ch. Öldorp / H. Wimmer (eds), *Mediale Wechselwirkungen. Adaptionen – Transformationen – Reinterpretationen* (Berlin 2013) 13-27.
- Hutter 1980: H. Hutter (ed.), *Original, Replik, Paraphrase* (Wien 1980).
- Justin 1974: E. Justin, *Visual Communication and the Graphic Arts. Photographic Technologies in the Nineteenth Century* (New York 1974).
- Knaller 2006: S. Knaller, *Genealogie des ästhetischen Authentizitätsbegriffs*. In: S. Knaller / H. Müller (eds), *Authentizität. Diskussion eines ästhetischen Begriffs* (München 2006) 17-35.
- Krauss 1979: R. Krauss, *Sculpture in the Expanded Field*. October 8, 1979, 30-44. [www.onedaysculpture.org.nz/assets/images/reading/Krauss.pdf](http://www.onedaysculpture.org.nz/assets/images/reading/Krauss.pdf) (23.01.2019).
- 2000: R. Krauss, *Skulptur im erweiterten Feld*. In: R. Krauss, *Geschichte und Theorie der Fotografie. Die Originalität der Avantgarde und andere Mythen der Moderne*. Hrsg. von H. Wolf (Amsterdam, Dresden 2000) 331-346.
- Latour/Lowe 2011: B. Latour / A. Lowe, *The Migration of the Aura, or how to Explore the Original through its Facsimiles*. In: Th. Bartscherer / R. Coover (eds), *Switching Codes* (Chicago 2011) 275-297.
- Lippard 1973: L. R. Lippard, *Six Years. The Dematerialization of the Art Object from 1966 to 1972* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London 1973).
- Locher 2008: H. Locher, *Reproduktionen: Erfindung und Entmachtung des Originals im Medienzeitalter*. In: M. Bruhn / K.-U. Hem-

- ken (eds), *Modernisierung des Sehens. Sehweisen zwischen Künsten und Medien* (Bielefeld 2008) 39-53.
- Mensger 2012: A. Mensger (ed.), *Déjà-vu? Die Kunst der Wiederholung*. Exhibition catalogue Kunsthalle Karlsruhe (Bielefeld, Berlin 2012).
- Noetzel 1999: T. Noetzel, *Authentizität als politisches Problem. Ein Beitrag zur Theoriegeschichte der Legitimation politischer Ordnung* (Berlin 1999).
- Preciado 1989: K. Preciado (ed.), *Retaining the Original. Multiple Originals, Copies, and Reproductions*. Exhibition catalogue. National Gallery of Art Washington (Washington 1989).
- Prost 2011: J. Probst (ed.), *Reproduktion. Techniken und Ideen von der Antike bis heute* (Berlin 2011).
- Rebbelmund 1999: R. Rebbelmund, *Appropriation Art. Die Kopie als Kunstform im 20. Jahrhundert* (Frankfurt am Main 1999).
- Schulte Strathaus/Holl 2012: *Persephone und Sisyphos im Archiv*. Stefanie Schulte Strathaus im Gespräch mit Ute Holl. *Zeitschrift für Medienwissenschaft* 2/7, 2012, 143-150.
- Tietenberg 2015: A. Tietenberg, *Die Ausstellungskopie im Kontext intermedialer Austauschprozesse*. In: A. Tietenberg (Hrsg.), *Die Ausstellungskopie. Mediales Konstrukt, materielle Rekonstruktion, historische Dekonstruktion* (Köln, Weimar, Wien 2015) 7-19.
- 2016: A. Tietenberg, *Raum wird zum Bild, Bild wird zum Raum. Anmerkungen zu den medialen und historischen Dimensionen der Rekonstruktion des Kabinetts der Abstrakten*. In: C. Anda / Y. Bialek / C. Durka / A. Karpisek / N. Pohlmann / Ph. Sack (eds), *Aura-Politiken. El Lissitzkys »Kabinett der Abstrakten« zwischen Musealisierung und Teilhabe*. Eine Publikation des DFG-Graduiertenkollegs 1843 »Das fotografische Dispositiv« an der Hochschule für Bildende Künste Braunschweig (2016) 48-59. [http://demonstrationsraum.de/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/aura-politiken\\_epub-1.pdf](http://demonstrationsraum.de/wp-content/uploads/2017/05/aura-politiken_epub-1.pdf) (23.01.2019).
- Waetzold/Schmid 1979: S. Waetzold / A. A. Schmid (eds), *Echtheitsfetischismus? Zur Wahrhaftigkeit des Originalen* (München 1979).
- Wolf 2002: H. Wolf (ed.), *Paradigma Fotografie. Fotokritik am Ende des fotografischen Zeitalters* (Frankfurt am Main 2002).

### *Zusammenfassung / Summary*

#### **Die Ausstellungskopie als anachronistisches Geschichtsmodell und als Bestandteil künstlerischer Praxis**

Ausstellungskopien stehen in dem Ruf, mangelhafte Derivate zu sein. Da sie vorrangig dem Zweck dienen, die Verluste von ästhetischen Gebilden zu kompensieren, die zerstört wurden oder verloren gegangen sind, wird ihnen zumeist kein eigenständiger Wert beigemessen. Vor dem Hintergrund einer zeitgenössischen künstlerischen Praxis, die dem »Original« aufgrund seiner ideologischen Implikationen kritisch gegenübersteht, wird hier der Versuch unternommen, die Ausstellungskopie als ein spezifisches anachronistisches Geschichtsmodell, als eine spannungsreiche Konstellation von Vorleben und Nachleben zu deuten. Anhand des »Kabinetts der Abstrakten«, das von 1928 bis 1937 im Provinzialmuseum Hannover seinen Platz hatte und das zunächst 1968 und dann noch einmal 2017 rekonstruiert wurde, wird aufgezeigt, dass eine Ausstellungskopie zugleich von partizipativen Präsentationstechniken, von Vandalismus, von Trauer und von einem Streben nach Wiedergutmachung zeugen kann. Stärker als »Originale« es vermögen, sind Ausstellungskopien in mediale Wechselwirkungen und Narrationsmuster eingebunden, die Authentizitätseffekte erzielen und auf Historisierungsprozesse Einfluss nehmen.

#### **Exhibition Copies as an Anachronistic Historical Model and as a Component of Artistic Practice**

Exhibition copies have the reputation of being derivative and deficient. As they serve the primary purpose of compensating for the loss of aesthetic images which have been destroyed or lost, in most cases they are not considered to have any value of their own. Against the background of contemporary artistic praxis, which confronts the »original« critically because of the latter's ideological implications, the article will attempt to interpret exhibition copies as specific and anachronistic historical models, as an intense constellation of pre-and post-existence. With particular reference to the »Kabinett des Abstrakten« (Chamber of the Abstract), which was housed in the Hanover Provinzialmuseum from 1928 to 1937 and was reconstructed in 1968 and once again in 2017, it will be demonstrated that an exhibition copy can bear witness to participative presentation techniques, to vandalism, to grief and to a striving for restoration. Exhibition copies are bound up more strongly than »originals« in medial interactions and narrative patterns which aim for effects suggesting authenticity and influence processes of historicisation.