The terms “museum” and “creativity” may justifiably be seen either as pleonasms – taking into account the heritage-focused role of museums, libraries and archive collections since at least the eighteenth century, namely, the preservation of the material culture derived from creative agency, not only in the arts but within the broader realm of material culture derived from technical or social practices – or as oxymorons, if we see the creative act as being ephemeral, inherently unproductive, inexistent without its creator and defined only by the effect it produces, at a particular time and place. These issues significantly impact on culture, culture seen both as a place or “realm” of memory, in the broadest sense of the term adopted by historian Pierre Nora and his colleagues, and as a process of constant creation that draws freely on an underlying historical frame of reference with which the artist entertains relationships which may be of deference, of defiance or of irreverence (see Poirson 2014:157-200).

The issues arising from the interrelation between museums and creativity stand at the centre of a wealth of cultural changes. These changes include the inflation of memorial approaches, emphasizing cultures of celebration, of deference and of commemoration, whether victim-centred or hagiographic; the internationalization of the worlds of art and culture and the gradual decline of groups and communities which become increasingly seen as purveyors of heritage, as evoked in the Declaration on the Importance and Value of Universal Museums, adopted in December 2002 by some twenty major museums, including the Louvre, the British Museum, the Metropolitan Museum of New York and the Hermitage Museum in St. Petersburg; the development and accepted usage of the concept of “cultural heritage”, the very essence of any policy intended to safeguard and contribute to cultural value in contexts where ideological issues are felt to be obscure (Guillaume 1980; Mélot 2012); the unprecedented extension, to highly unusual categories of objects or practices, of interpretations of what should be included in, even to what might be said to carry the label of “heritage”, thereby contributing to an increase in the length of the “heritage chain” (Heinich 2012; Poulot 2006); the inclusion, particularly since the October 2003 UNESCO initiative aimed at the adoption of the Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage (songs, ceremonies, rituals, traditional craftsmanship, oral traditions, festive events, etc.), considered to be an instrument for safeguarding “cultural diversity”, and the related 2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (see also Bortolotto 2011; Hottin 2011).
Furthermore, the hybridization and increasing intermediality of creative processes today leads to a heightening of the tensions between the tangible and intangible interpretations of what is meant by “ephemeral heritage”, tensions which the advent of digital technologies has not in any way reduced (Dufrêne 2013, 2014), given that their immense storage capacity is equalled only by the programmed (or perhaps, predictable) obsolescence of the digital support systems or interfaces or even the frameworks that allow them to exist (Fourmentraux 2005), all of which has led some researchers to talk about a “digital memory crisis” (Hoog 2009). The instability, the transient nature and the performativity of acts of creation constitute major issues for museography in this digital age, both in terms of their impact in time and space on audiences, and in terms of the related production processes, and the need for developing procedures for their conservation, mediation or transmission.

While the trend toward increasing theatricality in museum or art gallery spaces has long been identified, the particularly telling example of performance, and, in its broadest sense, of live performance, in this complex web of museography and archival records (Guillot and Poirson 2008) remains relatively little studied, in spite of a recent performative turn (Fischer-Lichte 2008). The above considerations, along with the need to more fully explore the potential of an effective policy for heritage-based performance creations in museums, have been major catalysts for this issue of THEMA, which drew on contributions from a variety of specialists from a range of different fields (Sociology, Anthropology, Art History, Political Science, Performance Studies, Cultural Studies, Museum Studies), in close synergy with museum professionals and artists open to using performance as a way to increase people’s understanding of heritage. Recognizing that creation and heritage conservation and curation are no longer seen, if not entirely as contradictions in terms, then at least as competing concepts, this volume identifies some of the key elements needed to understand the complex interrelation between performance and museums in the present global context. By exploring and contrasting the fundamentals of artistic postures and global creative processes, THEMA contributes to a better understanding of how the symbolic impact, and even the particular “aura”, of artistically created objects – and more importantly still, of creative acts – can be preserved and curated, whether on a temporary or permanent basis. This approach holds good even when institutions decide to risk exhibiting such objects or acts in places where they can be kept safely, free of the constraints, though not of the demands, of artistic creation. Clearly, live performance and the performing arts are far from being the only sectors concerned by what might be described as the ontological variability in the act of creation, with a growing number of practices now drawing on various approaches and forms of expression (street art, land art, in situ art, art installations, performances). Even so, they function as paradigms and constitute the main focus of this issue, while paving the way for further reflection around other types of examples.

Even so, legitimate questions can still be asked as to how appropriate it really is to assimilate performance to a form of intangible cultural heritage, if we are to propose as complete a definition as possible of performance and the challenges it poses in terms of selection, conservation and increased recognition of its (cultural) value. This issue has become particularly acute as museums, with attractive artist-in-residence or “carte blanche for visiting artists” arguments, adopt a range of cross-discipline strategies for use in hybrid installations. As a result, artists, often with experience in the performance milieu, take advantage of the opportunities to create participatory protocols and immersive displays designed to involve visitor-spectators in the creative process.

In this context, the challenge to be addressed by what can be called museum-based interpretation is two-fold: on the one hand, to provide a creative process, intrinsically built on varying degrees of transience, with adequate conditions of sustainability and, on the other hand, to stimulate the processes of reinterpretation, or of reenactment of the cultural and historical heritage. More specifically, it means seeing the body as a vehicle of social values (the *hexis*), and as incorporating a cultural memory that embodies a kind of present-day virtual museum, reinterpreted in series of performances.
THE PERFORMANCE OF THE MUSEUM

Transience is not specific only to live performance; it also encompasses a significant proportion of artistic and cultural practices. As Le Clezio (2001) points out in his analysis, “museums are worlds” composed of “floating objects”, witness to societies that have been “forgotten, eradicated and turned to dust”. Within these relics, “life is different, evolves differently”, even though they sometimes reflect “the shadow of life, like a lichen” (our translation). Similarly, objects or documents in a museum, by very reason of their rich incompleteness, can become depositories for “the gesture and the word”. This depository is a deformed admixture of virtual historiography, memories, and especially, of fantasies:

What remains is the hand. The hand that shapes, caresses, polishes, weighs and imagines forms. The hand enduringly alive, the oldest tool, a tool that continues to move, in spite of the passage of time, in spite of progress [...] There are the words, too, the words that give birth to art. And if we are unable to hear the words expressed by works of art, what then can we feel in the face of these colours, these bas reliefs, these glyphs, these bodies of stone? Then we are going to have to reinvent them, conjure them up, approach the works closely, imagine the words, fathom them. Ancient songs, myths, fables and poems, but also everyday sounds, the jokes that come thick and fast, the rude words, and then the fears and the beliefs, the fiction and romances, the miracles, the stories (not yet the histories), this fabric that humans have woven that has enveloped the world since its beginnings. And there is not one single place on the planet that does not reflect this reality. There is not one single person who carries no memory of it. And if we stumble in trying to get so close, if we give too much freedom to our imagination, if we fantasize, is it not precisely in this way that we can discover the truths in these works of art? Museums are places for voices to resonate. (Le Clézio 2011: 20-21, our translation)

So it is that, for this art-loving poet and novelist, objects that are on display convey a special resonance, one which constitutes a source of intrinsic performative potential. Even so, live performance raises the critical question of the fragmentary nature of the traces, remains or vestiges of the work of art displayed in museums which are themselves seen as playing the role of “conservatories” for living practices that can transition from performance to heritage. This parallel with institutions providing training in theatre, opera and ballet is far from fortuitous. Yet it seems that the crucial issue of what might be the most effective form to adopt for a museum exclusively dedicated to performance is still being drowned out today by the noise of the questions about how an undertaking of this nature can possibly be justified. For a significant number of artists, museum curators and experts, the need for such a project is far from self-evident, and its very legitimacy is at times called into question, on the grounds that it could oversimplify or fossilize the act of creation. The absence of any museum on or of performance, either in France or in Québec – each of which can rightly claim a dynamic and longstanding tradition of performance production – should clearly raise some questions, particularly at a time when cultural institutions everywhere are reducing their activities while at the same time promoting rapprochements and interaction between heritage conservation and artistic practice. This absence is in all likelihood due in part to the predominance of two opposing viewpoints defended inside cultural institutions and organizations: the first sees creation as sacrosanct and “fetishizes” all traces of creative acts, objects and places of memory; the second seeks to “dematerialize” the creative act and tends to want to replace it with virtual substitutes, based on the increased importance of information and communications technologies and the onset of digitization. This bipolar split, besides the fact that it hardens the lines drawn between what is today an outdated opposition between museographic traditionalism and digital culture, compromises the much-needed debate on how to develop a “performance-centred museum-city”, as argued recently at an international symposium in Paris, that would weave together yet-to-be-invented processes for creation, conservation, delivery, information and dissemination. This new museum-city, if ever it is finally established, would need to be in direct contact with the artistic production milieu, while at the same time remaining open to as broad a public as
possible, given the fact that the memory of creation is an integral part of our different multi-influenced identities.

PERFORMANCE AT THE MUSEUM

However, in the absence of any existing cultural institution with the specific mission of safeguarding and promoting the memory of live performance, it does seem that the performing arts are increasingly taking themselves into museums, and the number of such initiatives is growing, particularly in museums of anthropology, of modern art or of civilization. “The collection is just the starting point”, argues Stéphane Martin, Director of the Quai Branly Museum (which features an auditorium, a centre for live performances, and cycles of themed events). The Museum endeavours to establish “linkages between fundamentally traditional cultures and the most avant-garde expressions of culture” in a dynamic where “performance is paramount.” This evolution in approaches is not limited to museums alone; it is also appearing in the art gallery world where directors or curators are frequently identified as “cultural workers”, playing a role mid-way between the act of creation and extending a welcome to gallery visitors.

While the MoMa, the Tate Modern or the Centre Pompidou have established performance departments, and constructed auditoriums or performing arts centres, some institutions, like the Musées de la civilisation in Québec City, the MuCEM in Marseille or the Musée des confluences in Lyon, have developed an overall vision for cultural programming centred around the theme of performance. Furthermore, a number of creative artists enjoy the status of “invited artists” in different museums, such as the Louvre, which, in addition to activities in its busy Caroussel auditorium, has hosted a series of performers in the “Counterpoints” section of its permanent collection: Jan Fabre with *L’ange de la métamorphose* in 2008, performances by Patrice Chéreau with *Les visages et les corps* in 2011, in this case associated with the *in situ* creation of Jon Fosse’s *Rêve d’automne*, where the action takes place in a cemetery; and finally Bob Wilson in 2013 with *Living Rooms*, a giant video installation somewhat like a curiosity cabinet, bringing pop culture and heritage together, featuring a tribute to the pop-rock star Lady Gaga, depicted in the posture of the assassination of Marat, as painted by Jacques-Louis David. The osmosis between the museum, the collection, the works of art and the choice of artistic expression is fully achieved, even while it remains deliberately incongruent and quirky.

Indulging in the pleasure of describing himself as a “master of ceremonies”, and fully accepting the subjective nature of his work (“I am just not capable of living, or of creating an object, a show or a film except in the first person”), Patrice Chéreau establishes a strict conjunction between his roles as a theatre actor and director, film producer and exhibition curator: “In cinema, in theatre, in opera, my role is to put a work on stage, to find ways to focus attention on an individual in a given place, to enable a face to project an idea. I will be doing exactly the same kind of thing at the Louvre. The duties I am to carry out there will mean that I will play a very similar role in taking a work of art, finding ways to stage it and presenting a unique final product.” The influences of the personal mythology of artists and of civilisations of the world are brought together inside real curiosity cabinets through a variety of forms of subjective expression marked by interactions between the Self and the Other.

Performance, as a key instrument for cultural mediation, has today become a recognized and fundamental element in the museum setting, with times, places, objects, bodies and voices being used to achieve meaningful shared experiences together with shared creative tools. The performing arts are now an integral part of a cultural ecosystem where different fields of artistic practice can be brought together and the historical heritage revitalized.
PERFORMANCE WITHIN THE MUSEUM

There are times when the process of creation in a museum or at a historical monument can take the form of true acts of (re)creation driven by the desire to provide new readings of heritage. Examples of this approach can be seen in the public celebrations of historical events, offered at Versailles in conjunction with temporary modern art exhibitions, ranging from Jeff Koons’ balloon creations in 2009 to Takashi Kurakami’s mangas in 2010, and from Joana Vasconcelos’ sanitary towel lamps in 2012 to Anish Kapoor’s Dirty Corner in 2015. In effect, cultural programming at the Château de Versailles is far from being limited to historical reconstructions or fireworks during the Great Waters and Nighttime celebration events; the grounds of the Château are home to the famous Académie Bartabas School of Equestrian Performance; Versailles also commissions site-specific contemporary performances, like Argentinian theatre director Alfredo Arias’ Marriage of the Boy King, performed in the park in 2006 for celebrations centred on Louis XV; Arias worked with the Rita Mitsouko rock group, drawing on choreography by Ana Maria Stekelman and a text by Chantal Thomas. The resulting call to memory was a performance featuring Argentine tango, danced on an enormous stage covering the Château de Versailles’ Neptune Basin, in front of spectators sitting in boats to better experience this unique evocation of history from France’s venerable institution.

A similarly innovative approach was used for the travelling performance-based installation of the South African artist, Brett Bailey, for the highly controversial Exhibit B exhibition presented at the Vienna National Museum of Ethnology and at the Avignon Festival in 2013, before being made available in a range of different venues: theatres, galleries and even churches. Created using photographic archives and personal historical accounts, live tableaux are presented in succession, like exhibits – to play on the word – shown for proof in a courtroom. In this case, their function is to heighten awareness, through “icons of colonialism”, in the form of human beings used as “exhibits”, in the judicial sense of the term (Blanchard, Boetsch and Jacomijn Snoep 2011), from the “Hottentot Venus”, Saartjie “Sarah” Baartman, to the Nama people of Namibia, but also including the use of human zoos, or Angelo Soliman, the African slave abducted in Nigeria and adopted by Viennese high society, then later stuffed in 1796 to be used as a decorative ornament in an imperial drawing room. Finally, there are the examples of present-day migrants (Congolese refugees, Egyptian migrants, banished Somalis, who later died)... A performance-based installation of this kind is designed to have audiences or visitors become key players in an immersive participatory process. They are literally integrated into the material used for the performance, as can be clearly seen in the live tableau entitled “The origin of the species”, which commingles “maps, trophies [...] anthropological props and spectators”. In some cases, there is an accompanying legend that reads: “Mixed techniques, exhibit mounts, chorus of Nama singers, audience”. The interplay between the objects shown, the archives and the performances, as is also true of the interaction between the performers and the audience, functions exactly like a mirror, with each one reflected back to the other – the overall effect being to throw into question not only our relationships with colonial history but also with the modern world.

Archive-based re-enactment, a process driven primarily by historiographical imperatives (see also Bénichou, this issue), is creating considerable interest in the field of Performance Studies. It highlights the importance (and need) for the active participation of the audience in performance designed to sustain archived memory. Art installation and performance now seem to have become two faces of the same coin in the creative process. One telling example is provided in the protocols of Béatrice Balcou in her Untitled performance #2 (Loop), presented in February 2012 at the Palais de Tokyo in Paris, as part of the Des choses en moins, des choses en plus (Fewer things, More things) exhibition. By endlessly and meticulously wrapping up and unwrapping the same paintings, with almost mantra-like repetition, the artist, inspired by the Japanese tea ceremony, immerses visitors in an aesthetic of what slow can convey, by demonstrating how the repetition of a particular gesture can contribute to our understanding of suspended time. The same is true of the participatory museum-based creations of Sarah Rozem, such as...
Concluding Thoughts

Takes care of you – an experimental performance ritual offered at the Business Model exhibition presented at La vitrine art in Paris in January 2014 – where care (care as concern for others and care as caution) is central to a creative process designed to provide an experience that is at once cognitive and emotional. To this end, caring persons wearing T-shirts with slogans on them test how visitors react to obvious signals of wanting to care, with a view to building a community that can, collectively, recognize and help create awareness of the need for attention or care. The goal of Rozen’s art is encourage altruistic or cooperative behaviours, to slow people down and bring them to make socially focused, even ritualized, creative gestures fundamental to their lives.

But what about artists like artist and entrepreneur Bernard Brunon and his business, That’s Painting Production?, who use the effects of the visibility or invisibility of the creative process to question how the market value of artistic production is established. Brunon makes no distinction between the painting services he offers to the building industry, to individual clients or to cultural institutions like the Palais de Tokyo where he, as an artist “exhibits” regularly, often being called upon to contribute to the scenography of exhibitions or to major renovations. He plays on the ambiguity surrounding the terms “artist” and “artisan” and experiments with an economic model that works for him as a creative artist, while simultaneously undermining the stronghold that is industrial-scale production. His infinitesimally small creative gesture goes almost unnoticed by visitors but serves to challenge accepted definitions: “the fewer things there are to see, the more there are to think about”. The painter occupies the entire compass of the exhibition, making it impossible to separate the work of art itself from its particular cultural environment, and blurring the lines between the social and economic structure it rests on and its artistic value. The strategy he uses to enable his business to penetrate or even pervert the market means he has every reason to claim that he has succeeded in subtly undermining accepted practices in cultural entrepreneurship:

As an employer with employees working for him, I have sometimes been accused of selling out to capitalism and supporting the system. However, I firmly believe that directly challenging the capitalist system is a recipe for failure. After all, one of the many features of this system is its capacity to appropriate challenges like this, to transform them into a marketable product and to then market that product back to the very people who wanted to fight the system. We need new strategies. Working from within the system, though not buying into its values, we may be able to get around it. Without necessarily being eye-catching or far-reaching, this kind of strategy can be effective to a certain extent.12 (our translation)

By clouding the usual distinctions between the act of creation, works of art on display and the venue housing an exhibition, Brunon blurs the lines between the production and resulting impact of a work. In undermining accepted codes for interpreting meanings and signals, he provokes a broader reflection on the nature of commitment to artistic expression.

PERFORMANCE AS A MUSEUM

The French actor, director and poet, Antoine Vitez (1991), purportedly wanting to shock people, would describe the Comédie-Française as a “theatre-museum”; that was his way of demonstrating how it embodies, “in the psyche of the entire French nation, the theatre par excellence, located, emblematically, in a place of memory like the Palais-Royal, itself widely seen as being inherently linked to the idea of the nation [...] To expand on Malraux’s concept of the imaginary museum we all carry within us, [...] the Comédie-Française should become our reference for the construction of the imaginary museum of the future…” (Vitez 1991:41, our translation). In other words, performance, not only as a repository for creation, but also, and even more so, as a tangible process and a frame of mind, can rightly be seen as embodying cultural practices where theatre craft holds pride of place. This merging of different functions should not be simply seen as the end result of a long tradition of training in body-centred
performance disciplines; it is also communicated in the different impacts – affective, immersive, critical, even mystical – conveyed through the gestural language of a performer and “intermediary.” The growing number of revivals commemorating “cult” productions, like the one staged by William Christie and Jean-Marie Villégier with *Atys* in Paris’ Théâtre de l’Opéra-Comique in 2011, in exactly the same conditions as when it was produced at the Théâtre de Prato in Lille, including participation by some of the artist-performers of the time, is a reflection of deep-seated changes that have occurred in the way live performance practices are understood today as heritage, and the importance of taking ownership of one’s own actions and history.

This was precisely the kind of insight displayed by Mathieu Copeland in *A Choreographed Exhibition*, presented over a period of two months in 2008 at the contemporary art centre La Ferme du Buisson in Noisel, France. It drew solely on movements interpreted by three dance artists working at the frontiers of the visual arts, the performing arts and art installations (Copeland and Pellegrin 2013). The originality of the project is a perfect example of the growing trend over the past decade toward the increased use of choreography in places of memory while, at the same time, there is a marked proliferation in new exhibitions and retrospectives at live art festivals. These changes all point to the growing dematerialization in modern-day art (Cramer 2014) or what might be seen, conversely, as a greater materialization of performance. While they adopted a diametrically opposite approach in presenting their *Moments. A History of Performance in 10 Acts* at the ZKM in Karlsruhe, Germany, in the spring of 2012, Boris Charmatz, Sigrid Gareis and Georg Schöllhammer also reflected this changing environment in their celebration of the history of performance, on the frontiers between dance and the visual arts.

Choreographers Boris Charmatz and Jérôme Bel tried to capture the theoretical framework behind creative undertakings of this nature for the 2009 celebrations to honour Merce Cunningham on her 90th birthday, at the Théâtre de la Ville in Paris. For them, actions designed to honour a person constitute a kind of “archeology of the present moment”, grounded in ingrained memory and drawing on the essential qualities of “improvisation based on that archeology”:

First of all, there must be recognition that improvisation can be entirely nourished and driven by the workings of memory. Instead of trying to do something new, we can just allow ourselves to float around in memories and let improvisation come freely. That is when we come to realize that improvisation is not just a quick snapshot printed on a blank page; it is, on the contrary, the result of our *archeology of the present moment*, our turning back to the past so our bodies can find their expression in real time today. What immediately appealed to me in this venture was the opportunity to shake off the constraints of what might be called modern-day mysticism and adopt a broad-based stance that brought together the past, the present and the future. Seen in this way, memory becomes the leavening ingredient on which improvisation, even the most outlandish forms of improvisation, can draw. (Bel and Charmatz 2013: 178-179, our emphasis and translation)

The underlying logic behind any reprise of a performance is undeniably the desire to find a way to recapture the past (Kihm 2007). The artist-interpreter becomes the vehicle through which memory is recreated and communicated and that same artist is free to adopt an entirely new creative approach, with no obligation to strictly reproduce what went before.

The two choreographers subsequently return to the art of letting the mind wander, using a more extreme premise in response to the question “A Museum of Dance?” they proposed for the Festival d’Avignon in 2011. After some initial experimentation with the use of a mobile performance training approach for the Bocal “Stage School”, Charmatz converted the National Choreographic Centre of Rennes and Brittany (where he was appointed Director in 2009) into what he called in English a
“Dancing Museum”. While acutely aware of the inherent risk that this entity could potentially become a “mausoleum” or “place to die”, he pleads for recognition of “the body as a museum”:

When you are a dancer, it is patently obvious that the body is a museum space: the dance movements you were taught are ingrained in your body, as are the arm positions you learned; even dance performances constitute familiar references for the audience. Furthermore, the body is a vast amalgam of gestures we would dearly love to, but cannot always, put behind us. Every day our bodies are revitalized through a multiplicity of gestures, some we make, some directed at us. Even when its environment is damaged or flawed, the body is the medium for expressing its own culture and the art it carries within it. When we think in these terms, the idea of the body as a museum is not simply an archeological exercise to discover the experiences it is built on, the literature that has influenced it and the identities it is composed of. This “museum in a body” is also a crowded storehouse we can explore to pull out reactions and actions we can use today and in the future. The core message of our project lies in this concept of a body with the capacity to absorb and draw on whatever might come along, not one that finds satisfaction in simply identifying and replicating particular actions and performance practices from the past that should be saved and popularized. (Charmatz, Archambault and Baudriller 2011:19-20, our translation)

When looked at in this light, any corps of dancers, or, more broadly speaking, any group of actors, musicians, singers or storytellers, have the capacity, through their different performance arts, to exemplify, reconstruct or epitomize what might be described as a particular repertory of gestures and movements. They can thus quite justifiably said to be “conservatories”, like the recognized institutions which teach and train in performance – even though these newer “conservatories” have evolved along radically different lines from the conservatories centred on the arts, crafts and folk traditions. In these new genre conservatories, the paramount value is the human dimension of the medium, not the instrument or the technique used.

It is both through the body of the artist-interpreter and through the combined expertise of production and technical staff (the stage managers, lighting specialists, machinists, props people, stage decorators, costume specialists, etc.) that the fundamentals of our cultural unconscious are expressed. They are at once vessels carrying a non-verbal history of performance, conduits for transmitting a form of theatre craft based on bodily movement or the traditions of the craft and the motive force behind a continuing process of artistic creation. So it is that the “techniques of the body”, a term first used by the French sociologist, Marcel Mauss, can, outside the confines of recognized heritage conservation institutions, build an “imaginary museum” of performance. This “museum” draws on strategies based on coaching, the communication of skills and a rethinking of the performance “exercise”, fundamental to the practice of the art, itself construed as being a combination of imitation and creation. The “professional body”, understood in both the literal and figurative senses of the term, is a structure that connects a community of practitioners in a given field who together constitute a repository of shared practices from their live memory, and who interact with the interpretative community of audiences, visitors or listeners who truly give meaning to the act of performance.

This same imaginary museum preserves what might be described as the poetics but also as the politics of gesture, in that “gestural reconstruction” (our translation) can help to offset “dehumanizing programming” (Citton 2012a, b); performative gestures are merely reflections of one of the many ways of being part of the world, a world with museums simply serving as recording devices and if need be, to continue the metaphor, as loudspeakers and amplifiers.

Whether the goal is to preserve the memory of performance (seen as heritage) using approaches based on museum practice or to integrate approaches drawn from the performance sectors to enhance the museum experience, the resulting interactions – some of them completely unprecedented – between
the two worlds of museums and creativity are, as may well be imagined, myriad and with far-reaching consequences, at both aesthetic and ideological levels: changing definitions of the status of the artist-interpreter-crafter of performance, now also seen as a mediator and go-between, and a blurring of the lines between tangible and intangible culture.

These are but some of the more compelling reasons why the complicated interrelation between museums and creativity should be recognized both as constituting unprecedented opportunities for experimenting with new approaches, and, at the same time, creating sources of tension and emblematic conflict. Herein lies the formidable challenge facing cultural institutions in the modern world, and, even more so, in tomorrow’s world, whatever the nature of those institutions.

Martial Poirson
Université Paris 8
“World Scenes” Research Group

Translated from French by Margaret Whyte

NOTES
4 This is precisely the reason why the Bibliothèque nationale de France is currently attempting to establish an inventory of Internet sites, in consonance with the legal deposit process presently used for published material.
5 This is the controversial argument made by Michael Fried in La Place du spectateur: Esthétique et origines de la peinture moderne (1990), notably in his third chapter, « Le tableau et le spectateur ».
6 In spite of the existence of places such as the highly dynamic Centre national du costume de scène in Moulins which opened in 2006, the collections held in the museum-libraries of France’s Opéra and Comédie-Française, or the performance arts collections of the performance nationale de France.
7 In spite of a variety of activities carried out in this area by the Musées de la civilisation in Québec City, as well as the efforts made by artists like Robert Lepage with ExMachina to foster debate and reflection on subjects such as the role of memory in the performance arts, or on theatrical heritage.
8 A symposium entitled in French « Quel musée pour le spectacle vivant en France ? » (Could there be a future for a museum of live performance in France ?) was held at the French National Institute of Art History and the Bibliothèque nationale de France from October 21-23, 2010, organised by Béatrice Picon-Vallin and Martial Poirson, and co-hosted by the French Ministry of Culture, the Comédie-Française, the Opéra de Paris, the Franco-Russian Year, and the ARIAS research team of the French National Research Centre (CNRS).
9 Note from the Editor: The author here refers to the francophone concept of a museum of civilization, or of society (musée de société), as an inclusive, and generally theme-based cultural and heritage institution (see, e.g., Noémie Drouguet’s recent book Patrimoines éphémères. Available Online: http://revue-hybrid.fr/ (accessed September 16, 2015).
12 Upcoming symposium entitled Through the Stage to the Museum. Performing Arts in Museums: Practices, Audiences, Cultural Mediation, to be held at the Musée du Louvre, the Musée du Quai d’Orsay and the Bibliothèque nationale de France, under the direction of Pauline Chevalier, Aurélie Mouton Rezzouk and Daniel Urrutiager, November 18-20, 2015.
14 Examples in the French university world can be found in Symposia such as « De l’archive au reenactment: les enjeux de la représentation de la performance », April 8-9, 2013, at the Université de Strasbourg; « Rejouer la performance: de l’archive au reenactment », February 5-7, 2014, at the Université de Rennes 2; and « Processus de création et archives du spectacle vivant: manque de traces ou risque d’inflation mémorielle ? », October 15-17, 2014, at the Université de Rennes 2.
16 Symposium entitled in French « L’acteur comme intercesseur », held at Université Paris 3 and organized by Josette Féral and Louise Poissant, June 3-5, 2015.
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