Lady Gaga, Sleeping with Gaga, September 13, 2012. 'Fame' Eau de Parfum Launch Event and live performance, Guggenheim Museum, New York. Photo by Kevin Mazur/WireImage.

PHILIP AUSLANDER

The Fame: Performance art and Celebrity Culture

A woman lives for twelve days on three raised platforms in an art gallery in New York City, performing such routine daily actions as washing, dressing, sitting, and standing, but not eating, without speaking. Ladders with knives for rungs provide the only way for her to leave the platforms or for others to join her.

A woman sleeps eight hours a day for seven days inside a glass box raised four feet off the floor in a public gallery in London. She is part of an exhibition that also includes historical artifacts such as Napoleon's rosary and a cigar partially smoked by Winston Churchill.

The first work of art described above, Marina Abramović's *The House with the Ocean View* (2002) is considered one of the artist's 'key works'[1] and was declared 'one of the most important live artworks of the decade' in the pages of *Artforum* by no less a luminary than RoseLee Goldberg, author of the first history of performance art and director of the Performa festival.[2] The second, Tilda Swinton's *The Maybe* (1995),[3] although a crowd favourite and a work performed so far in London, Rome, and New York between 1995 and 2013, has not been declared a masterwork. Although both the London and New York

versions received some favourable notices in the UK press, not only has the work not attained the status granted Abramović's, it has been the object of some rather harsh dismissals. Jason Farago, writing for the *New Republic*, for example, describes the piece as 'an empty gesture by a movie star with an incomplete command of art history.'[4]

Two works of performance art each of which consists largely of a woman's body framed for display. One is taken to represent the epitome of what performance art should be, while the other is dismissed as the work of a usurper who has no place in the art world. Although the differences between these two pieces are important, they share a common thematic ground that goes beyond their surface similarities. The stated intentions of the two artists are closely related: both see their respective presences ultimately as creating contexts for spectatorial performance. Upon descending from her perch at the conclusion of the performance, Abramović reportedly declared to her audience, 'this work is as much you as it is me.'[5] Swinton takes up the same theme in her statement that the 'piece is really about the audience. It acts like a mirror.'[6] Given the congruencies between the two pieces and their intentions, what accounts for the difference in critical reception?

The key to this difference is implied, I think, in Farago's description of Swinton as a movie star. Swinton is but one of several high profile performers to take part in performance works in art world venues over the past twenty years, but particularly since 2009. In addition to Swinton, their number includes musicians Lady Gaga and Jay Z, and film actors James Franco, Milla Jovovich,

Joaquin Phoenix and, most recently, Shia LaBeouf. Reception of their performance art work is inevitably coloured by their celebrity status and a deep suspicion of the cult[ure] of celebrity on the part of art critics.[7]

Despite her considerable bona fides as a performance artist with a body of significant work made over four decades, Abramović herself fell under this suspicion during the 2010 run of her retrospective exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art in New York City. In addition to a survey of her earlier work, the show included a new piece, *The Artist is Present*, for which Abramović sat in the museum's atrium dressed in a vividly coloured floor-length dress (in red, white, or blue, depending on the month) for all of the hours it was open during her exhibition and invited anyone who wished to sit in an empty chair opposite her. This work, which was also streamed live on the museum's website, quickly became a sensation: 500,000 people attended the retrospective while 800,000 watched the performance online, and over 1,400 people participated in it, usually after waiting for hours, even overnight, on a line that stretched for blocks outside the museum.[8] It was as if Abramović were a pop star rather than an artist, and this rubbed some critics the wrong way. Carrie Lambert-Beatty, writing in *Artforum*, allowed that Abramović certainly deserved a museum retrospective but registered disappointment that 'it looks like performance art is entering the Museum of Modern Art in the form of unabashed celebrity worship.'[9]

CELEBRITY CULTURE AND THE ART MUSEUM

The critical allergy to celebrity culture reflected in Lambert-Beatty's comment seems to be based on an idea that the art world is and should remain a cultural bastion set apart from the grubby world of mass culture in which celebrity is celebrated—a position that is hard to justify when one considers the entanglement of both the art world and the museum as an institution in supporting and sustaining, if not necessarily creating, celebrity culture. David W. Galenson devotes two sections of his book *Conceptual Revolutions in Twentieth-Century Art* to the concept of 'The Artist as Celebrity,' pointing out that Picasso was perhaps the first twentieth-century artist to cultivate celebrity. Galenson goes on to trace the conjunction of artist and celebrity through the lineage of Andy Warhol, which passes through Jeff Koons to the Young British Artists (YBAs) like Damien Hirst and Tracey Emin in the early years of the twenty-first century.[10]

David Cottington dates the evolution of the modern artist as celebrity to the period after World War II:

> It is the postwar saturation of social life achieved by a proliferating mass media, led by television, that has given 'celebrity' the meaning and lustre that it has today. It is therefore no coincidence that artists first became celebrities in the contemporary sense in the mid-20th-century USA. Jackson Pollock was the

> prototype: while his career peaked before modern media saturation was achieved, he was the first modern artist to be given wide publicity in the popular press even before his avant-garde reputation had been secured.[11]

While the museum may not be an engine of celebrity on the same order as the mass media, it nevertheless clearly plays a role in the promotion of celebrity artists by providing them with prestigious platforms and cultural validation.

Another phenomenon that points to the museum's implication in the workings of celebrity is the so-called 'blockbuster exhibition.' The term *blockbuster* originally referred to a type of aerial bomb capable of destroying an entire city block used by the Germans during World War II. After the war, the term was quickly taken up by the entertainment industry, particularly to describe very popular movies.[12] Especially now, the reasons behind the blockbuster museum show are economic—museums can no longer rely on their traditional sources of funding and subsidy and must find ways of appealing directly to the general public. The analogy with the film business is direct: '"To draw the crowds, it is now necessary to propose imposing headline stars, like in a movie" . . . Just as Hollywood has its Spiderman, Batman and Avengers, the big museums have their Picasso, Van Gogh, Koons and Dali, breaking records for visitors.'[13]

The exhibition *Girl with a Pearl Earring and Other Treasures from the Mauritshuis in The Hague*, which

toured globally from 2012 to 2014 while the Dutch museum was closed for renovation, well exemplifies the current coalescence of the worlds of entertainment and celebrity with the museum world. For one thing, it seems improbable that the choice to feature this particular painting is unrelated to the popularity of the 1999 novel by Tracy Chevalier and its 2003 film adaptation, in which Scarlett Johansson plays the titular character, both titled *Girl with a Pearl Earring*. Press write-ups of this exhibition regularly personify the Vermeer painting itself as a celebrity performer, describing it, for example, as having spent 'two years on a blockbuster world tour.'[14] When this exhibition was installed at the High Museum of Art in Atlanta in 2013, Vermeer's painting was presented as the star of the show, ensconced in an ornate frame in its own darkened room, which visitors entered after passing by all the other paintings by Rembrandt, Hals, Steen and other Dutch masters. There, it was dramatically lit and held at a distance. One can still see on the museum's website a description of the show that features an animated graphic of Vermeer's Girl herself, or at least her celebrity version, wearing aviator shades, holding an ice-cream cone, and winking at the viewer.[15] Closing the circle, this exhibition and Vermeer's painting are now the subjects of a documentary film whose publicity continues the discursive construction of the painting itself as a celebrity: 'its recent world tour garnered huge queues lining up for the briefest glimpse of its majestic beauty—in Japan 1.2 million people saw the exhibition.'[16]

In the age of the celebrity artist, the blockbuster

exhibition, and even the celebrity work of art, to suggest that there is impropriety in the museum as a site that celebrates a performance artist's star identity (or one by a movie star) is simply to ignore the current reality: 'as the proliferation of . . . museums [of modern art] and the rise in their attendance figures . . . testify, and the celebrity status bestowed on individual artists . . . underlines, [modern art] has been fully assimilated into what the cultural critic Guy Debord called "the society of the spectacle."'[17]

PERFORMANCE ART BY CELEBRITIES

Sharon Marcus argues that while Abramović was an established art world figure prior to *The Artist is Present*, she achieved celebrity through the exhibition, as evidenced by the fact that the performance was discussed on celebrity websites such as *Gawker.com* and that the rapper Jay Z invited Abramović to participate in his work of performance art, *Picasso Baby*, at the Pace Gallery in New York City in 2013. The heart of Marcus's argument is contained in four 'theses on celebrity'; in each case, she identifies an aspect of celebrity culture and discusses Abramović's relationship to it. She concludes,

> 'The Artist Is Present' turned the dynamics of celebrity itself into art. In a sense, Abramovic's performance was a metacelebrity event that made its creator a celebrity because it was itself about celebrity. For some, the connections

> between 'The Artist Is Present' and celebrity culture signalled the death of performance art, but the show's real significance may lie in its artful grasp of the ongoing life of celebrities and their publics.[18]

It is noteworthy that Marcus's description of Abramović's performance, a work by an accredited performance artist, also describes almost all performance art pieces undertaken recently by celebrity performers: these, too, are metacelebrity events that are themselves about celebrity, though they affirm the celebrity of their respective creators rather than bring it about. Sarah Howell, writing in the *New Statesman*, suggests of the 2013 version of Swinton's performance at the Museum of Modern Art in New York City,

> *The Maybe* dissects our obsession with celebrity. It constructs a scenario that encourages the public to gawk, to gossip, to scrutinise a famous actress as she sleeps… Its entire construct relies on Swinton as a recognisable face, but its resonance moves beyond this initial reaction, to one of obsession, of fascination and curiosity.[19]

Swinton herself described the original version at the Serpentine Gallery, for which historical relics accompanied her sleeping presence, as being partly about

'this dialogue about fame.'[20]

In 2012, between the two iterations of Swinton's performance, Lady Gaga performed a related piece, *Sleeping with Gaga*, at the launch of her perfume, The Fame, at the Guggenheim Museum in New York City. Dressed and made up as a glamorous Sleeping Beauty, Gaga also engaged in public sleeping—the difference was that the enclosure in which she slept allowed participants to reach in and touch her hand (though she did not wake when touched). Whereas Swinton staged the gaze that celebrities are subjected to by the public, Gaga allowed those attending to enact the fantasy of making physical contact with the object of that gaze (and those who have seen the event on video subsequently to have the same experience vicariously). Both Swinton's and Gaga's respective performances were meditations on fame and celebrities' relationship to the public, undertaken by celebrities in museums that have played major roles in shaping modern and contemporary art.

The film actor James Franco describes his first venture into performance art, which occurred outside the museum in 2009 in related terms. Franco appeared in twenty episodes of the American television soap opera *General Hospital* as a conceptual performance, playing a version of himself,

> The bad-boy artist 'Franco, just Franco.' I disrupted the audience's suspension of disbelief, because no matter how far I got into the character, I was going to be perceived as something that doesn't

> belong to the incredibly stylised world of soap operas. Everyone watching would see an actor they recognised, a real person in a made-up world. In performance art, the outcome is uncertain—and this was no exception. My hope was for people to ask themselves if soap operas are really that far from entertainment that is considered critically legitimate.[21]

Franco's attempt to raise aesthetic issues by collapsing the boundaries between cultural realms that normally do not intersect depended, as he says, not on his ability to create a persuasive illusion as an actor but on his recognisability as 'a real person'—in other words, his celebrity. As these examples suggest, Abramović's metacelebrity event at the Museum of Modern Art was neither the first nor the last time that the cultural meaning of celebrity has been examined through performance art. The chief difference is that whereas Swinton, Franco, and Gaga were celebrity performers before they became performance artists, Abramović was a performance artist who became a media celebrity by enacting the role of celebrity in a work of performance art.

REPRESENTATION, ORIGINALITY, AND NARRATIVE

Marcus looks at the relationship between Abramović's performance and features of celebrity. In the remainder of this essay, I will follow a similar path by similar means. My concern, however, is not just with *The Artist is Present*

but with performance art as a form and the degree to which aspects of performance art have historically resembled the workings of celebrity.

For example, the first of Marcus's four theses states, 'celebrity combines presence and representation,' and she continues, 'celebrity presence is always shadowed by representation' since celebrity identity has long been created through a combination of live presence before audiences and media images.[22] In the case of *The Artist is Present*, Marcus argues that by presenting herself as an iconic figure, Abramović was in a sense a representation of herself even in her live performance. However, one did not have to be in her presence in the museum to experience the performance, since representations of it abounded, beginning with the live feed and photos posted to Instagram.

Although Marcus's analysis of Abramović's performance is persuasive, the relationship between presence and representation in performance art is a question that pertains to the form as a whole, not uniquely to Abramović, and especially to the currently vexed issue of performance art documentation. Although the essential experience of performance art is supposed by many to reside in a live event, it is nevertheless clear that most people experience most performances through representations and reproductions, just as most people encounter celebrities only as media representations, and it is in these forms that works of performance art enter into public and historical discourses. The ephemerality of performance, often taken to be one of its essential qualities, is belied by the necessity of preserving it for

future audiences.

Reproduced versions of performances may give rise to a desire to witness the actual event, just as representations of celebrities create the desire to access the actual person, a desire that Swinton's *The Maybe* both acknowledges and deflects by presenting the celebrity body in an unresponsive state (her fans can see her up close but she will not acknowledge their presence) and behind glass (her fans can get up close to her but cannot touch her). The same attributes of her performance can also be read in relation to performance art rather than celebrity. As Frazer Ward points out, 'distantiation and mediation is [sic] centrally characteristic of much performance art,'[23] not only because performance art is generally experienced through its reproductions, but also because performance artists are often distanced from their spectators, even in live events. Ward's examples are Chris Burden's speaking to his audience from inside a locker and Vito Acconci's verbally fantasising about his audience from under a ramp.[24] Abramović's *The House with the Ocean View* dramatised this distantiation of artist from audience through Abramović's elevated position in the gallery and the unclimbable ladder that connected her space with the public's space.[25] The construction of the performance artist as an elusive presence that is rarely directly accessible, but is much more readily available as a representation, thus parallels the social construction of the celebrity, even if the stage on which performance artists perform this identity is much smaller and more culturally specific than that of the mass media.

Marcus also argues that celebrity identity is

constructed around binary oppositions, one of which is 'Originality/Replicability.' Paradoxically, 'celebrities who achieve an aura of uniqueness become, by their very distinctiveness, all the more easy to imitate; at the same time, even stars hailed for their originality advertise their debts to previous performers.'[26] Imitation thus confirms the cultural status and iconicity of the celebrity being imitated, whether by another celebrity or a member of the public. 'A celebrity, then, is someone whose aura of originality is intensified by copying and being copied.'[27] Looking at performance art with this in mind also evokes the question of documentation, since the uniqueness and distinctiveness of particular performance artists and their signature performances are often created and maintained through the replication and circulation of a relatively small number of compelling images.

As a somewhat arbitrarily selected example, an Internet search for images of Carolee Schneemann's groundbreaking feminist performance *Interior Scroll* (1975) turns up numerous examples in which the best-known images of this performance appear in multiple contexts, including art historical ones, personal ones such as blogs, commercial ones in which the photographs are for sale, and so on. In addition, the same search shows that the performance in question is almost inevitably described as 'iconic.' There is no question that Schneemann's aura of originality as an artist is enhanced through the many reiterations of these images; this reiteration is in itself testimony to the importance and originality of her work. Additionally, the search reveals that numerous other female performance artists have performed the

piece; this is another kind of copying that also speaks to Schneemann's innovation and the significance she holds for her audiences. As Marcus points out, the structure of *The Artist is Present* invited participation by asking partakers to engage in a very simple activity.[28] Even when the demands of the performance are not simple, however, some people will perform it themselves in imitation of the artist as an admired figure.[29]

Thinking about the replication of performances in this way sheds fresh light on one of the criticisms most frequently leveled against celebrities who engage in performance art: that of unoriginality. Farago's accusation that Swinton possesses only 'an incomplete command of art history' is a thinly veiled way of saying that her work lacks innovation because it is imitative of other artists who have slept in gallery spaces of whom he presumes her to be unaware; his earliest example is Chris Burden's *Bed Piece* (1972).[30] If Swinton's piece is unoriginal, how much more so must *Sleeping with Gaga* be, since it seems unlikely that Gaga did not know of Swinton's work; in fact, it is more than possible that Gaga's piece refers to Swinton's.[31] There is certainly a question to be raised about the critical assumptions underlying such judgments—while it is clear that originality was a profound value for modern artists, it is much less clear how it has remained so since the arrival of Pop Art in the 1960s and the many appropriationist art practices that have followed it since.[32]

The film actor Shia LaBeouf has placed questions surrounding originality and copying in the age of digital media at the center of his performance art work, largely through serial acts of publicly visible, yet unmarked,

appropriation (or plagiarism, according to most of the commentary he has received). After dropping out of a Broadway production in 2013, LaBeouf emailed an apology to his fellow cast members that he later tweeted to the public, which proved to have been largely copied from a magazine article. When questioned, he then issued a public apology on Twitter that was an unattributed quotation from the playwright David Mamet. LaBeouf has also been accused of stealing material from graphic novelist Daniel Clowes in his short film *HowardCantour.com* (2012). He again apologised via Twitter, this time by recycling a statement that had been posted on *Yahoo!Answers* several years earlier. A subsequent accusation of plagiarism resulted in a barrage of tweets in which LaBeouf appropriated text from Tiger Woods, Robert McNamara, Kanye West, Shepard Fairey, and Mark Zuckerberg.[33]

LaBeouf's strategy can be seen as parodying the workings of celebrity described by Marcus. He relentlessly repeats the words of famous others, thus ultimately interlacing his own celebrity with theirs. But since he does not acknowledge his sources until forced to do so, his repetition of their words does not shore up their celebrity and iconicity in the usual fashion. Rather, LaBeouf's performance of plagiarism reflects the ubiquity and accessibility on the Internet of all manner of expression from all kinds of sources that is already being continuously recirculated, usually without explicit permission, in ways that distance it from its sources. There is no indication that most of those who posted the many images of Schneemann's *Interior Scroll* found on the Internet had

permission to do so, for example, and the identities of the photographers of Schneemann's performance are seldom acknowledged.[34] LaBeouf has claimed (via Twitter, of course) that the objective of his performance project is to provoke a 'broad cultural discussion that needs to be had about plagiarism in the digital age and celebrity/social media absurdity.'[35]

Reframing the question of artistic originality through the role played by replication in celebrity culture allows us to see that originality may not be an end or value in itself. Rather, originality and replicability have specific functions in the creation and maintenance of celebrity identity. Perhaps the best way of understanding the iterative chain of works featuring artists sleeping in galleries that extends at least from Burden to Swinton to Abramović to Gaga is not by debating who did it first, who is stealing from whom, and which celebrities are lifting ideas from legitimate artists. It may be more productive to consider the *functions* of such replications and reiterations in the cultural context of the art world, and the question of whether the dialectic of originality and replicability found in celebrity culture is also at work in our perception of performance artists.

Media critic Neal Gabler identifies the difference between a famous person and a celebrity in terms of narrative. Celebrities are famous people whose life stories engage us as an audience.[36] These stories include everything from career narratives to gossip, though Gabler stipulates that our interest in celebrity narratives is aesthetic rather than merely prurient.[37] Gabler also points out that we often conflate the identity of celebrities who are performers with the fictional roles they perform: 'a

great lover on screen is frequently assumed to be a great lover in real life, a tough guy on screen a tough guy in life, a great soul on screen a great soul in life.'[38]

Narrative is also central to our understanding of performance artists, beginning with the narratives of their work conveyed to us through its documentation, though documentation is but one of the ways performance artists construct their work narratively. Mechtild Widrich insists on the importance of other kinds of narratives artists produce, pointing to the example of VALIE EXPORT's *Action Pants: Genital Panic* (1969), a performance documented (implied might be a better word in this case) only by a small number of photographs. In 1979, EXPORT claimed in an interview that she had walked through a pornographic movie theater in Munich wearing crotchless pants and carrying a gun. In a subsequent interview in 2007, EXPORT retracted the story.[39] From Widrich's perspective, the question of which (if any) of the stories EXPORT told is true is not the point. Rather, the story 'is a performance in its own right' and a device EXPORT used 'in the performative production of meaning… It is what Austin calls a "happy performative," namely an utterance being taken for the action of that which is being uttered.'[40] In other words, the stories EXPORT tells about what the photographs purportedly show become the work. Widrich is not alone in suggesting that the question of whether or not performance artists' narrations of their own work are truthful is less important than seeing such narrations as an essential dimension of their work. Speaking of the 'elaborately staged photographs' through which Chris Burden documented his performances, Henry Sayre

describes Burden as a storyteller and observes, 'narrative is not the same thing as truth, but it has the force of truth.'[41] Since they are not usually subject to the incessant scrutiny of the press and paparazzi, performance artists actually have much more ability to create and control the stories that circulate about them—and, consequently, their images as performers—than celebrities do; but narrative is central to the construction of both the celebrity and the performance artist for their respective audiences.

In some cases, as with celebrities, the narratives the artists themselves produce through their work are appropriated in the public sphere and taken to be equivalent to the real person. Writing of Burden's notorious piece *Shoot* (1971), in which a friend shot him in the arm with a rifle, Ward observes, 'critics have answered the question of why Burden had himself shot, or what it means for Burden to have had himself shot, by referring him to categories of persons, by making claims for what kind of person he is.'[42] Just as John Wayne's image as a tough guy derived from his work as an actor and not his actual qualities as a human being, so the meaning of Burden's image as 'the artist-who-shot-himself' derives from his work as a performance artist rather than his life as a private person, yet gives rise to speculation as to what kind of person he must be.

Not only is it not necessary for stories about celebrities or performance artists to be true in order to shape the audience's perception of them, it seems that audiences are prepared to believe almost anything regarding people in both categories. A particularly dramatic case in the realm of performance art is that

of Rudolf Schwarzkogler, an artist associated with the Viennese Actionists, who was reported in 1972 by *Time Magazine* art critic Robert Hughes to have 'died as a result of deliberate and self-inflicted penis mutilations undertaken in a series of performances in the late 1960s' based on a body of photographs exhibited at Documenta 5.[43] This narrative continues to be accepted and reproduced without question in art historical circles despite the efforts of scholars to debunk it. As Susan Jarosi observes, it is remarkable that 'so outrageous a claim as auto-castration was taken at face value, and circulated, for more than two decades; this claim has been buttressed by another equally outrageous one that contends that the artist was "crazy" enough to take photographs to prove he did it.'[44] As in celebrity culture, the person is equated with the represented figure (which, in the case of these photographs, is not even Schwarzkogler) and speculation is directed toward the kind of person he must be on the basis of what he seems to be doing in the performance.

CONCLUSION

Recent years have seen the incursion of the culture of celebrity into performance art, both in the sense that celebrities from other fields such as music and film are undertaking performance works, and in the sense that performance art has become a platform for the development of a celebrity identity, as in Abramović's case. This development has been simultaneous with the growing interest on the part of museums in showing and collecting performance and has been met with resistance by art critics, seemingly on the grounds that the museum

is an inappropriate setting for the glorification of celebrity or to showcase performance work by overprivileged and artistically unqualified celebrities.

I have attempted to show here that any argument that the museum as an institution is independent of celebrity culture is tenuous at best, given the museum's historical participation in the promotion of both artists and works of art *as* celebrities and the current blockbuster mentality. The performance work undertaken by celebrities like Swinton, Franco, and Gaga is not necessarily conceptually, thematically, or technically all that different from—or aesthetically inferior to—work by an accredited artist like Abramović. Therefore, the antagonism toward them from art critics and the suggestion that they do not belong in the art world likely derives solely from an unrealistic assessment of the current state of the museum in both cultural and economic terms.

Finally, there are certain structural similarities between the respective relationships between celebrities and their public, and performance artists and their audiences. These similarities can be organised around concepts of representation, originality and narrative, among others. Like celebrity, performance art entails a dialectic of presence and representation in which the figures in question are available to their audiences primarily as representations that give rise to a desire to experience their presence. Even when present before their audiences, both celebrities and performance artists are generally distanced from them. Like celebrities, we know performance artists largely through narratives about them. The documentation of performance art, the representations

through which it reaches its largest audience, is one form of narrative, but there are also narratives about the artists separate from documentation that play a significant role in our understanding of the work. This parallels our knowledge of celebrities, whom we know through their performances as musicians or actors but also, perhaps even more pervasively, through popular tabloid narratives. In both cases, there is a tendency to equate the artist as person with these narrative representations. Although critics maintain the idea that originality is a chief value when assessing performance art and often accuse celebrity performance artists of lacking originality and reinventing the art historical wheel, there may be something to be gained by looking at this question in terms of celebrity, where repetition and reference to other figures are means by which celebrity identity is both asserted and maintained. Perhaps something similar is true for performance artists.

Even if there are some provocative similarities between the way celebrities and performance artists relate to their respective audiences, it goes without saying that the audience for performance art is miniscule by comparison with the public to which celebrities have access through the media. However, as more and more performance art documentation is circulated through the Internet, on blogs; institutional websites; and via social media, including Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and Pinterest, where performance artists may amass friends and followers, it will become more and more difficult to maintain clear boundaries between the mediatised world of celebrity culture and the art world.

Notes:

1 Mary Richards, *Marina Abramović* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2010), 107-113.

2 RoseLee Goldberg, 'Marina Abramović,' *Artforum* (February 2003), MutualArt.com, http://www.mutualart.com/OpenArticle/Marina-Abramović/6944CE5A9F4AE241

3 The authorship of *The Maybe* is somewhat in dispute. The original version, at the Serpentine Gallery, London, in 2010 was presented as a work by Cornelia Parker in which Swinton was presented as an object among others on display. The later versions, in which Swinton has been the only 'thing' on display, are attributed solely to Swinton. See Tilda Swinton and Joanna Scanlan, 'The Maybe: Modes of Performance and the "Live,"' in *Perform Repeat Record: Live Art in History*, eds. Amelia Jones and Andrian Heathfield (Bristol and Chicago: Intellect, 2012), 469-481.

4 Jason Farago, 'The Real Story Behind Tilda Swinton's Performance at MoMA,' *New Republic.com*, March 28, 2013, https://newrepublic.com/article/112782/real-story-behind-tilda-swintons-performance-moma

5 Marina Abramović, *The House with the Ocean View*, November 15-26, 2002. Live performance and installation, Sean Kelly Gallery, New York, cited in Goldberg, 'Marina Abramović.'

6 Tilda Swinton, quoted in Tom Leonard, 'The Art of Sleeping,' *Daily Mail.com*, March 24, 2013, http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2298237/Star-gazing-Tilda-Swinton-display-sleeping-glass-box-MoMA.html

7 Philip Auslander, 'Tweny-First-Century Girl: Lady Gaga, Performance Art, and Glam Rock,' in *Global Glam and Popular Music: Style and Spectacle from the 1970s to the 2000s*, eds. Ian Chapman and Henry Johnson (Abingdon: Routledge, 2016), 184-185.

8 Holland Carter, '700-Hour Silent Opera Reaches Finale at MoMA,' *New York Times*, May 30, 2010, http://www.nytimes.com/2010/05/31/arts/design/31diva.html?_r=0

9 Carrie Lambert-Beatty, 'Against Performance Art,' *Artforum* (May 2010): 213.

10 David W Galenson, *Conceptual Revolutions in Twentieth-Century Art* (Cambridge, USA: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 26-29; 334-338.

11 David Cottington, *Modern Art: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 90.

12 Ammon Shea, 'Why Is It Called a Blockbuster?' *Dictionary.com*, http://blog.dictionary.com/blockbuster/

13 Cecilia Rodriguez, 'Picassomania, And How Blockbuster Exhibitions are Saving Museums,' *Forbes*, October 29, 2015, http://www.forbes.com/sites/ceciliarodriguez/2015/10/29/picassomania-and-how-blockbuster-exhibits-are-saving-museums/#52394cb45138
14 Anita Singh, 'Girl with a Pearl Earring Goes Home,' *The Telegraph*, February 28, 2014, http://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/art/art-news/10666913/Girl-With-A-Pearl-Earring-goes-home.html
15 'Girl with a Pearl Earring,' High Museum of Art, Atlanta, http://www.high.org/Girl-With-A-Pearl-Earring.
16 'Girl with a Pearl Earring,' *Exhibition on Screen*, 2016, http://www.exhibitiononscreen.com/en-uk/our-films/season-2/girl-pearl-earring
17 Cottington, *Modern Art*, 11.
18 Sharon Marcus, 'Celebrity 2.0: The Case of Marina Abramovic,' *Public Culture 27*, no.1 (2015): 46.
19 Sarah Howell, 'Reviewed: The Maybe by Tilda Swinton,' *New Statesman*, April 3, 2013, http://www.newstatesman.com/art-and-design/2013/04/reviewed-maybe-tilda-swinton
20 Swinton and Scanlan, 'The Maybe,' 476.
21 James Franco, 'A Star, a Soap and the Meaning of Art,' *Wall Street Journal*, December 4, 2009, http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424052748704107104574570313372878136
22 Marcus, 'Celebrity 2.0,' 29-30.
23 Frazer Ward, *No Innocent Bystanders: Performance Art and Audience* (Hanover: Dartmouth College Press, 2012), 10.
24 Ibid.
25 Chris Rojek, in his book *Celebrity* (London: Reaktion Books, 2001) uses the term 'elevation' to describe 'the social and cultural processes involved in raising the celebrity above the public' (75). He points out that this elevation is frequently enacted literally, as with the billboard images of stars and celebrities in Hollywood that tower over ordinary people. Abramović's elevated position over gallery-goers in *The Housewith the Ocean View* is a parallel example.
26 Marcus, 'Celebrity 2.0,' 35.
27 Ibid., 36.
28 Ibid.
29 The impulse to re-perform extends well beyond the art world. For example, many re-performances of Andy Kaufman's *Mighty Mouse* piece, in which he lip-synched to a recording of the theme from a television cartoon program, first performed on *Saturday Night Live* in 1975, are available on the Internet. At least one sports figure has performed Kaufman's work, as have many amateurs, in situations ranging from talent shows to videos posted on social media.

30 Farago, 'The Real Story.'

31 It is perhaps not surprising that the question of who is stealing from whom gets muddled very easily in this context. Writing for the art website *Hyperallergic,* Alicia Eler accuses Gaga of having stolen her sleeping performance from Canadian-Ukranian artist Taras Polataiko's *Sleeping Beauty* (2012), performed at the National Art Museum of Ukraine ('Did Lady Gaga Rip Off Artist Taras Polataiko?,' *Hyperallergic*, September 21, 2012, http://hyperallergic.com/57315/did-lady-gaga-rip-off-artist-taras-polataiko/). Her *Hyperallergic* colleague Kyle Chayka suggests a connection between Swinton's performance at the Museum of Modern Art and Polataiko's piece ('The Perils of Sleeping in an Art Museum,' *Hyperallergic*, March 27, 2013, http://hyperallergic.com/67676/the-perils-of-sleeping-in-an-art-museum). The possibility of a relationship between Gaga's performance at the Guggenheim and Swinton's at MoMA goes unmentioned.

32 Cottington, *Modern Art*, 10.

33 Laura Stampler, 'A Brief History of Shia LaBeouf Copying the Work of Others,' *Time.com*, February 10, 2014, http://time.com/6094/shia-labeouf-plagiarism-scandal/

34 To be fair, the fact that those who photographed Schneemann's performances are usually not credited as the images circulate on the Internet reflects Schneemann's own treatment of them. She consistently claims the photographs, which she did not take, as her own work, for example by signing them. The question of whose work performance documents should be considered to be—the artist's or the documentarian's—is at the heart of an ongoing discussion. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that both the Carolina Nitsch Project Room, a New York gallery that hosted the exhibition *Carolee Schneemann: Performance Photographs from the 1970's* in 2009 (http://www.photography-now.com/exhibition/62215) and *fineartmultiple.com*, a website offering a suite of photographs of *Interior Scroll* for $45,000 (https://fineartmultiple.com/buy-art/carolee-schneemann-interior-scroll) describe the images as Schneemann's work with no mention of the photographers.

35 Quoted in Michael Rothman, 'Shia LaBeouf's Plagiarism Performance Art Explanation Decoded,' *Yahoo!News*, January 22, 2014, https://gma.yahoo.com/shia-labeouf-39-plagiarism-performance-art-explanation-decoded-194705858--abc-news-movies.html

36 Neal Gabler, *Toward a New Definition of Celebrity* (Los Angeles: The Norman Lear Center, 2001), 5.

37 Ibid., 11.

38 Ibid., 7.

39 In an example of the kind of copying that affirms the earlier figure's iconicity and significance, Abramović performed EXPORT's *Genital Panic: Action Pants* in 2005 as part of *Seven Easy Pieces*, her program of performances of historical works of performance art at the Guggenheim Museum. She did not enact EXPORT's story but assumed the same pose EXPORT struck in one of the photographs and glared at the spectators.

40 Mechtild Widrich, 'Can Photographs Make It So? Repeated Outbreaks of VALIE EXPORT's Genital Panic Since 1969,' in *Perform Repeat Record: Live Art in History*, eds. Amelia Jones and Adrian Heathfield (Bristol and Chicago: Intellect, 2012), 93.

41 Henry Sayre, 'Burden of Proof: Performance and the Documentation Effect,' in *Lessons in the Art of Falling*, ed. Jonas Ekeberg (Horten: Preus Museum, 2009), 99.

42 Ward, *No Innocent Bystanders*, 85.

43 Susan Jarosi, 'The Image of the Artist in Performance Art: The Case of Rudolf Schwarzkogler,' *Sztuka i Dokumentacja*, no.8 (2013): 65.

44 Ibid., 65-66.