

Kate Martens
December 2007

Conceptual Art and Contemporary Audience

*The necessity and subordination of object and information
in the work of Kelly Sherman*

A lot has changed in the art world over the last forty years. Perhaps most notable is the shift in how work is looked at and experienced, and in who is expected to look at it and experience it. The Conceptual art movement, which began in the 1960s, set out with the aim to shake things up. And the proponents of the movement were successful. American and British artists like Sol LeWitt, John Baldessari, and Joseph Kosuth effectively trashed traditional aesthetic aims, cut down the critics, and created a discourse driven by the removal of the object in art-making. The social and historical relevance of the movement is undeniable. Yet there is an air of exclusivity in the work of the initiators of Conceptual art. It was surely not art for the masses. It was cerebral, aloof, and inaccessible. The audience was kept intentionally small. The publications were distributed tepidly. Nonetheless, Conceptual art became a fixture in the art world, and it affected other aspects of visual culture. Advertising, popular cinema, product design—these things worked in concert with Conceptual art, as they borrowed from one another, without ever fully acknowledging this system of interdependence. Still, the public had little direct exposure to Conceptual art, although, as is the case in most all art movements, they contributed to the necessity of its invention.

Needless to say, things have changed. Conceptual art is no longer exclusive or shocking—it has been around since the 60s, after all. Forty years is a long time to maintain the *je ne sais quois* it achieved so potently early on. Over the course of Conceptual art's history, its physical presentation has changed significantly. Artists who were not involved with the early Conceptual artists, due to difference in time or location, but who shared their value system of idea over object, found innovative, interactive ways to engage the audience. Lygia Clark has challenged and captivated the viewer's senses with her "proposals,"¹ for instance. Felix Gonzalez-Torres infused comedy and comfort

¹ Peter Osborne: *Themes and Movements: Conceptual Art* (New York: Phaidon Press Incorporated, 2002) 149.

into his thematically somber candy piles. Conceptual art has become an accepted part of the contemporary artistic conversation because it has reached out and touched the viewer in some capacity. No longer is the message restricted to the flat white plane. No longer does it feel antiseptic or detached. No longer does the cerebral meaning outweigh the personal one. Since its remote beginning, Conceptual art, due to its appearance and implications, has become relatable for the contemporary audience.

Kelly Sherman, a contemporary Conceptual artist working in Boston, is a bit of an anomaly. The formal qualities of her work allude quite plainly to LeWitt, Baldessari and Kosuth. She uses text and monochromatic color schemes. The images in her work are consistently diagrammatic. But there is little that is wry or flippant about the work. She is not playing visual and philosophical tricks in the way that Baldessari and the gang did. There is a real sense of the genuine, the authentic, the human, in Sherman's work—though the physicality of the images she creates hardly invite warm and fuzzy feelings. Sherman's format may be likened to LeWitt's, but the subjects she broaches are not abstract. Sherman walks the fine line between objectivity and emotionalism. I'm not sure if it works or not, but it's certainly an interesting body of work to consider.

Kelly Sherman is both contemporary artist and “ethnographer,” by Hal Foster's definition. She collects and presents information that reveals ever-present but oft-ignored aspects of American culture in a manner that is concise in its visual language but voluminous in its intrinsic implications.

I. “If it looks like art, **you're not trying hard enough**”

(Sherman)

I had the chance to speak with Kelly Sherman last month. Though her training is in sculpture, the artist has been working predominantly with “non-art” materials for the last five years. She takes pride in the fact that she'd choose Xerox paper over Arches brand. Though she is quite young and her career has just begun, she speaks well about her work. Sherman has recently shown at the ICA and the Le Centre Pompidou.

Sherman is taking the sort of stoic visual language invented by artists like Kosuth and Baldessari. But her thematic agenda—that it, what she is expressing and why—contrasts quite distinctly from how she expresses it. She explores themes that are inherently personal and emotionally untidy. Sherman is not looking to solve

metaphysical mysteries about object and word and image, like the Conceptual artists of the late 1960s. Rather, she is ordering and abbreviating volumes of emotional information. Sherman exposes subjects that are explosive in our current culture. She does not shroud her work in big ideas, in blockbuster terms. Her themes are relatable. Divorce, poverty, the American Dream. These are things that are rooted in life and culture. These are things the viewer doesn't have to work so hard to wrap his mind around.

Conceptual art—as a movement and as a body of work—is not something I've ever felt a connection to. I've always shrugged it off, thinking that it's esoteric and that it's iconoclastic. I found it smug in its presumed “progressiveness,” and its rejection of the relevance of art history. I took offense to its denouncement of art materials, its deprecation of art media. I knew a bit about the hard-hitters of the late 1960s and early 1970s, and I found their visual style to be unappealing and cold. To me, it seemed standardized. It felt computerized. It was anti-tactile, anti-aesthetic.

Despite all this, I went to a talk given by the contemporary Conceptual artist Kelly Sherman. And, to be honest, I was quite surprised by how much the discussion has changed. Her work *looks* quite a bit like the work made in the late 1960s and early 70s, but her thematic focus could not be more distant from the broad, briny, existential dilemmas being worked out 40 years ago. She has brought things down to a human scale—made pieces that can be read and assimilated not only by the elite, but also by the public. I'm interested in how artists like Sherman have expanded and edited the audience receptive to contemporary Conceptual art. When I later had the opportunity to interview her, I felt comfortable really questioning the paradox of the issues she's examining about how she is examining them. To be honest, I am still hesitant to say that I really “like” Conceptual art as a movement or a body of work. It's important, however, to look at the history of the genre in order to understand how it's changed. And once I started to look into the history, I found it is, like most things, a bit more complex than it initially appears.

II. “Art changed its focus from the form of the language to **what was being said**”

(Kosuth)

The term “conceptual” is rather vague these days. It is applied to a wide variety of subjects—from software to chemistry. And, even within the context of art, it’s certainly a word that is thrown around with great gusto, and with little regard to the powerful historical connotations of the word.

Conceptual art, as a movement, got its name and its official start in 1967—and the term, “Conceptual art”, at that point, was anything but vague. A similar thing happened to the term “abstract art” in the middle of the 20th century² in that it began as a very specific term, and was overused until its meaning loosened and expanded to accommodate the themes to which it had been applied. The Conceptual art movement is a difficult one to assess and analyze from most any of the critical angles we’ve discussed in this class because the artists involved had a very strong aversion to the role of the art critic—and, really, the art historian as well. Many of the artists deliberately resisted critical input—which is a difficult thing to do in the art world. It was a movement that turned the art community on its axis. This was art made by artists for artists. It was not intended to be consumed by the general public.³ And, to be quite frank, the general public wasn’t really ready to consume it.

Sol LeWitt was among the first to define conceptual art. “In conceptual art the idea or concept is the most important aspect of the work. When an artist uses a conceptual form of art, it means that all of the planning and decisions are made beforehand and the execution is a perfunctory affair. The idea becomes a machine that makes the art.” There is a kind of implied violence in the formation of the movement. The artists involved were plainly attempting to destroy the constructs of art practice. There was a very real animosity that artists felt for the aesthetic expectations society held. Francis Colpitt called it “the tyranny of formalism.”⁴

Conceptual artists have in common with one another the emphasis on the idea the work presents, rather than the aesthetic mode they employ to get this idea across.⁵

² Charles Harrison “Conceptual Art, the aesthetic and the end(s) of art,” Gill Perry and Paul Wood, ed.: *Themes in Contemporary Art*. (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 2004) 46.

³ Francis Colpitt: “The Formalist Connection and Original Myths of Conceptual Art,” in *Conceptual Art: Theory, Myth, and Practice*. (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004) 31.

⁴ Francis Colpitt: “The Formalist Connection and Original Myths of Conceptual Art,” in *Conceptual Art: Theory, Myth, and Practice*. (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004) 28.

⁵ Peter Osborne: *Themes and Movements: Conceptual Art* (New York: Phaidon Press Incorporated, 2002) 11.

Conceptual artists work in many media—including painting, photography, installation, performance, text, and so on. The work I've focused on is the 2- and 3-dimensional text and image art made by artists such as John Baldessari, Joseph Kosuth, Sol LeWitt, and Art & Language—a collaborative group.

What I'm most interested in is the early forms of conceptual art and how the work of the contemporary artist, Kelly Sherman, both replicates and violates the goals set forth in the late 1960s. Many of the artists have made work in the medium of language—forged from nouns, adjectives, verbs, articles. Conceptual artists of the 60s (and beyond) had many different goals, but their most pressing one was the dematerialization of the art object—the sort of stripping away of its visual power, castration of its physical potency. In many cases, language and text replaced the object (a phenomenon that is particularly strong in Sherman's work, which will be discussed later).

Conceptual art delivers a kind of sucker punch. It at once removes the boundaries that traditional modes of representation put up (finding meaning in Monet's handling of paint, for instance) but it also introduces new, unfamiliar challenges. Take Baldessari's painting. At first glance, it seems liberating. A painting that is “purged” of ideas seems like a painting that rejects the potential for namby-pamby of critical discourse. For most viewers, this is a relief! But the longer one takes to look at and consider the text, the less clear the message becomes.

Baldessari's piece follows some of the basic rules of painting. It's on a canvas. It's hung on the wall. The image (letters) is rendered in paint. But, if the viewer were to try to analyze the work in the same way he'd look at a Monet, he'd run into some serious obstacles. What is there to analyze in this piece, anyway? “I was attempting to make something that didn't emanate art signals,” the artist stipulates. “The only art signal I wanted was the canvas.”⁶ He was quite successful, if this was, indeed, his goal. The image is coded—visually, it references nothing except what meaning the letters, which are built into words and sentences, provide. Once the process and production of the piece is revealed, things get even more nebulous. Baldessari actually commissioned a sign

⁶ Peter Osborne: *Themes and Movements: Conceptual Art* (New York: Phaidon Press Incorporated, 2002) 125.

painter to do the lettering. The distance, therefore, between artist and art object is apparent. This is a theme that continues throughout the history of Conceptual art.

Just as interesting and complex as the relationship between maker and object (for lack of a better word) is the relationship between object and viewer in Conceptual art. The issue of audience is certainly a compelling one when looking at Conceptual art—and this is the more specific topic of my investigation. In 1967, when the term “conceptual art” first came into being, the common spectator had some pretty concrete expectations when he entered a gallery space. Yes, the Abstract Expressionists had uprooted representational tendencies in American painting. Yes, the Pop artists had blurred the boundaries between industrial production and fine art production. The difference between Conceptual art and the movements that had come before it was the fact that Conceptual art was not (and is not) material-generated. People, by the late 1960s, knew all about shock value. The public had been exposed to images depicting war, pornography, and so on. But Conceptual art has a different kind of power. It is shocking because of what’s *not* there.

Joseph Kosuth produced *Clear Square Glass Leaning* in 1965-57—early in the life of the movement. The meaning that the viewer derives from looking at the image is precisely the same as the meaning he or she derives from reading the words printed on the image. The language and the image are perfectly aligned in a manner that weakens the division between idea and object. This is unnerving, to say the least. The viewer panics when there is nothing to hold on to, nothing to sink his analytical teeth in to. Kosuth has dodged associations in this piece. He is telling no story. He is preaching no belief system. He doesn’t even give the viewer the benefit of the prim white canvas, like Baldessari did. Instead, the viewer is left with four clear glass plates—a wholly transparent image with no outstanding formal qualities to question or consider.

Kosuth was an American editor of the journal *Art-Language* (a project run by the British group Art & Language), and he wrote quite a bit on Conceptual art. “With the unassisted readymade, art changed its focus from the form of the language to what was being said. Which means that it changed the nature of art from a question of morphology to a question of function.” His description is compelling, and it relates well to his work. Kosuth goes on to say “this change—one from ‘appearance’ to ‘conception’—was the

beginning of 'modern' art and the beginning of 'conceptual' art. All art (after Duchamp) is conceptual (in nature) because art only exists conceptually."

Clear Square Glass Leaning is almost like a physical expression of an idea. It is barely tangible, and it is coded in the maker's (or the imaginer's) minimalist language. It is simple, but it is also impenetrable. Before Duchamp, most of the art in the West was expected to communicate in some capacity. The dialogue between maker and viewer was an important aspect of the work. With the advent of the readymade, things changed.

It's impossible to talk about Conceptual art without talking about Duchamp. He is the true champion of the movement, though he made the work most applicable to the movement decades before Conceptual art even had a name.

III. "I was struck by **how much stuff there was in the world**, and by how much stuff I was putting into the world."

(Sherman)

Sherman's execution is deliberately "clinical," as she calls it, but her themes are vulnerable. In a manner that appears eerily detached, Sherman documents her parents' divorce by recreating the arrangement of the furniture on floor plans. She presents anonymous lists of wishes made by impoverished mothers, greedy teenagers, children.

Sherman is definitely interested in human dependency on and attachment to the non-art object—the chair, for example, the sewing machine, or the lamp. Emotional attachment to and affection for inanimate objects is an ironic theme that runs through much of the work. The object becomes evidence of a human presence. The Wited-out guitar. The request for clothing to cover husband, son, and daughter. The objects obscure the individuals who love or miss or lack them. The objects also reveal what is important to Sherman's absent (but vital) human subjects. The tension between word and image and body is almost tangible.

And in this acknowledgment of the object and in this specificity of the subject matter, there is a lot more for the viewer to grab on to. Sherman may be retreating into the stark visual style of the early Conceptual artists, but she encouraging the viewer to involve himself in the ideas she presents in a way Baldessari or LeWitt might have scoffed at. Sherman's invitation is not physical in the way Clark's or Torres's is. Yet Sherman has tapped in to the (American) human condition in a very interesting way, in a

very relatable way. This work is about abbreviating personal stories, whereas the work of the early Conceptual artists was about expanding general, “big” ideas. Furthermore, Sherman involves the audience in a way her predecessors of the 60s and 70s did not. It is the viewer’s job to re-infuse the abbreviations, to explicate the diagrams, and to breathe life into the schematic representations.

In *Wish Lists*, the artist used Internet search websites to find documents outlining people’s wishes. She took the lists she found, and made them anonymous by putting them in a uniform font and format and printing them on an inkjet printer. Although the series looks quite simple, Sherman considered each of the visual components—the paper, the ink, the font—very thoroughly. The artist’s dependence on (and delight in) technology is a compelling facet of her work. The simplicity of Sherman’s work does not signify flippancy toward the aesthetic aspects of the piece, but actually great care. Sherman’s artistic process is one of distillation and reduction. She uses only what’s necessary to communicate the idea and its implications. She disregards the excess. The text is so rich in this work that it would most likely be overwhelming to present the lists in a way that did bring in aesthetic ideas and references.

In *To Move*, a piece about the end of cohabitation (and the end of a relationship), Sherman looks at the theme (often present in her work) of domestic disintegration. She uses actual text to describe the objects, rather than shapes to render them visually, as she does in *The Family House*. *To Move* is simply a pair of lists documenting the possessions contained in an apartment. One is left plain, the other has certain items removed (by way of Wite-Out application). As in *Wish Lists*, the subject is simple here. The piece is about loss, mourning, leaving, or being left. And although the format of the work may be reminiscent of Baldessari and his contemporaries, Sherman’s ideas are much more straightforward in that they are grounded in common experience.

IV. “I think it’s important to understand **the context in which you work.**”
(Sherman)

Sherman’s *Wish Wall Mural* is a particularly interesting project in that it shows just how available Conceptual art has become. The mural is on Walden Street in Cambridge, near Porter Square. Kelly Sherman worked with a class of 4th graders. She taught a unit on the basic history of Conceptual art (using the classic example of the

erased de Kooning) and had the students participate in a project that illustrated and exemplified that Conceptual art could look and feel like. Members of the community were also invited to participate.

The role of site in contemporary art practice is an undeniably relevant one. *Wish Wall* is the most obviously site-specific of Sherman's work that has been discussed. The relationship between Conceptual art and the space in which it lives is nothing new. Robert Smithson was mining the implications of ideas in physical spaces thirty years ago. But the attempt to integrate and assimilate the idea into the space is what sets Conceptual art apart from general site-specific work. When the artist chooses a physical place in which to make and display work, he or she "enters its culture and learns its language."⁷ This is certainly the case in *Wish Wall*. Sherman's aesthetic is far from decorative, and it does little make the building stand out in its environment. In fact, I've walked it on a few occasions and simply not noticed it. And yet Sherman managed to involve numerous members of the community in the process. In this sense, she very successfully (and also very literally) found her way into the culture of this street corner where the Thistle and Shamrock, a convenience store, serves the kids, the construction workers, the retirees and the commune-dwellers of Cambridge. The *Wish Wall* is appealing because it is approachable. "It was the result of a greater aesthetic open-endedness that allowed art to intersect with an expanded range of social life."⁸

In "The Artist as Ethnographer," Hal Foster examines the ethnographic paradigm. Foster is concerned with the contemporary artist's interest in educating the viewer on issues of cultures—both far-off and immediate. He looks at the connections between artist and anthropologist. If successful, the reader infers, both individuals function as cultural "interpreters,"⁹ self-aware societal shamans who wield the power and the influence to shape public prejudices.

The two professions do have some major differences, however, and Foster acknowledges them wholeheartedly. He also emphasizes the "envy" that the artist and

⁷ Hal Foster: "The Artist as Ethnographer." *Return of the Real*. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1996) 202.

⁸ Alberro, Alexander and Buchmann, Sabeth ed.: *Art After Conceptual Art*. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 2006) 14.

⁹ Hal Foster: "The Artist as Ethnographer." *Return of the Real*. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1996) 180.

anthropologist feel toward one another. Historically, he maintains, the anthropologist has felt inferior to the artist. The artist has always been a desirable “other,” perched up in a studio, free to explore whatever ideas tickle his fancy, considered to be above the moralizing rules of society. The ethnographer has his feet on the ground. He deals in fact. He pursues the truth through the grind of research, statistics, and study. Recently, however, the balance has shifted. Many artists have begun to admire—and in some cases act like—ethnographers.

The Conceptual art of the 1960s and 70s, as well as the more recent work, relates quite nicely to Foster’s argument. The early Conceptual artists presented information in distinctly “non-artistic” ways. They used text. They referenced graphs, architectural models, machines, and various facets of technological progress. These are the very same informational tools that anthropologists use. And yet, the viewer wonders, what is it that LeWitt and Kosuth were trying to communicate? Certainly not facts and figures about the Fante tribe of West Africa. Certainly not the linguistic complexities of the indigenous peoples of the Amazon. Certainly not the educational inconsistencies in the still largely segregated schools in the American south. The Conceptual artists of the late 1960s and early 70s were too wrapped up in their own elite culture to venture beyond it. These things they left to the *real* anthropologists.

Artists working in the conceptual vein at different times and locations used ethnographic inspiration to different ends. Many used their work to educate the public on a specific group or culture—though not necessarily in a manner that an anthropologist would communicate, but in a manner that is intuitive and interactive. Hélio Oiticica, a Brazilian artist, made a series of *Parangolés*—cape-like garments meant to be worn by the viewer.¹⁰ Layers of fabric and text reveal potent political messages outlining the injustices in indigenous communities in Brazil for the viewer to absorb and consider. By inviting the viewer to literally wear these words, the artist allows the viewer to involve himself in the issues presented. Michael Rakowitz, a contemporary American artist, takes on the culture of this country’s homeless population in his work. He produces functional sculptures that exist outside, on city streets in Cambridge, Boston, New York,

¹⁰ Peter Osborne, ed.: *Themes and Movements: Conceptual Art*. (New York: Phaidon Press Incorporated, 2002) 149.

and Baltimore. The sculptures are portable sleeping spaces for the homeless. He employs the use of inexpensive materials and appropriates exterior ventilation systems on existing buildings to inflate and heat the structures.

These artists actively involve the viewer in their respective causes by way of materials. Yet, as the tradition of Conceptual art dictates, the idea is still more important than the object the artist employs to express it. Sherman's causes are subtler, but her modes of presenting information are quietly strong. Foster would likely count Sherman among the "indigenous ethnographers", artists such as Mary Kelly and Silvia Kolbowski who routinely ethnologically examine aspects of their own personal culture in their work. Oiticica and Rakowitz were also working within their own cultures. Most artists of late wouldn't dare appropriate information about the non-Western other with the aim to "educate" the viewer. Photojournalism is an obvious exception. But few would argue that documentary photography or photojournalism serve the same purpose as Conceptual art. Cultural imperialism, thankfully, has gone out of style. Thus, Foster's examination of the indigenous ethnographers is the most relevant part of the article, particularly in relation to Kelly Sherman's work.

Sherman does act as a kind of anthropologist. Her work is not about fictionalizing common situations. She is not dramatizing imaginary lives. Sherman is a meticulous recorder of facts. The work is made stronger by virtue of its truth and authenticity. I can't help but to think of LeWitt's comparison of artist to clerk. "The serial artist does not attempt to produce a beautiful or mysterious object," he maintains, "but functions merely as a clerk cataloguing the results of his premise."¹¹ Well, we've come a long way from the Romantic notion of artist as genius, or artist as sensitive superhuman. Some of the stories she presents are autobiographical. Others require research. She conducts interviews, reads books on psychology and sociology, and spends a good deal of time scouring the Internet for stories, facts, and data. And so it seems appropriate, when imagining Sherman—mechanically constructing the series of floor plans for *The Family House*, or compiling the *Wish Lists* on a computer screen, or dabbing Wite-Out on sacrificial objects in *To Move (Ours. Mine.)*—to think of her less as

¹¹ Peter Osborne, ed.: *Themes and Movements: Conceptual Art*. (New York: Phaidon Press Incorporated, 2002) 95.

an artist, and more of an anthropologist. She is a collector of information. The research process is inherent in the work.

Sherman often uses text in her work. Even when images are the primary focus in a piece, they are simple, concise, and translatable into language. The visual style is diagrammatic—and thus orderly and precise. All this tidiness does more than neaten up the arrangement of information on the page, however. Because of the method of its presentation, the work feels quietly authoritative. It feels wise. Despite the temporality of the printer paper, the work feels as though it is intended to last. It seems as though the artist is preparing the information, not for the eyes of the contemporary viewer, but for the perusal of future generations—populations that will likely have the same problems that the work examines. Though, as Sherman says, there is too much stuff in the world. One can only hope, then, that the ideas will endure.

It's only natural that Sherman's work, due to timeframe and subject matter, would attract a very different audience than Baldessari's or Kosuth's or Art & Language's exhibitions. It is accessible. It is approachable. It is applicable to the common American experience. Sherman spoke of "demystifying" conceptual art—which is rather ironic, considering that Baldessari and the rest claimed to be "demystifying art." If Sherman is working, some 40 years later, to clean up the theoretical mess they made, we can only assume that they didn't do a very thorough job. But here, again, arises the question of spectatorship. Sherman has the benefit of time. No longer is Conceptual art necessarily shocking in its starkness. The public has grown accustomed to it because we've had the chance to. And Sherman's work has the audience it does because it looks at issues that feel relevant and real. There is a kind of ever-present objectivity in Sherman's work that is in direct opposition with the subjects she chooses to examine. It is this very specific tension between the clinical presentation and the emotional subject matter that makes her work compelling.

Sherman's work is about absence—the absence of a specific person, for instance, or a particular object. It is what isn't in the work that makes it powerful. And this certainly applies thematically as well. *Wish Lists* and *To Move* both allude to the power of the absent but acquirable object. And the *Wish Wall* is a kind of monument to the agelessness of longing. *The Family House* lays out the relevance of the arrangement of

household objects, and how much these arrangements can reveal about familial dysfunction and disintegration.

Yet Sherman's work is not always about loss, but more the potential to gain, acquire, grow, and heal. There is a good deal of vacant space in Sherman's work—but the blankness isn't really blank. It's activated by what isn't there. Sherman has effectively put the pregnant pause in visual terms. It's the viewer's projection onto the work—the assumptions we're invited to make, the associations we're urged to contemplate, the stories we're asked to invent—that give it power. It's an interesting paradox, then, that Sherman has expressed the importance of the object in life in a manner that denies the importance of the object in art.

Works Cited

Alberro, Alexander and Buchmann, Sabeth ed.: *Art After Conceptual Art*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 2006.

Colpitt, Frances: "The Formalist Connection and Originary Myths of Conceptual Art." Michael Corris, ed.: *Conceptual Art: Theory, Myth, and Practice*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Foster, Hal: "The Artist as Ethnographer" *Return of the Real*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1996.

Harrison, Charles: "Conceptual Art, the aesthetic and the end(s) of art." Gill Perry and Paul Wood, ed.: *Themes in Contemporary Art*. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 2004.

Morley, Simon: *Writing on the Wall: Word and Image in Modern Art*. Berkeley California: University of California Press, 2003.

Osborne, Peter ed.: *Themes and Movements: Conceptual Art*. New York: Phaidon Press Incorporated, 2002.

Sherman, Kelly. Personal interview. 26th November 2007.