**What Is Documentation?**

Suzanne Briet (1894–1989) was a pioneer of the European documentation movement, a precursor to the field now known as information science. She was among the first women to be appointed as a professional librarian at the Bibliothèque Nationale in France, in 1924. During her 30-year tenure there, she gained the nickname “Madame Documentation” for her active role in advancing documentation as a practice distinct from librarianship. What Is Documentation? pushes the boundaries of the field and of the profession and is strangely prescient of current dilemmas faced by librarians, archivists and curators despite the technological advances of intervening decades.

What Is Documentation? is a short work of 48 pages. Often referred to as a “manifesto,” it puts forth some of Briet’s ideas about the nature of the document, the practice of documentation and the relationship between users and documents. Her treatise begins by building on the traditionally espoused notions of the document as an embodiment of proof, expanding this idea to define a document as “all concrete or symbolic indexical signs [indices], preserved or recorded toward the ends of representing, of reconstituting, or of proving a physical or intellectual phenomenon” [3]. Several of her key ideas constitute a significant break from previous thought within the field of European documentation. Her analysis of the document as a sign subverts the positivist view of evidence as proof of a “fact” and situates the practice of documentation within a network of social and cultural production, something not previously acknowledged by documentalists [4]. The production of knowledge and its documentation proceed simultaneously, and often the two may become conflated, as documents are rearranged in new contexts to create new meanings. The fluid, discursive and contextual nature of the use and creation of documents is emphasized here, as “the forms that documentary work assumes are as numerous as the needs from which they are born” [5]. The content of documentation is in fact “inter-documentary,” comprising a complex array of relationships between indexical signs. Briet predicted that evolving technologies would only further the trend of selection and recombination of information in new formats to meet diverse needs. In her lifetime, this trend was effected by the use of the Dictaphone, microfilm and Teletype.

Briet explodes the idea of paper as the primary documentary form, literally referring to the book as bursting from its seams due to the need for “mobility” [6]. So what forms then can a document take? Briet asks:

- Is a star a document? Is a pebble rolled by a torrent a document? Is a living animal a document? No. But some documents are: the photographs and the catalogs of stars, stones in a museum of minerals, and animals that are cataloged and shown in a zoo [7].

Briet is renowned for using the unorthodox example of an antelope as a document to illustrate this statement: A new species of antelope is discovered in Africa and a specimen is brought back to the Jardin des Plantes in Paris. Briet considers this antelope to be a document, because it is framed as such within a community of scholarship, that of zoology. Unlike its cousins in the wild, this particular beast has become the focal...
point of a specialized discourse and its attendant social interactions. For Briet, this antelope is a primary or initial document—the object of the documentary act. She identifies the “documentary fertility” of this primary document; its potentially limitless manifestation in multiple forms, from the press release announcing its display at the zoo to a recording of its voice, from drawings and monographs to its ultimate taxidermy and display in a museum. The forms that are created from the initial document are defined as secondary documents, the means and networks in which the phenomenon manifests itself outside its original frame of context.

The idea of the document as socially constructed was a new one in the library world of 1951. Briet's thinking led her to propose a new approach to the management of information, departing from the centralized control and access model of the library to a contextual model of selection and recombination based upon the needs of specific communities. She proposed a new role for the documentalist: working side by side with researchers, “prospecting” along the frontiers of a given domain of knowledge and participating in the construction of new knowledge. In fact, she viewed documentation as a new cultural technique spanning documentary forms, social networks and cultural means of expression [8].

**The Digital Document: Container, Content and Context**

The nature of the document remains a subject of discussion and debate in the field of information science. The proliferation of heterogeneous digital and networked resources in today’s information landscape raises many questions about what forms a document may take and in what ways we may interact with them. Briet’s work positions the document within a social and technological framework, existing in multiple forms to meet multiple needs. Her division of content from form prefigures the popular metaphor in information science of container, content and context, a multifaceted perspective that has become instrumental for the description and preservation of digital resources [9]. Many of the current technological implementations aimed at managing digital documents have treated these three facets independently and have favored the preservation of content and context over the container. Often the container is considered a secondary property of the document, only concerned with the transmission of content; however, the importance of the container’s influence should not be overlooked in the quest for mobile and contextual content [10]. These three elements are inseparable: containers are integral to the properties of content and context.

Digital resources perhaps illustrate Briet’s concept of the document more persuasively than the antelope in the zoo. If we revisit her definition of the document as a “concrete or symbolic indexical sign,” we see that materiality is not a prerequisite characteristic. Rather, it is the notion of the pointer that is emphasized, a notion that certainly applies well to digital entities, which could be said to exist materially as electrical signals but whose meaning depends upon the interplay of external agents that can read and reconstruct them when required. The container in this case provides the pointer: the file format and its associated operations within a specific cultural and technological framework. This container enables the reconstruction of the content and context of the document, an iterative process dependent upon environmental variables. The process of reconstruction echoes another aspect of Briet’s definition of the document; its goal of reconstituting or representing a phenomenon. The digital document or object is a fragmentary entity, by nature both intangible and interactive. In many cases there may be more than one technological configuration or container that will provide access, leading to variability in the final presentation of content and context. These three distributed yet interdependent facets are all required in order to convey meaning.

**Variable Media Art: The Work as Document**

Briet spoke of the atomization of the book into its constituent leaves and the recombination of these leaves in new forms (such as the binder) that were context specific. Today in information science literature, context is everything as researchers seek to create a digital environment of “ambient intelligence” that is context-aware and able to recombine information in real time based upon geographical or other environmental data and user preferences [11]. How can the perspectives of information scientists concerned with the nature of digital objects provide insight into the documentation and preservation of variable media art? Variable media artworks have much in common with digital documents, existing as distributed and interdependent networks of components. They are complex configurations of the digital and analog, physical and ephemeral, that depend upon a variety of human and nonhuman agents for instantiation. They are interactive, mutable, fleeting and fragmentary. As Richard Rinehart has pointed out, they are as much performative as they are object based [12].

An artwork is framed within a given dis-

---

Briet predicted that knowledge creation and documentation would increasingly become parallel and even convergent enterprises.
**40 Part Motet**

40 Part Motet is an audiovisual installation work that investigates the intersections of perception, sound and space. Like much of Cardiff’s work, the Motet is concerned with the ephemeral nature of sound as a medium and the ways in which it influences both memory and our perception of time. Sound is a physical phenomenon yet it evokes an ephemeral presence. With 40 Part Motet, Cardiff utilizes a gallery space to re-enact a performance of an extremely complex polyphonic choral work of the 16th century, Thomas Tallis’s Spem in Alium. Forty recorded choir members are channeled through dedicated speakers, arranged in a circular configuration originally conceived by Tallis. The installation deconstructs conventional spectatorship, allowing the listener to “climb inside the music” by moving throughout the space and listening to different configurations of voices [13]. The trajectory taken by the listener is an integral part of the experience of the work. The principle of spatialization is explored, whereby perceptions of both aural and physical space are affected. The installation is highly interactive, requiring the participation of an audience to complete the work and carry out the artist’s intent.

Simulation also plays a key role in the work in the implied presence of the performers indicated by the anthropomorphic presentation and arrangement of the 40 speakers. Channeling as a metaphor describes both the physical conduits through which the recordings are connected to the speakers as well as the spectral effect of the voices they emit. Tallis himself could be said to be channeled across time in this work, which Cardiff describes as a collaboration rather than a reinterpretation [14]. The overlay of recorded sound and ambient sound within a space creates the impression of layered realities, an infiltration of the past into the present, the virtual into the real. The work juxtaposes both physicality and ephemerality, psychological and technological aspects of perception.

Like the primary document, particularly the digital document, this artwork relies upon a complex interoperability of components, from the digital audio recordings of the performers to the reverberation of the presentation space and the presence of people within it. The infrastructure of interactions between physical constituents, technological elements and participatory activity corresponds to Briet’s notion of a document in that it points to external agents that act to reconstitute or re-perform the phenomenon of the work. This “infrastructure” is a kind of interoperable architecture crucial to what is perceived as “the work,” namely the phenomenological dimension that reflects the artistic intent. Briet claimed that a document could act as a substitute for a lived experience, and it is in this sense that we can understand how the infrastructure provides the documentary structure for the experience of the artwork [15]. To revisit the tripartite metaphor of the document as container, content and context, the container could be equated to this infrastructure, which in turn allows the content and context of the work to take form. In 40 Part Motet the container includes the operation of components such as hard disk recorders, amplifiers, cabling and speakers, the interaction between space and sound, as well as the movement of listeners through the space. The content of the work is embodied in the experience. Context exists in the cultural and social constructions brought to the work by all participants, as well as the roles and practices involved in instantiating the work.

**Tacit Knowledge and the Documentation of Practice**

Context is the most difficult aspect of the work to document for posterity. It consists in large part of what could be called tacit knowledge. The concept of tacit knowing was developed by Michael Polanyi and refers to the range of conceptual and sensory information that cannot be expressed in words but that provides the backdrop to our understanding of a thing [16]. It is best described by Polanyi’s aphorism: “We can know more than we can tell” [17]. For documentalists this kind of knowledge by its very nature poses a problem. For variable media artworks, the tacit knowledge necessary for preservation consists of the artistic intent, the social and cultural contexts that impart meaning and the practices that are required to re-present the work. Tacit knowledge in the museum setting is essential for the preservation of variable media art yet remains as ephemeral as many of the works. Hummelen and Scholte review some of the methodologies that have been devised to capture the practices associated with these artworks [18]. Interviews with artists are one way of gathering this knowledge directly from the source, and the use of multimedia interview formats permits nonverbal communication through example or demonstration. Interview material can be incorporated into artist’s archives, which should ideally be shared among institutions [19]. Besides the interview, they review the Variable Media Questionnaire [20], a tool that has the potential to document intangible features of a work by incorporating varying perspectives alongside information about the artistic intent and the effects and behaviors of the work [21].

Cardiff’s Motet has generated an abundance of secondary documentation. Exhibition catalogs and reviews, press interviews, photographs and detailed technical specifications are all collected by the institutional proprietor. While this is an informative network of documentation, it does not encompass all of the contextual knowledge required for preservation. Some of the collected documents, such as records of conversations archived as e-mail correspondence, do provide some context. The museum has also undertaken to film short interviews with Cardiff himself, who could be said to be channeled across time in this work, which Cardiff describes as a collaboration rather than a reinterpretation.

Thomas Tallis could be said to be channeled across time in this work, which Cardiff describes as a collaboration rather than a reinterpretation.
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a source continually available to the museum, and so responsibility for “knowing” the practices associated with the work has been delegated to one person who can oversee successive installations at various locations [22]. The frequent reinstallation of this work in different spaces presents unique problems, because the experience of the work is so closely tied to its physical location. The importance of sound spatialization requires that some parameters be established to determine which physical spaces are most suitable. These parameters exist as specifications about room dimensions, decor and reverberation. If certain fundamental criteria can be met, then the installation can proceed. Once a decision has been made to install the work within a given space, the tacit knowledge of the technician comes into play. This individual’s “sound memory” [23] of the original instantiation of the work serves as a guide and is a highly subjective awareness residing only in the practice of this single person.

The experiential nature of the work is mirrored by the subjective practice of its installation, and to date no systematic methods have been defined to transmit these processes to others [24]. Potential means of capturing this knowledge and context could be borrowed from the management techniques of gathering “lessons learned” and “best practices” [25]. For example, an installation log would be a simple method of recording practice by documenting the context-specific installation issues that may provide insight in the future. These lessons learned borrow from the practice of storytelling and are often conceived as narrative structures, from annotated databases to notebooks, detailing circumstances and decisions taken. In capturing context through narrative, it is informative to share accounts of both failure and success [26]. Best practices are developed over time from the results of extensive experience and lessons learned. In the museum setting, it would be beneficial to produce a set of best practices for the documentation of variable media artworks in general, but perhaps a more informal guide could be developed for individual works such as the 40 Part Motet. Developing methods for documenting practice is one way to preserve tacit knowledge. The preservation of knowledge is as essential to the future of the variable media artwork as the maintenance of its physical and technological constituents. Tools developed to perpetuate this knowledge would enhance the network of documentation surrounding the work.

**Toward a New Paradigm of Documentation: Scoring the Work**

Suzanne Briet envisaged documentation as a new cultural technique, with practitioners actively occupied alongside the producers of knowledge. She predicted that knowledge creation and documentation would increasingly become parallel and even convergent enterprises. This idea is illustrated in the museum environment by the changing relationships between the key players concerned with the future of the variable media artwork as an evolving media art.

**The overlay of recorded sound and ambient sound within a space creates the impression of layered realities, an infiltration of the past into the present, the virtual into the real.**

The document is no longer a stable concept, and documentation has in turn become a fluid and agile intellectual activity. Documentary practice intersects social, cultural and technological frameworks, reflecting the interactions that occur between them. Briet’s positioning of the document as a constructed entity is quite applicable today to both digital documents and variable media artworks. The move away from an emphasis on form toward the primacy of use and context is a key attribute of the new paradigm of documentation envisaged by Briet. While documentary practice is shifting to accommodate the nature of contemporary art forms, there is a need for a structured model that will address some of the issues particular to variable media artworks. Documentation of variable media art must comprehensively consider...

---

The experiential nature of the work is mirrored by the subjective practice of its installation, and to date no systematic methods have been defined to transmit these processes to others [24]. Potential means of capturing this knowledge and context could be borrowed from the management techniques of gathering “lessons learned” and “best practices” [25]. For example, an installation log would be a simple method of recording practice by documenting the context-specific installation issues that may provide insight in the future. These lessons learned borrow from the practice of storytelling and are often conceived as narrative structures, from annotated databases to notebooks, detailing circumstances and decisions taken. In capturing context through narrative, it is informative to share accounts of both failure and success [26]. Best practices are developed over time from the results of extensive experience and lessons learned. In the museum setting, it would be beneficial to produce a set of best practices for the documentation of variable media artworks in general, but perhaps a more informal guide could be developed for individual works such as the 40 Part Motet. Developing methods for documenting practice is one way to preserve tacit knowledge. The preservation of knowledge is as essential to the future of the variable media artwork as the maintenance of its physical and technological constituents. Tools developed to perpetuate this knowledge would enhance the network of documentation surrounding the work.
can convey structure, experience and movement. All the unique documentary concerns and demands in the preservation of variable media art point us toward a new model of documentation similar to the medium of the score as proposed by Richard Rinehart [31]. His proposed formal notation system has a flexible yet robust structure and incorporates the passage of time and the possibility of change. It can act as both a documentary and compositional tool, affirming the correspondence between knowledge production and documentation. Rinehart states that the score constitutes the “clearest type of description that compiles formalized (systematic) discrete elements into documents that aid in the re-performance or re-creation of works of art” [32]. Through the process of compilation, it permits varying levels of granularity [33] appropriate to the context of use. Thus, the model of the score offers a balance between experience and structure, infrastructure (container) and the phenomenon (content and context), creation and recording.

Rinehart recognizes the link between digital informatics and variable media artworks and proposes the use of a markup language to express the notation system. This is reminiscent of Briet’s idea of an abstract and algebraic schematization of documentary elements. A markup language provides a schema to delineate the components, context and practice of a work. It acts as a script for the re-performance of the work at a future time, incorporating the spectrum of participatory and decision making, of roles and interactions. The document, the score and the markup language all imply movement and navigation. The document as an indexical sign positions itself within a web of connections, easily visualized using the associative properties of a hypertextual markup language. Rinehart’s formal notation system for variable media art presents a documentary model that is able to encompass many of the complexities inherent in the nature of the artwork and its relationships with its documentation. This model embodies the notion of “recording” as a dynamic documentary process [34].

**Conclusion**

Questions about the nature of the document as expressed within the field of information science provide us with some interesting revelations about the documentary practices surrounding variable media art. Suzanne Briet’s definition of the document as a sign recorded in order to reconstruct a phenomenon brings to the foreground of this investigation the interdependent and recombinatory relationships that exist between a work and its documentation. The work as document and documented helps us to understand variable media art in multiple dimensions as pointer, narrative and network.

Briet saw in the emerging role of the documentalist a new rhythm of intellectual work, one fostered by the technological developments of her time. Today documentation is still a rhythmic force, buffeted by new technologies and demanding new models. The issues raised in the documentation of variable media art call for a new methodology that can embody these fluctuating rhythms of production and practice. Rinehart’s formal notation system leverages the synergy between current technological standards and the concept of the musical score to enable the documentation of both experience and structure. The re-performance of a work through the score will provide an interesting departure point for future investigation of the interdisciplinary cultural technique that is documentation.
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