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Abstract

This thesis is an analysis of lithographic stones used by Edvard Munch, and the purpose of this is to reveal what kind of role a matrix like a lithographic stone has when they are on display. The thesis also contemplates on how museums can work with lithographic stones in the context of exhibition.

In chapter one, I will explore what the lithographic stones are in general and what they meant for Edvard Munch. And in chapter two, I will introduce theories which I will use to analyse the stones and define what a museum object is and what the role of a museum is. I will also refer to some theatrical theories which I will borrow to discuss this, because I believe that making an exhibition shares common factors with making a stage play, which thus makes it possible to use theories from the theatrical field to analyse exhibitions. I will mainly borrow from dramaturgy by Peter Brook. In chapter three, I will present three cases where Munch’s lithographic stones have been displayed, and explain how I will analyse those cases. These are 1) an unofficial display of his lithographic stones in a corridor near the employee entrance in the back of The Munch Museum, 2) the exhibition “With Eyes Closed – Gauguin and Munch” where Munch’s works were shown together with Gauguin’s from 17 February to 22 April 2018, and 3) an untitled project planned to last 10 years featuring Munch’s original works at Oslo Gardermoen Airport which opened on 27 April 2018. Then in chapter four, I will investigate the three cases one by one and examine how and with what context the stones have been exhibited. I will start with observations on how and with which context Munch’s lithographic stones are exhibited in practice and think over if his stones are objects for research, for educational purpose, or artistic objects which deserve to be displayed at an exhibition. In chapter five, I will discuss what the status of the lithographic stones among museum objects is, and attempt to expand the topic from the individual case with Munch to a more general discussion. And as a conclusion I will reflect on the new aspects of possibilities which matrices may have.
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People want to find a meaning in everything and everyone.

That’s the disease of our age…

- Pablo Picasso

I’m afraid that if you look at a thing long enough, it loses all of its meaning.

- Andy Warhol
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Introduction

For the third semester of my museology master course at the University of Oslo, I had an internship at the Munch Museum (Munchmuseet), at the section for graphics and sketches (seksjon for grafikk og tegninger) from September to November 2017, and under the guidance of Dr. Ute Falck I participated in the production of the exhibition “With Eyes Closed – Gauguin and Munch” (“Med Lukkede Øyne – Gauguin og Munch”), which was held from 17 February to 22 April 2018. My tasks included gathering information for a timeline panel and a catalog related to the exhibition, ordering pictures for the catalog, and working with the database, and through the internship I gained firsthand knowledge of the process of making an exhibition. Since the exhibition mainly featured graphic arts by Gauguin and Munch, I got the chance to come close to Munch’s graphic works. Munch is of course famous for his paintings like “Scream” and “Madonna”, but in fact he made many more graphic works than paintings. Through this experience at the museum I came to realize how much Munch searched for the possibilities that exists within graphic arts through experimenting in using various matrices such as cut woodblocks, etched/engraved metal plates, and lithographic stones. I was especially fascinated by his lithographic stones because they have their own distinctive atmosphere which is similar to that in his artworks on paper. The Munch Museum will change location from Tøyen where they are now to the downtown near Bjørvika bay in 2019, and currently they are considering if they have room to display the lithographic stones in the new museum building. If this possibility comes true, how will the stones be displayed? What is the position of the lithographic stones within the collections of the museum now and what will they be after 2019?

In 2017 the Munch museum presented a plan for a new exhibition at the international terminal of Oslo Gardermoen airport in collaboration with Avinor Oslo Lufthavn.1 It’s a 10-year project which will be held from 2018 and exhibit original art by Edvard Munch. This is planned to be an opportunity to introduce works by one of the most famous and the greatest Norwegian artists to airline passengers from various countries. Every year two original works will be chosen and shown in a display case at the departure area. Chosen for the first year was the painting Head by Head (1905) [figure 1] and the lithograph stone which was used to create the famous work Separation (1896) [figure 2]. At the Munch museum in Tøyen, the
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exhibition *Head by Head -Cronqvist/Bjørlo/Munch* was held from 28 October 2017 to 28 January 2018, Munch’s works were exhibited alongside those of two other artists under the theme human beings’ inner loneliness. The choice for the exhibition at the airport was surely related to the one at the museum, and the two artifacts were chosen as works which could convey the same theme from the museum to the airport passengers. (The opening was originally planned to be in December 2017, but because of technical problems at Gardermoen Airport it was postponed to 27 April 2018. If it opens according to schedule, the exhibition will be synchronized with the one held at the Munch Museum.) But why was the lithographic stone chosen as a display item? There are many of Munch’s works where a mental distance between two persons who are close together physically is expressed, and it’s not so difficult to pick out one which can present that theme. Why was it not a graphic art or a painting, but a lithographic stone?

The Munch museum publishes the free yearly magazine *Munchmuseet* that gives diverse information related to their exhibition program, including interviews with artists and curators, articles about research projects and conservation, educational programs, and collaborations. In the issue for 2018 the collaboration project is mentioned and this is the reason behind the choice of displaying the lithographic stone. “[…] By displaying a painting along with a lithographic stone, we also want to demonstrate that Munch created a host of different variations of the same themes and motifs, executed in a variety of techniques. The Munch Museum owns two-thirds of Munch’s extant lithographic stones, a collection that is unique in the international art scene. These stones are rarely on display, […]”² That is, the museum selected the painting and the stone to show a good example of the similar motif of two heads created by different tools. But as it is mentioned in the quotation, it is not common to show his lithographic stones in exhibitions. Why is it a rare case to show them to visitors? I speculate that it is because the stones are usually not regarded as works of art, but a tool to create graphic works in the same category as wooden plates for woodblock prints and zinc plates for zincography. They could be objects for research and studies and could also be subjects of preservation if they have a certain historical value. But when they are shown in front of an audience, what kind of role can they perform and in which context will they be exhibited?

² *Munchmuseet* 2018, s.51
What kind of objects do museums usually show in an exhibition? In the most cases, objects on display are something historical, cultural, or works of art. But sometimes they also can show something which was not traditionally regarded as an object for exhibition or something invisible like a manufacturing- or conservation process. From 31 August to 2 October 2016, at Zachęta – the National Gallery of Art (Narodowa Galleria Sztuki) in Warsaw in Poland, the exhibition “Before, after and in between, Decision-making in Contemporary Art Restoration” was held and it showed how restoration of art was performed. The concept of the exhibition is the followings: ‘Differences in works of art in the stage BEFORE and AFTER restoration may be visible, but often they are not noticeable to the viewer. The status in BETWEEN, normally not revealed to the audience, includes complicated process and activities, as well as important decisions regarding restoration. The aim of the show is not to present simple comparisons, showing how the work has changed, but to focus on what happens BETWEEN these activities. […] We also reveal one of the aspects of backstage activities of the gallery.’ To put it in another way, this exhibition was not about showing the effectiveness of the restoration process through comparison of the before and after result. It was an attempt to show an invisible process which is usually hidden from the audience and that cannot be known from the objects on display. There, the tools which were used for conservation and the videos of the interviews with the conservator were also placed alongside the works of art. [figure 3] [figure 4] Are the lithographic stone in the same status as the tools for conservations or interview videos?

To offer another example of museum objects which are normally hidden from the audience. A matrix. A matrix roughly means something to produce, and is used in a range of fields from mathematics to digital technology. Even in the field of museology the term is used in several slightly different meanings. For example, Berkeley Art Museum and Pacific Film Archive has since 1978 held a series of contemporary art exhibitions called “MATRIX”, and it ‘provides an experimental framework for an active interchange between the artist, the museum, and the viewer.’ In that exhibition, the term “matrix” is used to focus on the function of creating something, and it suggests that the exhibition is “a leading model in for contemporary exhibition practices, inspiring museums across the country to develop project series of their own”. When it comes to the term in the printing context it still possesses the
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3 These quotes are from the introduction panel for the exhibition.
4 https://bampfa.org/about/matrix
5 https://bampfa.org/about/matrix
meaning of being something used to create, but the word is taken in more narrow sense, a mold for casting typefaces. In this thesis, the word “matrix” is used in this meaning and indicates plates and blocks to print graphic works. In September 2017 the conference “Blocks, Plates, Stones” was held in London with the subtitle, “Matrices/Printing Surfaces in Research and Collections”, and the word “matrices” was used as the term to indicate master copies for printing. In the conference, matrices mainly received attention as a new aspect for interdisciplinary research: ‘The material turns in fields that rely on printed matter has led to interest in how those texts and images were—and are—produced. Those objects, including cut woodblocks, etched/engraved metal plates, and lithographic stones, could be fundamental to research.’6 So they were mainly discussed as an object for research or to tell the process making artifacts or works of art, thereby showing the “backstage” like exhibitions which show the process of conservation.

But is it impossible to show matrices as works of art, not for research or educational purposes? Especially in the case of lithographic stones I suppose there is a potential to be shown as works of art since they are different from the other matrices such as cut woodblocks and etched/engraved metal plates. Drawings on the stones are visibly clear enough while in the case of the other matrices it is often difficult to know what is expressed on them. In this thesis I would like to explore the significance of the stones, and define what kind of museum objects they are. I am particularly intrigued by the recent uses of stones as an object of display.

Is an appreciation of Munch’s lithographic stones the same as the appreciation of his paintings and graphic works? How does The Munch museum present them? Should audiences see and feel the stones as a drawing on the stones in the same way as viewing his paintings? Or are the stone objects of study that can be used to show the process of creating master pieces? Or are they valuable because the great artist Edvard Munch used them and that is enough reason to deserve to be seen? For certain people, it is the most important to see works with a solid reputation as a valued work when they visit an exhibition.

To discuss the status of lithographic stones, I will start analysing this research question: What kind of museum objects are lithographic stones? And as my research target, I will focus on the lithographic stones in the possession of the Munch museum. As my case

---

6 Programme from the conference in 2017 “BLOCKS PLATES STONES Print Matrices/Printing Surfaces in Research and Collections”
In chapter one, I will explore what the lithographic stones is in general and what they meant for Edvard Munch. And in chapter two, I will introduce theories which I will use to analyze the stones and define what a museum object is and what the role of museums is. I will also refer to some theatrical theories which I will borrow to discuss this, because I believe that making an exhibition shares common factors with making a stage play, and it is thus effective to use theories from the theatrical field to analyze exhibitions. I will consider this matter in detail in chapter two, but to put it briefly, both of their missions are not to show something as it is, but to present something with certain contexts, and the choice of them are one of the most important performances during their making processes. In chapter three, I will present three ways to display where Munch’s stones have been shown, and explain how I will analyze those cases. Then in chapter four, I will investigate the cases one by one and examine how and with what context the stones have been exhibited. I will start with observations on how and with which context Munch’s lithographic stones are exhibited in practice and think over if his stones are objects for research, for educational purpose, or artistic objects which deserve to be displayed at an exhibition. In chapter five, I will discuss what the status of the lithographic stones among museum objects is, and attempt to expand the topic from the individual case with Munch to a more general discussion. And as a conclusion I will reflect on the new aspects of possibilities which matrices may have.
Chapter 1: Edvard Munch’s lithographic stones

The purpose of this chapter is to understand what a lithographic stone is and the personal relationship between Munch and his lithographic stones. So, in this chapter I will start by explaining general information about lithographic stones, their history and how they have been utilized, and then I will focus on the specific stones used by Edvard Munch. To comprehend these matters is a prerequisite for analyzing lithographic stones used by Munch. It was in 1894 that Munch began making graphic works in earnest and for 50 years, till 1944 just before his death, he continued to produce a large number of prints experimenting with three different techniques of graphics: etching, woodcut print, and lithography. (Woll 2001: 6) Even though it was in 1894 he actively became involved in creating graphic works, there is evidence that he was interested in making prints already in his younger days. ‘Even at 19 years of age, he produced a small booklet containing eight humorous pen drawings on paper, printed lithographically. Both the style and form of the publication were of a type very popular in Norway in the 1870s and the print method was simply and cheap. It is not known whether production of the booklet brought Munch into contact with prints and gave him an insight into lithographic printing. The attempt was not a financial success.’ (Woll 2001: 10) Even though it is unknown how big Munch’s interest for lithography was in those days, it is shown that he at least had already had some experience with using graphical techniques. It was in Berlin that he created his first intaglio print and his first lithography in 1894, and later he moved to Paris in 1896 and created his first woodcut print and his first colour lithography. So, in the beginning he made prints outside Norway, but he had also an intention of continuing to create graphic works after moving back to Norway in 1909. He brought many lithographic stones back with him to Norway and kept them with his lithographic press in the cellar of his atelier in Ekely, a suburb of Oslo. There is no record detailing where he bought the stones, how much he spent on them, and how he transported them, but at any rate it was probably not cheap and we can imagine his enthusiasm for lithography. What is lithography and how was it invented? What unique points does a lithographic stone have compared to the other tools which make graphic works? What elements of lithography attracted Munch?
1.1. What is Lithography and Lithographic Stones?

Lithography is a method of creating graphic arts using repulsion of oil and water. It ‘is based on the simple chemical principle that oil and water do not mix.’ (Meggs 2012: 163) This method was accidentally discovered in 1796 by Aloys Senefelder, an actor and director in München. (Meggs 2012: 162) He was up to his ears in debt due to problems with publishing his play “Mathilde von Altenstein” and he tried to make plates for etching by himself to print the next play that he had already written and he had bought a smooth fine-grained stone of Solnhofen limestone to make ink on it. He got the idea for a new printing method from an accidental occurrence – he couldn’t erase trivial notes he wrote with an oil-based crayon on the limestone when he tried to remove the notes with nitric acid. Then he experimented with putting an oil-based ink on the letters, and it succeeded making a print on a paper. He came up with the thought that this discovery could be applied to print from the flat surface of the stone without having to make engravings, and it became the first planographic process of printing. Senefelder asked for cooperation in making this new technique a pragmatic form of printing from the André family of music publishers, and after two years, in 1798, the technique of “lithography” was completed. Its original purpose was to print books and music notes, but the property of the lithograph allowed artists to draw directly on stones with their own favorite tools such as pens, crayons, and brushes, without using special skills to carve and engrave. So already in the 1810’s the lithograph had achieved popularity as a new technique to create art, while at the same time spreading as a technique to print a large quantity of commercial publications. In the beginning this technique was developed for printing music notes and pamphlets, so a solution to the inconvenience of drawing a mirror image was needed. In the middle of the 19th century the way to transcribe from original drawings made with oil-based crayon or ink on a Japanese paper onto a limestone, putting the recto page of the work on the stone and adding water and pressing it down. In this way the result of printing becomes the same as the drawing on a paper by a painter.

Senefelder called the technique “stone printing”, and the French name “lithograph” comes from the Ancient Greek, lithos (λίθος) meaning 'stone', and gráphein (γράφειν) meaning 'to write'. (Meggs 2012: 162-163) The method was invented using limestone, but gradually metal plates made of aluminium and zink (and in modern lithography now, a
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flexible plastic plate with a polymer coating as well) have been used. Even though a limestone can be used many times if its surface is polished again, the image on the stone must be erased in order to make a new creation. Above all, limestones which are of good quality like the ones from Solnhofen in German are very expensive. And heavy to transport and bulky to keep. So already in the 1830’s the method of zincography, in which zinc plates were used, had been adopted to create graphics, especially in the commercial field. (Meggs 2012: 163)

After the 1820’s lithography flowered as an art in France, and it was said that “it was invented in Germany and became art in France”8 and the technique was adopted by artists, such as Delacroix, Géricault, Goya and Daumier. In the end of the 19th century most artists, such as Chassériau, Bresdin, Manet, Degas, Fantin-Latour, Redon, Toulouse-Lautrec, Gauguin, had tried their hands at lithography. The genre, “graphic” has a long history after the Renaissance, and it is known that famous painters, like Dürer and Rembrandt actively practiced the method using copper plates and wood blocks. (Meggs 2012: 86-97) It had however been ranked under painting. Because unlike painting where there is only one existence of a work, graphic works can be reproduced many times.

In 1936-39, Walter Benjamin wrote his masterpiece “The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction” (Benjamin 2008) and in the book, he discussed the lithograph:

During the Middle Ages engraving and etching were added to the woodcut; at the beginning of the nineteenth century lithography made its appearance. With lithography the technique of reproduction reached an essentially new stage. This much more direct process was distinguished by the tracing of the design on a stone rather than its incision on a block of wood or its etching on a copperplate and permitted graphic art for the first time to put its products on the market, not only in large numbers as hitherto, but also in daily changing forms. Lithography enabled graphic art to illustrate everyday life, and it began to keep pace with printing. (Benjamin 2008: 115)

In his thesis he mentioned that art works which can be copied by mechanical reproduction have lost an “aura” which the original piece has. He appreciated the useful aspects of lithography, but still regarded it as a graphic art made for commercial purposes.

But are there any possibilities for lithography to possess an “aura”? The strokes by the artist on the plate are made directly and there are many possibilities for the artist to gradually

---

8 Kotobanku, searched with the word, lithography (https://kotobank.jp/) It is an internet version of “Encyclopedia Nipponica” (日本大百科全書 Nihon Dai Hyakka Zensho, lit. The Japan Comprehensive Encyclopedia)
add originality after printing such as hand coloring and scratching on the ink. The specificity of lithography is in the strokes on the plates which aren’t engraved, and the property is unique when compared to other graphics. Above I referred to that the use of zinc plates in place of limestones was already increasing in the 1830’s due to cost and convenience issues. Then, does that perhaps not infer that the lithographs which were created with stones after this period mean the artist used stones on purpose, with certain intentions in mind? Specifically, does this not imply that the lithographic arts which used limestones have artistic intentions by artists trying to put “aura” in them?

As Benjamin pointed out, the lithograph was still a relatively new media in the beginning of the 20th century when Munch lived and was actively creating his works. At the time limestones were used to create them, though later aluminum- and copper plates would take the role instead of the stones. Munch had been interested in the technique through his life after encountering it, and he even imported lime stones from Germany to Norway, spending much money in the process. So, in the next section, I would like focus on the connections between Munch and the lithographic stones.

1.2. Munch’s Lithographic Stones

Since December 1892, Munch had settled down in Berlin, Germany, and in February 1894 he acquired the skills of etching, and of lithography by the end of the year, and continually expanded his potential to express his art. (Woll 2001: 10) By using the graphical technique, he examined how to express his inner mental impression through the same motifs and themes which he had already painted before. For Munch who repeatedly used the same themes to pursue his own art, the method of “graphic”, which can be reproduced many times, was suitable. His first lithograph was a portrait of “Harry Graf Kassel” from 1895, and after he moved to Paris in 1896 he started to create color lithographs and wood block prints at the factory of August Clot. (Woll 2001: 11-12, 66)

Woll pointed out that one of the reasons Munch became interested in various graphic techniques was economical. He was eager to be independent economically and wanted to sell his works. But it was difficult to find someone who was able to afford to buy his paintings. If

9 From an interview with Dr. Ute Falck. (16 February 2018)
the artworks could be reproduced, then they could be sold for a much lower price. (Woll 2001: 10)

But was it only for economic reasons that Munch chose to adopt the method of graphics? As I already mentioned in the former section, using lithographic stones were expensive both to buy and to print out at the professional factory\textsuperscript{10}. He bought all his limestones in Germany, and when he came back to Norway he had them sent to his atelier. One of the reasons he did it could be that it was difficult to get good quality stones in Norway, but above all it shows his intent to continue to print lithographic works in Norway as well. Although there is no record of the price of shipping to Norway, he left several letters where he mentioned that buying stones and printing with them was expensive.\textsuperscript{11} Even though using the technique of lithography had a high cost, he continued with lithography through his life, so from that it is possible to assume that they were of large importance to Munch. The stones that haven’t been lost are all in the collection of the Munch Museum today, and currently 171 works on 139 stone plates are kept there. (Munch sometimes used both side of the stones).

1.3. What was the Relationship between Munch and Lithographic Stones?

Munch began to make lithographs in 1894 and he continued to create them to the end of his life. The last lithographic work was a portrait of “Hans Jæger” in 1944. (Woll 2001: 435)

He is known for his enthusiastic attitude towards new methods such as graphics and photos which were products from, borrowing a term from Benjamin, “the age of mechanical reproduction”. That is because he thought the role of an artist was like a mediator and of great significance, and he left some notes describing this concept.\textsuperscript{12} For him creating art was a communication with the people who looked at his art works, and the spirits which came out through the works were more important than the works themselves. To transmit the spirit which he wanted to express, he regarded many of his works as series, and wanted them to be

\textsuperscript{10} From an interview with Dr. Ute Falck. (16 February 2018)
\textsuperscript{11} We can read his letters and notes on the webpage: eMUNCH, Edvard Munchs tekster, digitalt arkiv (https://www.emunch.no/welcome.xhtml)
\textsuperscript{12} eMUNCH, Edvard Munchs tekster, digitalt arkiv (https://www.emunch.no/welcome.xhtml)

Munch left many of his notes where he expressed these concepts repeatedly: “Art is the opposite of nature”, “A work of art only comes from inside oneself”, “Art is the form of image created through a person’s nerves – heart – brain – eye”, etc.
shown together instead of being introduced one by one. This might also be one of the reasons Munch was interested in graphics which can easily be reproduced.

Paul Rollon "Pola" Gauguin, the son of Paul Gauguin, wrote a book titled “Grafikeren Edvard Munch” and in that he described how Munch made his lithographic works. (Gauguin 1946: 18) He tells that Munch did not draw after a mirror image, but could with his steady eye see the mirror image in front of himself and draw without having the original in front of him. He tells that technically Munch never copied his works, but they were clear in his reimagining of them so he could repaint them without major deviations. This is the case of “The Sick Child” which there was eight versions of, but most of the lithographs of his paintings became mirror images of the originals.

When artists create graphic works, they usually draw the original pictures and put it on the plate in verso and transfer the lines. Then they can create the same design on the graphics as the drawings. But Munch didn’t use this technique. He used many motifs from his previous paintings for his lithographic works, but he drew on the stones directly without making any drafts, and that is why many of his lithographic works are the reverse of his paintings. Later Munch also experimented with metal plates as well instead of limestones, but Paula described that Munch paid particular attention to the stones. As for Munch’s attitude towards creating lithographs, Woll pointed out (Woll 2001: 11) that Grief Kessler who was a model for the first Munch’s lithograph also noted in his diary for 10 May 1895 that Munch drew directly on the stone using lithographic crayon.

It was actually not only Munch who used this method. Another was Toulouse-Lautrec who was famous for his posters made with the lithographic method. ‘Drawing directly on the lithographic stone, he often worked from memory with no sketches and used an old toothbrush that he always carried to achieve tonal effects through a splatter technique.’ (Meggs 2012: 209-211) There is no evidence that they influenced each other in their creation methods, so it could be just coincidence. But it is interesting that both the artists who expressed their artworks lively with lithography were fond of the same creation method. If we consider their way of making lithographic works, we may say that their strokes on the stones are more like artworks than printed graphic work. That is, could we say that the drawings on the stones express more “aura” in their case? In the same way as a drawing by a pen on a paper, were the drawings on the stones exactly like the images in Munch’s head?
If we look at one of his very first lithographic prints, “self-portrait” which was produced in 1895, his name was drawn in the upper parts of the work. But some letters of his name, “D” and “N” are mirror images. [figure 5] If he really wanted to make the letters appear in the correct way, it was not difficult to do that. Even if we suppose that he did not notice the orientation of the letters until the self-portrait had been printed, it was still possible to correct them, since lithographic stones are usable multiple times by scraping off the drawings on the surface. That was the reason why the method of lithography was developed in manufactural fields like making music notes and geographical maps in its early stage. In this sense the stones are different from the other techniques of graphic art. For example, with a plate for a woodcut print it is not possible to fix a line once it has been engraved. So, I assume that he was actually unconcerned with if an image would become reversed left to right or not, and both images are the same for him because the most important matter for him was to express a work of art which only comes from inside oneself, and he did not intend to draw something realistically. So, the self-portrait might be a message from Munch that he drew on the stone in the same way as when drawing on the paper. An amusing thought is that if the self-portrait was originally drawn while using a mirror, then the finished graphic printed by the stone would reflect the real orientation of Munch, while that drawn on the stone would be how Munch himself saw himself in a mirror.

In 1899 he created a woodcut print “Woman Bathing” and with the wooden plate he also tried to use “frottage”, a method of printing by rubbing, by putting a paper on the plate and rubbing it with purple colour. [figure 6] This experiment also showed his interests in reversal of images.

I assume that he appreciated a mirrored image as a challenge for considering composition and adopted the reversed images actively. For Munch lithographic stones were tools to print his drawings on a paper, but at the same time he might have had the perspective to look at the stones like a canvas or a paper.
Chapter 2: Lithographic stones as museum objects

2.1. Introduction

As I mentioned in the introduction chapter, in a museum a matrix indicates a mold for producing graphic works such as metal plates and woodblocks, and currently they are primarily objects of research. But what kind of role does a matrix like a lithographic stone have when they are on display? How can museums work with lithographic stones in the context of exhibitions? And how can they be used? Before discussing that, in this chapter, I will first define what a museum object is, and present concepts and theories which I will use to discuss these questions in the following chapters. As for the theories I will attempt to borrow from dramaturgy. I think it is useful to borrow a theatrical theory to analyse exhibitions because making an exhibition and considering how to exhibit objects with narratives shares some underlying ideas with the thinking on how to show and direct a play and interpret a script. Borrowing from dramaturgy has already been carried out in sociology. E. Goffman contributed to social theory with his study of symbolic interaction which took the form of dramaturgical analysis. (Goffman 1990) In his study, a dramaturgy is used as a way to analyse the relationship between society and individuals, and he claimed that the relationship is preserved by performing role-playing. The interaction is defined as a process in which individuals manipulate their impressions and play roles against each other. In my analysis I will utilize dramaturgy to classify exhibitions into several types, and to see what kind of roles stones perform in them.

2.2. A Museum Object and “Musealia”

What is a “museum object” exactly? The term “museum object” can be replaced by the neologism “musealia”. (Desvallées 2010: 61) This term describes not only the thing which the museum has acquired, but also includes a concept of a “musealized” process which happens to the thing after it enters a museum. This process can be being placed in a museum, being subject to conservation, organization, researching, and exhibition. ‘A thing can be defined as any kind of reality in general. The expression ‘museum object’ could almost be a pleonasm in so far as the museum is not only the place which shelters objects, but also a place
with the principal mission of transforming things into objects.’ (Desvallées 2010: 61) So, anything in this world has the potential to be a museum object and once it has been chosen by a museum, it changes its status to “musealia” due to the museum’s influence. ‘Once inside the museum it becomes the material and intangible evidence of man and his environment and a source of study and exhibition, thus acquiring a specific cultural reality.’ (Desvallées 2010: 51)

At the end of the 1980s the Reinwardt Academie in Amsterdam recognized that a museum has three functions, reservation, research and communication, (Desvallées 2010: 21) and the classification is still adopted in museology. Communication has two main functions, education and exhibition. On the assumption that a museum object is supposed to undergo the three processes to achieve the status of “musealia”, Munch’s lithographic stones thus were matrices to create graphic works when they were active in use, but when they were collected by The Munch Museum they gained a new status as “musealia”.

While “musealia” in general indicates all objects which have acquired by a museum, various terms are used depending on which field deals with the thing and in which process among the three functions of museum the thing is within. ‘The result is the relativism summarized by Jacques Hainard in 1984 in a sentence which has become famous: “The object is not the truth of anything. Firstly polyfunctional, then polysemic, it takes on meaning only when placed in context.”‘ (Desvallées 2010: 64) Pearce wrote about the terminology related to the different material, and defined the difference of meaning between ‘object’, ‘thing’, ‘specimen’, ‘artefact’, ‘good’ (usually used in the plural as ‘goods’), ‘artisan’, and the term ‘material culture’ (Pearce 2012: 23-25) ‘All of these terms share common ground in that they all refer to selected lumps of the physical world to which cultural value has been ascribed, […] but each carries a slightly different shade of meaning because each comes from a distinguishably different tradition of study.’ (Pearce 2012: 23) Pearce took the example of the moon rock that turns from a “natural object” to a “specimen” through cultural value creation. So, we may see what context and meaning material have been given by the chosen terms that label them. In her definition, though ‘thing’, ‘object’, ‘artefact’ and ‘material culture’ are often used to indicate material pieces on the same level, the term ‘artefact’ which is mostly used in the cultural field emphases the meaning ‘made by art or skill’. (Pearce 2012: 23)

---

13 It is actually not preferable to quote some sentences which includes a quotation, but Jacques Hainard wrote the thesis in French and I could not read it. So, I decided to leave the sentence in the quotation.
What is the difference between ‘artifact’ and ‘(a work of) art’ then? According to Danto, “to be a work of art, I have argued, is to embody a thought, to have a content, to express a meaning”. (Danto 1989: 32) Both a work of art and an artifact are made by human beings, but in contrast to a work of art, an artifact is a thing without a thought, a content, or a meaning. A thing which is made for the purpose of expressing a feeling and a thought is obviously a work of art. However, a thing which was originally made as an artifact can be also transformed to be a work of art by there being discovered a meaning in it or a thought being added to it by someone. As Bunzl pointed out that ‘relational aesthetics affirms that anything can be art’ (Bunzl 2016: 144), so not only artifacts, but also anything else can be art if they come to embody meanings or contexts. Defining the museum effect as ‘turning all objects into works of art’ (Alpers 1991: 26), Alpers argued how museums can provide visitors with a place to exercise ‘a way of seeing’. (Alpers 1991: 27) According to her, a museum should be a place ‘where we are invited to find both unexpected as well as expected crafted objects to be of visual interest to us’ (Alpers 1991: 32), and she emphasized ‘what the museum registers is visual distinction, not necessarily cultural significance’ (Alpers 1991: 30). So, in her opinion objects on display should have elements as works of art and be of visual interest.

What is the definition of Munch’s lithographic stones then? When a stone was cut out from a quarry, it was a ‘natural object’ in the form of a limestone. While it was used by Munch in practice, it was a ‘thing’ used as a matrix to create his graphics. After it was collected by The Munch Museum, it had become “musealia” in the broad sense. But in the context of exhibitions, what status will the lithographic stones gain? Artifact, or art? Munch’s graphic works which were printed using the stones are definitely works of art. But how about the stones which were used for creating works of art? From the point of the view that it has gotten that shape by a human being’s hand, are they artifacts? Or should they be called objects since they are not created for their own sake? Or since strokes by Munch are shown on their surfaces, could they be works of art? And furthermore, will their status change depending on what context they appear in?

2.3. Implicit Connotations: “Affordance” and “Narrative”

How does a museum object change status during a process of making an exhibition? ‘The museal object is made to be seen, with its whole mass of implicit connotations, because
we can display it in order to stir emotions, to entertain, or to teach.’ (Desvallées 2010: 62)

Here, we should not overlook that the term “museal object” is used instead of “museum object”. While the term “museum object” indicates it had undergone the process of musealisation and preserved in a museum, “museal object” includes a stronger sense towards being shown to audiences. Namely, a museum object which has a potential to be shown changes its status to a museal object based on the premise of being shown when it is decided to be on display.

Why can a museal object be with mass of implicit connotations? This is mainly due to two factors; an unfixed relationship between an object and its circumstances, and processes to put context and meanings into the object. The unfixed relationship can be explained by the concept in ecological psychology, “affordance”, and the latter can be elaborated by the idea of “narratives”.

The term “affordance” is created by psychologist James J. Gibson. In his books (Gibson 1950, 1978, 1985) he discussed the relationship between creatures including human beings and the objects surround them, and considered how human beings viewed their circumstances and pointed out that people chose what they wanted to see and did not see the world evenly. And he explained that ‘when the constant properties of constant objects are perceived (the shape, size, color, texture, composition, motion, animation and position relative to other objects), the observer can go on to detect their affordances. […] What they afford the observer, after all, depends on their properties’. (Gibson 1983: 285) That is, all objects in this world potentially have organic relationship with the creatures that surround them, and creatures always choose which properties in objects they see. For instance, in relationship with Munch a limestone gave an affordance of a matrix to express his emotional concepts, but the stone could have offered an affordance as a construction material and become a part of a floor or a wall. For a spider it could have given an affordance as a place to hide, and for museum visitors it can display an affordance as something to see. So, this term “affordance” suggests that a thing does not have an absolute status, but one that is mobile and based on relativism. Which affordance pulled from the object depends on who perceives it and what kind of context it is shown in. A museum object usually has various potential characters such as a ‘thing’, ‘material’, ‘artifact’, or a work of ‘art’ at the same time. The central point in an exhibition is thus how to choose an affordance from an object and how to exhibit it.
Charlotte Klonk pointed out that ‘in recent years there has been a tendency to turn away from the ideology-critical angle of museum studies literature and more attention is paid to the spellbinding qualities of what is collected.’ (Klonk 2009: 226) And ‘what is collected and what narratives are told with this’ (Klonk 2009: 11) is a ‘dominant strand of museum studies today.’ (Klonk 2009: 11) Namely, if we discuss this in relation to museums, we cannot avoid reflecting on what affordance we can pull from the object which was chosen for collection, and what context we can tell through the object in an exhibition. “Experiment in meaning-making” (Macdonald 2007: 3) should be taken there.

It was Mieke Bal who was recognized as the foremost authority on the analysis of the concept “narrative” in a museum. To discuss narrative, she uses the three essential concepts, “fabula”, “story” and “narrator”. (Bal 2006: 272) The “fabula” is a plot which is a series of events. And the “story” is a subjectivized plot, that is, a concept or a context and the “narrator” is a semiotic subject conveying messages. The structure of those three concepts correspond to elements at a theatre, a script, an interpretation of it and an actor. To discuss about how narratives are told through objects in an exhibition, it might be useful to borrow from the field of theater the concept of dramaturgy.

2.4. Dramaturgy by Peter Brook

If we think about a work of art by itself, we probably do not need to consider the viewpoint of the audience, because sometimes art is not necessarily narrative. For example, art can be only for the person who made it, for self-satisfaction, or it need not be targeted towards human beings. It could for instance be produced for nature. But if we tell a story through an object, an audience should exist, at least those who make a narrative should be conscious of the audience. If we think about how to show a certain object to an audience, the strategy of exhibition has some commonalities with dramaturgy. While keeping in mind how the spaces are organized and how the stones are presented, I will borrow from dramaturgic theory to analyze it. Dramaturgy is a practice-based theatrical discipline which discusses how to create a stage drama in relation to audience reception and engagement. In the field of the performing arts there is another similar term, scenography. While scenography mainly discusses aspects of visual design on a stage or in a space, dramaturgy primarily deals with directing. In another word, dramaturgy often focuses on how to show a play through a director’s interpretation.
Since a museum is a space for narratives and exhibits objects imbued with a curator’s interpretation, dramaturgy has points in common with thinking about making an exhibition.

To take an example, when “Hamlet” by Shakespeare is performed, by using the assumption that Hamlet’s father was actually killed by his uncle as the ghost of his father told him, the play can be used to express the agony and loneliness of a young man. But it can also show the effect of excessive suspicion when the interpretation is that Hamlet is paranoid. Even though the same script and the same actor is used, it can be possible to produce different plays. This is also applicable to an exhibition. An object has several possibilities in how it can be displayed and it depends on which interpretation is used and what context it is shown in.

‘A man walks across this empty space whilst someone else is watching him, and this is all that is needed for an act of theatre to be engaged.’ (Brook 2008: 11) This quote is the most famous sentence from the writings by Peter Brook, one of the greatest directors today. To hold up an act of theatre, only a man or woman who appears on stage, and an audience to watch him or her are needed. Therefore, if there is no audience, it cannot work. It is the same at a museum. If an object is shown and someone comes to see it, it can be called an exhibition. To go back to the beginning of the history of exhibition, it is known that the concept of exhibition started from the “Cabinets of curiosities” (also known as “Cabinets of Wonder” and “wonder-rooms”) of the 15th century. To take one example, the Ashmolean Museum of Art and Archeology at the University of Oxford already opened in 1683, where originally there was the Cabinet of curiosities based on the collections by Elias Ashmole.14 There, the most important factor was what was collected. The scarcity of the objects was attractive, and audiences came to see them because of their rarity and value. If we perform this method of exhibiting, museums should just care about collecting rare objects which are worth seeing. Since the objects themselves were interesting, and audiences were satisfied only by watching them, museums did not need to consider how to present them.

But today museums must consider how to insert a narrative into an exhibition, and how to add meaning and context, therefore the theory for theatre is also effective when thinking about exhibitions, because we in both cases need to consider the audience, and must put some narrative into the object/play. Narrative in an exhibition, and direction on the stage.

14 https://www.ashmolean.org/history-ashmolean
It was actually in 1968, half a century ago, that Peter Brook wrote his book “The empty space”, but his theory is still alive and useful, and is read as the bible among theater people. In 1911, director, Edward Gordon Craig published his book, “On the Art of the Theatre” (Craig 1911) and advocated needs for a director. ‘It has been accepted that the theatre is a unity and that all elements should try to blend - this has led to the emergence of the director’ (Brook 2008: 44), but ‘it has largely been a matter of external unity, a fairly external blending of styles’ (Brook 2008: 44). Therefore, Brook proposed a new role of the director, that is, ‘how the inner unity of a complex work can be expressed’ (Brook 2008: 44). This attitude towards direction is the same as the museum and curators seek for how to put narrative into an exhibition now, so that is why I would like to adopt his discussion here.

Brook discussed dividing the character of theater into four forms, “The Deadly Theatre”, “The Holy Theatre”, “The Rough Theatre” and “The Immediate Theatre”.

The Deadly Theatre is the theater which he thinks is bad. He pointed out the reasons which made theaters bad and unlively, and criticized the theaters which played in a traditional and ordinary way and did not insert any new ingenuity. Bal emphasized the importance of bringing a discursive perspective to the museum and described ‘if there is anything that would differentiate the “new” museology from the “old”, or plain museology, it is the idea that a museum is a discourse, and exhibition an utterance within that discourse.’ (Bal 1996: 214) So, the Deadly Theatre might be similar to a museum which is not a discourse. As some kind of audiences are satisfied with watching famous plays by famous playwrights, even though it is played in the direction of the difficult and boring way, some visitors are satisfied with a huge number of masterpieces of oil paintings at a famous museum even though it is actually extravagant, and just wears them out through repetition. There it does not matter how they are displayed and what the contexts behind them were. Often an elegant atmosphere is present and being there by itself gives status.

The Holy Theatre is “The Theatre of the Invisible-Made-Visible” (Brook 2008: 47). “Invisible” indicates various things, such as ideal thoughts, ritual concepts, and so on. This type of theater has commonality with the experiments at museums now. Exhibitions ‘are a fundamental feature of museums, in so far as these prove themselves to be excellent places for sensory perception, by presenting objects to view (that is, visualisation), monstration (the act of demonstrating proof), ostention (initially the holding up of sacred objects for adoration).

The visitor is in the presence of concrete elements which can be displayed for their own
importance (pictures, relics), or to evoke concepts or mental constructs (transubstantiation, exoticism). If museums can be defined as places of musealisation and visualisation, exhibitions then appear as the “explanatory visualization of absent facts through objects, and methods used to display these, used as signs”.’ (Desvallées 2010: 36) There it is attempted to express narratives as same as The Holy Theatre. It does not matter if it comes from art pieces, or through a director/curator, the feeling, meaning, and background which objects contain, or contexts which a curator create. The intention to show an invisible thing is the most important fact here.

In contrast to The Holy Theatre, The Rough Theatre consists elements of wildness and roughness like satire and the grotesque. In the meaning of inserting something invisible, this is the same as The Holy Theatre, but The Rough Theatre is closer to vulgar and unpretentious elements. It sometimes gives the audience a feeling of displeasure and gives them an opportunity to think. Bertolt Brecht is the most famous director and playwright for “Defamiliarization” (Verfremdungseffekt), and by inserting elements of defamiliarization, audiences can use their reason and deepen the understanding of objects. This element of The Rough Theatre is also shown at the exhibition in the educational context or in the promotion of dissemination.

As a conclusion, Brook suggests “The Immediate Theatre” which consists of both elements from The Holy Theatre and The Rough Theatre is what he aims for. Greenblatt examined two elements for the exhibition of works of art, “resonance” and “wonder”. (Greenblatt 1991) In his definition, the element “resonance” is ‘the power of the displayed object to reach out beyond its formal boundaries to a larger world, to evoke in the viewer the complex, dynamic cultural forces from which it has emerged and for which it may be taken by a viewer to stand.’ (Greenblatt 1991: 42) And the other “wonder” is ‘the power of the displayed object to stop the viewer in his and her tracks, to convey an arresting sense of uniqueness, to evoke an exalted attention.’ (Greenblatt 1991: 42) The element “resonance” has the same underlying idea with The Holy Theatre in the meaning of meeting something invisible and stimulating audiences, and the element “wonder” has the commonalities with The Rough Theatre in the context of catching visitors. And he concludes that ‘almost every exhibition worth viewing has elements of both’ (Greenblatt 1991: 54) like Brook suggested The Immediate Theatre which is ideal form for him should have elements from both The Holy
Theatre and The Rough Theatre. That is, the direction which museums pursues to is the same as one which Brook seeks at the theatre.

The Brook’s classification of those four theatre types is not based on their outward form and techniques, but relies on how and with what context they are shown. Therefore, I claim that the sorting can be applied to identify exhibitions.

In the following chapters, I will stand on a hypothesis that a matrix like a lithographic stone will change their roles by exhibition type, and will examine how Munch’s stones will change their status in different ways to be on display by borrowing the categories of Brook’s four types of theatre, and through the analysis I will address what kind of roles Munch’s lithographic stones could achieve.

“All the world’s a stage
And all the men and women merely players;
They have their exits and their entrances,
And one man in his time plays many parts ...”

This is very famous lines which appears in the play, “As You Like It”, by Shakespeare. This can be rephrased for museology as well.

“All the exhibition’s a stage
And all the musealia merely players;
They have their exits and their entrances,
And one musealia in its time plays many parts ...”
Chapter 3: Methodology and the Choice of Cases

My analysis is primarily based on three cases where Munch’s lithographic stones were displayed. These are 1) an unofficial display of his lithographic stones in a corridor near the employee entrance in the back of The Munch Museum, 2) the exhibition “With Eyes Closed – Gauguin and Munch” where Munch’s works were shown together with Gauguin’s from 17 February to 22 April 2018, and 3) an untitled project planned to last 10 years featuring Munch’s original works at Oslo Gardermoen Airport which opened on 27 April 2018. By conducting visual analysis, I will compare the three different ways of displaying them, and attempt to reveal what kind of potential the lithographic stones have. On the assumption that the roles and meanings of the stones will change by how and with what context they are displayed. To clearly show the differences I took the three displays of the stones which were used by the same artist, Munch, and exhibited by or in cooperation with the same museum, The Munch Museum, therefore it is possible for me to compare them.

For the first case with the stones in the glass cabinet in the section for employees at The Munch Museum, I did direct observation during my internship period at the graphical section of The Munch Museum which lasted from September to November 2017, and carried out informal interviews with curators and workers there.

As for the second case I chose an exhibition at The Munch Museum for which I participated in as a trainee. In this case the analysis is based on the personal experience of participating in the creation process of the exhibition during a period of three months, and an attendance of it as a visitor on 16 February 2018, one day before the official opening. I also conducted both formal and informal interviews with Dr. Ute Falck who was the main curator for the exhibition.

The third case is an untitled project at Oslo Gardermoen Airport which was realized in cooperation with the museum. On 27 November 2017 I did a formal interview with the curator, Gerd-Elise Mørland who oversaw the project. On 27 April 2018 I attended the opening ceremony and observed the display in person. I also listened to the speeches by people related to the project, and engaged in informal conversation with them.
Through these direct observations, I will focus on performing visual analysis on the three cases of displaying the stones. I will adopt the methodological framework presented by Stephanie Moser for conducting research on the knowledge-making capacity of museum displays. (Moser 2010) She categorized the items which should be considered when visual analysis is performed. I will especially pay attention to her entries on “Display Types” and “Exhibition Style”. To analyse display types, she suggests using not only original objects or artifacts, but also a multitude of other display elements. ‘All of those elements of an exhibition are an integral part of the messages that are both intentionally and unintentionally communicated.’ (Moser 2010: 28) For exhibition style analysis, we must consider what the type or style an exhibition is, and if it has been produced with a specific approach of learning style. And we also have to be aware of the binary oppositional elements in an exhibition, such as themed or idea-oriented exhibitions versus object-led exhibitions, didactic versus discovery focused exhibition. It is also necessary to consider if the exhibition is contextual, immersive, or atmospheric.

On the first day of my internship, I was overwhelmed by the lithographic stones which were displayed on one side of the corridor, illuminated by faint lights. As I had never seen a lithographic stone directly, I did not notice they were actually tools used for creating lithographic works. They kind of looked like good replicas of famous works for sale at a museum shop. So, if I were told that they were special reproductions of the paintings made for some anniversary, I would never have doubted it. They were quite beautiful, and if one does not have knowledge about making lithographs, they would give one a more sensory experience than an intellectual one at first glance. Munch himself reminisced in his later years that he printed too many graphic works, and approximately 18,200 pieces of graphic works are left. Of course, trial editions are included in them as well, but it is still certain that Munch was a prolific artist and therefore it could be said that each graphic work’s “aura” and authority is diluted. If it is so, it might be said that the stones have more authority and “aura” in the meaning of being unique compared to the many graphic works which were printed by the stones. By chance the exhibition in which I participated was focused on graphic works and it had already been decided that matrices, woodcuts and a lithographic stone, would be part of the exhibition before I became involved in the process. And while working there, also by coincidence, the project at the airport was planned to feature a lithographic stone. Recently it has been a tendency that aluminium plates have taken the place of lithographic stones because they are easier to handle. So, the way of making lithographs with a limestone seems to be
becoming a production method of the past. I was interested in the unique status of the lithographic stones – the uniqueness of its appearance, of its way of being preserved while being on display inside a glass cabinet at the museum, and of its usage at exhibitions.

Every summer since 2016, I have working for Japanese tourists as an authorized Oslo guide recognized by Oslo municipality. Usually they will visit the National Gallery to see Munch’s famous paintings such as “Scream”, “Madonna”, and “The Sick Child”. But every Monday when the National Gallery is closed, I bring them to The Munch Museum instead. On these occasions I sometimes receive complaints from some tourists. The Munch Museum does not have enough space to have both a permanent exhibition and a themed one. And since the museum has approximately his 28,000 artworks, the museum desires to show a wide range of works. Consequently, many of his popular works are often not on display at the museum, and then the tourists complain about why the museum doesn’t exhibit “valuable” works. They become disappointed that they are not able to see famous art works after coming all the way to Norway, and some grumbled that the museum had to make an effort to show “something of value deserving to be exhibited”. But what is “something of value deserving to be exhibited”?

Through this analysis, I would like to reveal what the meaning of showing matrices like a lithographic stone is.
Chapter 4: Empirical framework: Munch’s lithographic stones in exhibitions

4.1. Introduction

In the preceding chapters, I argued that Munch’s lithographic stones are originally the tools to print his graphic art on paper, but at the same time they appear to be like artworks themselves. And that is a unique point which appears exclusively in his lithographic stones in contrast to other various types of matrices. As I already mentioned in chapter two, it comes from Munch’s original way of creating his lithographic works, - he did not care about exactly transcribing the drafts on the stones, but he copied the mirrored images which were pictured in his head directly onto the stones. As Gerd Woll pointed out, some of the lithographs were drawn on paper first (Woll, 2001: 11) to confirm the mirrored images which Munch would picture in his head, but he mainly drew directly on the stone without first drawing on the paper from an early stage. That is, for him it did not matter if the finish would become recto or verso to show what he wanted to express through his graphic works. I actually did not know about his unique way of creating lithographic works when I saw his lithographic stones for the first time. However, I suggest that Munch’s stones have artistic elements and are more than just matrices, stones were drawn upon in Munch’s peculiar way, so could the stones be called just matrices? I also referred to that Munch tried to make frottages using the woodblock which showed the reversed image, that is, for him both unreversed and reversed images could be artworks which could express his intention. It is like when we look at ourselves in a mirror, we usually regard the reflection as our real figure. We regard it as the same as the figure in a photo even though the reflection is mirrored, but both figures are definitely ourselves. As we are not conscious that the image in a mirror is reversed left-to right when we look at ourselves in it, we are usually not aware whether a drawing in front of us is recto or verso. Even if it is mirrored, we would not notice it whether it is, or not. Of course, if the stone is for making music notes or a map, or if it includes some letters, then we can see it is a matrix immediately. But if it is for making graphics, the drawings on it often does not give an impression as a matrix. To put it another way, the stones has an affordance to be an artwork.
Hideo Kobayashi, a Japanese author, who established literary criticism as an independent art form in Japan, wrote an essay about reading (Kobayashi 1939) and emphasized the importance of reading the complete works of an author which would seem useless unless for study and researching. He recommended to read throughout all works by one author and what the person wrote including his letters and mundane writing to understand him/her. There, it does not matter if it is a masterpiece or a trashy work, because even in small and slight words there are some elements to feel the whole of the author. It could also be said towards seeing artworks. Not only by seeing the masterpieces, but also by seeing the other works, the whole figure of the artist and the world of his/her ideas and thoughts appears more clearly in front of us. All of what he/she wrote to grab an author, and all of what he/she drew including drafts to see a painter. In this context, it has consequence if lithographic stones are just tools or art. Because it is not so important to see a tool except for a research or educational occasion, as it is not necessary to see a pen or handwritten manuscripts for understanding an author.

I have argued that Munch’s stones have an affordance as an artwork. Nevertheless, the stones were originally used to create lithographic works on paper, and they on paper were left as completed works by Munch, so that means the stones clearly have a character as matrices as well. In most cases, a matrix is an object for research and storage in archives, not being displayed in exhibitions as an artwork, simply because it is usually a mirror image, and it is hard to see what is drawn on it in cases such as woodblocks and copper plates, and the artist also did not intend to make it public. It should be preserved with care in archives as a record for research, even though there is no plan to make use of it and there is no immediate need for it, since it has the possibility to become an important object in the future, to see the making process, to confirm history, to discover new aspects of the truth, to correct some wrong theories, and to deepen understanding about an artist or an artwork. It is important especially for researching to keep matrices which show the process of creating the work. Although it is not needed right now, but it should be archived as a record and be accessible anytime to reference.

However, regardless of Munch’s intention, unexpectedly the stones have a unique character as both matrices and artworks, and therefore have wider possibilities of being exhibited in various contexts. That is, Munch’s lithographic stones have an ambivalent character when it comes to what should be preserved in an archive as tools for creating
graphics and wait for the research and educational occasions, and as what deserves to be shown to viewing public to express his aesthetics. The ambivalence between being an art meriting being shown to the public and as a matrix on the assumption that they will not be on display. We don’t quite know what they are. If a matrix is collected in a cultural history museum, it will get a role as a tool which shows the technique for a certain product from a certain era. The information such as what the materials are, what country they are from and how they were used are put more emphasis on than who made it and how much value it has from the view point of esthetics. But when the lithographic stones were received by The Munch museum, their role of just being matrices evolved, and depending on how they are shown in an exhibition - which affordance were pulled from the stones by what environment - what they are will change.

What kind of roles can Munch’s lithographic stones play in front of the audience? What kind of affordances (potentials which are pulled by each environment) they have? In this chapter I will analyze the three cases where Munch’s stones were on display and discuss about the possibilities of how they can be shown to the public and consider about how the stones can help people which are not specialists or researchers for experiencing Munch. Experience of museum objects will be varied due to what kind of spaces they displayed in, with what kind of contexts they are, what kind of narratives they have, and what kind of relation they have with each other.

First, I will examine the status of the stones in The Munch museum where 171 works on 131 stone plates are placed in a glass cabinet. There are some stones where both sides were used. They are protected, but available for viewing. Munch left a note\(^{15}\) that mentioned some of his stones being destroyed, but all the stones he left in his atelier were given to Oslo city (to The Munch museum), and most of them are displayed in the cabinet now. (Some stones which he did not use are kept in a storage in a basement.) Secondly, I will discuss about the use of the stone in the exhibition, “With Eyes Closed – Gauguin and Munch” (“Med Lukkede Øyne – Gauguin og Munch”). It mainly dealt with the graphic works by the artists and the matrices which created the art which was displayed in the exhibition. Lastly, I will address a small exhibition at Oslo international airport where a lithographic stone from the Munch Museum collections is displayed featuring his painting. By examining and comparing these three ways to exhibit Munch’s stones, I would like to cast light on what kind of museum

\(^{15}\) Munch Museum inventory number MM T 2705
object the lithographic stones can be after their active use in creating the artworks is finished. What kind of roles can they perform in front of the audience?

4.2. Case Study 1: The Status of the Stones in The Munch Museum

The Munch museum opened in 1963 which was the anniversary year celebrating 100 years after Munch’s birth. Since Oslo municipality inherited all his works which were left in his testament, the museum has preserved not only his paintings and graphics, but also his photos, notes, letters, and matrices including lithographic stones. When it comes to the stones, the museum owns all stones which have been found until now. When the museum’s building was expanded in the 1990s, a glass cabinet for displaying his stones was installed in 1993 by decision of the director and curators, and since then most of the stones, 171 works on 131 stone plates, have been displayed in it. [figure 7] The order of the stones is not decided chronologically or by inventory, but placed together based on similarity of themes.

Before then, they were preserved in a basement room called «bomberommet» (“bomb shelter”) where there is a solid space suitable to protect a precious testament by Munch, and stacked standing against the wall, with styrofoam as an intermediate layer. Now the stones are on display in the cabinet which is located in the building for employees where the usual visitors cannot enter freely. It is in the area behind the exhibition’s area, so, they are protected and still hidden from the public. It is actually available for anyone to see the stones if they contact the museum, even though most visitors do not know about the existence of the cabinet and stones. Anyone can get permission to see them if you contact an employee at the museum or a security guard at the entrance of the building. But the museum hasn’t disseminated information about the cabinet to the public, so it is practically only accessible to specialists and researchers in the art field who know that the stones are there, the people and visitors involved with the museum. It is open to the public and easy to see, but it is also practically inaccessible.

Compared to the situation in the past when the collection was preserved in the «bomberommet», it has become much easier to look at the stones, - for those who already know about the display. It could happen that someone comes into the building for a business
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meeting or something and encounters the cabinet unexpectedly. But the person is perhaps connected to the museum and it is unlikely that the occasion of the general public meeting them will happen. According to Dr. Ute Falck, the stones are mainly used in the context of research and dissemination to show graphics techniques, and sometimes consulted in the context of checking authenticity of graphic works.

About the conservation of the stones, around 1993 two stones which were in bad condition were treated by a stone conservator from The Vigeland museum which collects the total body of works by sculptor Gustav Vigeland. But with the exception of these two stones, to the best of Dr. Falck knowledge, no other stones have been conserved till now. The stones are relatively durable and don’t require strict control of temperature and humidity unlike paper and woodblocks. So, it makes the stones easy to have on display. In addition, the lithographic stones are aesthetically pleasing compared to other matrices like metal plates, in short, the stones have an affordance as “decoration” on the wall. However, there is a lack of the eyes of the general public, and since the museum does not have a necessity to be conscious of them and create a narrative around them, the cabinet is nothing but a list of the stones. It is a display without a narrative. To put in another term, it is a beautiful storage. It is like a mausoleum for Munch’s works where it is accessible for anyone to visit and see their faces. They do not get any role to tell the narrative but are protected as beautiful matrices and on display as models in a fashion show. As I wrote above, the cabinet is located in an area of limited access without permission, but if it is placed next to the exhibition area and easy to drop by for visitors? The visitors will recognize them as tools for making lithographs. But since there is no context and narratives there, and it is a display as a list of the stones, the experience with the stones will be like “worship”. They experienced seeing the stones which the famous Norwegian painter used, and they were pretty. For them the act itself, seeing the original tool directly will become the most important matter.

In 2019 the museum will move to the new building named “Lambda” in Bjørvika. Now they are planning to have a room for the lithographic stones to show the visitors and show them as one of their permanent exhibitions. How will they be displayed? Chronologically? With lithographs on papers using by them? With paintings which the same
motives are drawn? Or in the same style as now and becoming a place to worship by tourists? The answers to these questions has still not been decided.\textsuperscript{17}

If the stones are displayed just because Munch used them and are exhibited without narratives, and the visitors see them without discourses, they will be able to admire the lime stones which Munch drew something on directly for the first time. But what will they get from the experience? They will be satisfied just because the stones were drawn on by the famous artist, Munch, and think it is something to see and which is authorized, and go home. Then, the exhibition will become a “The Deadly Theatre” as explained by Brook. (Brook 2008: 11-46) What kind of narratives can the museum put in them in order to avoid becoming that?

4.3. Case study 2: The exhibition at the Munch museum, “With Eyes Closed – Gauguin and Munch”

From 17 February to 22 April 2018, the exhibition, “With Eyes Closed – Gauguin and Munch” (Med Lukkede Øyne – Gauguin og Munch) was held at The Munch Museum. The title of this exhibition came from those two artists’ words towards the attitude for creation – ‘both Gauguin and Munch based their art on thoughts and emotions above all else. Gauguin is said to have remarked that he closed his eyes in order to see, while Munch famously put it like this: “I don’t paint what I see, but what I saw.” Both Gauguin and Munch encourage us to turn our gaze inwards and focus on the indelible impressions that art is able to make.’\textsuperscript{18} This exhibition mainly focused on showing the graphics by Munch and Paul Gauguin (1848–1903). Both lived in the same era, from the end of the 19th century to 20th century and were eager about using various print techniques. In addition to exhibiting Gauguin’s masterpieces including the Noa Noa suits, comparing the differences and showing the common points between Munch and Gauguin, the matrices which were used for making their works were also exhibited with panels which explained the techniques. [figure 8] While the wooden printing blocks were displayed together with the prints which were created by them, the stone plate for lithograph was blanc and unused even though it had also been owned by Munch. [figure 9]

\textsuperscript{17} Interview with Dr. Ute Falck, 24 April 2018
\textsuperscript{18} http://munchmuseet.no/en/exhibitions/med-lukkede-øyne-gauguin-og-munch
I worked on this exhibition as a trainee as a part of the curriculum of the master course for museum studies at University of Oslo, and got a desk in the graphic department under the instruction by Dr. Ute Falck who was the main curator for this exhibition. Therefore, I got a chance to observe the whole process to create this exhibition closely. While I assisted by collecting information for making a catalog and a timeline related this exhibition, asking permission for using reproductions in the catalog to the institutions where the copyrights of them belong to, and putting the information about the works which were showed in the exhibition into the museum’s database, I was allowed to attend many meetings with various departments such as for marketing, for advertisement, with designers for the exhibition space, and with the paper conservators.

In this exhibition, only one plane lithographic stone was displayed as an example of a matrix to make graphic art. The presentation of matrices was intended to make visitors visually understand how graphics were created. They were on display as a visual aid for the panels which explained various techniques to create graphic arts. An explanation with a visual object is much more effective than if something is only explained with words, especially if visitors are not familiar with the graphic arts. At the beginning, the stone was supposed to be the one which was used for making the lithograph “Stéphane Mallarmé” (1897) [figure 10] which hung on the wall of the exhibition. Mallarmé was an influential poet in all of Europe then, and it was created when Munch was in Paris which was Gauguin’s hometown. So, this graphic was essential for this exhibition to show the common atmosphere that both Munch and Gauguin experienced. In addition, in the lower part of the stone the poet’s name was written, so showing the mirrored letters on the stone could also have been suitable for that occasion, because at a glance the visitors could then see that the stone was used for printing before reading the explanation panel. But in the middle of the preparation process, the choice of the stone had to be changed, because it turned out that it had already been decided that the stone would be part of the other exhibition project at Oslo Airport planned from December 2017, for about one year. (Actually, the project was delayed and opened in the end of April, after this exhibition, because of technical problems at the airport.) On the backside of the stone featuring “Mallarmé”, “Separation II” (1896) was drawn as well, and the project needed
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the “Separation II” side. (I will discuss about this stone and the exhibition at the airport again later in this chapter.) It was just coincidence that the stone was needed by the two exhibitions around the same period, but anyway, the stone with the “Mallarmé” could not be used in the Munch and Gauguin exhibition.

However, the problem was solved in the end. In this exhibition, matrices’ role was to explain the various techniques of making prints, not only by texts, but also with view. So, the blanc stone was actually better than the “Mallarmé” one when the balance between all matrices there had been considered. In short, if the “Mallarmé” had been the one on display, then the stone would stick out too much compared to the other matrices which were wooden plates which visitor clearly could identify as matrices which was tools for creating the graphic works by their forms at a glance. By showing the limestone without something drawn on it, its character as a stone, as a material, is what first is felt by visitors. If some drawings had been on it, and the greater drawings were, the more attention the drawings would have drawn, and the visitors could not notice the stone was there “being showed as a matrix”. If there is a drawing on it, even though the drawing is mirrored, - which most visitors likely would not notice immediately if they are not familiar with a process for creating graphics-, the lithographic stone would have stood out among the other matrices in the exhibition. Towards the general public, an affordance as “art” or “something to appreciate” will be exercised. Dr. Falck told me that she was satisfied with not using the “Mallarmé” stone, in this exhibition the stone was given a role as “a tool for teaching”, and that is why it did not matter if the drawing on it was good, or not. If it had been used by Munch, any stones would have worked in this case, and to keep the role as “an object to tell how to make graphic art”, the blank stone was unexpectedly suitable.

In this exhibition the integral element for the stone was the historical value that came through its connection to Munch (it could be possible through Gauguin as well). But it should not exceed the role as a material. If the stone was the only matrix in this exhibition, or only stones were on display, it would have been suitable because then it would not be necessary to consider the balance between the different matrices. However, with the context as “a tool for helping visitors to understand the process to create graphics”, the stone should primarily have the role as “material” or a “tool”.

To enjoy art works, visitors are often immersed in the narratives which the artists and curators have created. A museum is usually a closed space separated from our ordinary life,
and the visitors will experience narratives in it. In this way, being in a museum is the same as being in theater. If museum visitors can experience narratives, they will get various messages which are often abstract concepts like a mystical element of women or depression of human beings, and “feel” something like sympathy or opposition. It is the same as audiences in a theatre. It was the German theatre practitioner and playwright, Bertolt Brecht that proposed the famous principle “Verfremdungseffekt” which is translated as "defamiliarization effect", "distancing effect", or "estragement effect", and he attempted various ways for 'stripping the event of its self-evident, familiar, obvious quality and creating a sense of astonishment and curiosity about them’ (Brecht 1964, 138). The matrices in this exhibition also had Brechtian "defamiliarization effect". Namely, by not only letting the visitors enjoy seeing graphic works on the surface, but also by getting them conscious of the process to create the works, the visitors were forced to use their head. They did not only enjoy the atmosphere from the art works in the museum, but also “a sense of astonishment and curiosity” created by matrices, so it helped to make them appreciate the works deeply. The matrices including the stone were the tools “Invisible- Made- Visible” (Brooks 2008, 49) which show the creating process that usually was hidden, and through the process the other invisible matter, -what and how the artists tried to express with them- appears. And in this context the stone needed to play the role as an object which shows the aspect as a tool for printing, and by holding a status as a matrix and a tool for education, the exhibition space has become “The Holy Theatre” that Brook conceptualized.

4.4. Case study 3: The Munch’s exhibition at Gardermoen

4.4.1. A stone in the mini exhibition at Oslo Gardermoen airport

27 April 2018 the opening ceremony for the exhibition was held at Oslo Gardermoen Airport. As I already referred to in the introduction, it is a 10-year project to show Munch’s original works and every one to two years the works will be rotated to other of his original pieces. The first works on display are the painting “Head by Head” (1905) and the lithographic stone “Separation II” (1896). This project was realized through cooperation between The Munch Museum, that had previously held the exhibition “Head by Head” which is also the theme of this project, and Avinor AS, a Norwegian state-owned limited company via the Norwegian Ministry of Transport and Communications that operates most of the
civilian airports in Norway. Approximately 27,458,000 passengers used the airport in 2017\textsuperscript{21}, and in the period from 2012 to 2017 the number of travelers increased by 23 percent, and it is expected that the coming and going of passengers will grow. It goes without saying that Oslo Gardermoen is the most important and largest airport in Norway, so this project will have great exposure towards various passengers from all over the world.

The works by Munch are showed inside a display box with possibility of viewing his art on both the front and back side, and information like Munch’s name, the title of the works, and that it is the original works are written on the glass which the works are seen through. [figure 11] On the other 2 sides of the box, there are panels that explain the works in detail. [figure 12] The box is located near gate D in the international section after the security check. City Council Leader Raymond Johansen expressed that Munch’s works are “a part of the DNA of Oslo” in his speech at the opening ceremony, showing how Munch’s works are regarded as something which deserve to represent Norway’s great artworks and Norwegian identity. According to Johansen, there are two main pillars of tourism in Norway, the beautiful nature and the art. And recently the demand of the latter has been steadily increasing, and therefore it is significant to show the original works of Munch, one of the greatest Norwegian artists, at one of the major gateways between Norway and the rest of the world for the promotion of the arts.

Examples of displaying something representative for a country or a city at an international airport can find in other countries as well. For example, at Narita International Airport in Japan, also known as Tokyo Narita Airport, there are two replicas of Haniwa, terracotta clay figures which were considered to be made for ritual use and buried with the dead as funerary objects during the kofun period (3\textsuperscript{rd} to 6\textsuperscript{th} century AD) in Japan. [figure 13 and 14] Haniwa figures were excavated in many regions in Japan, but those two figures in the airport, “Warrior” and “Woman with Double Necklace” are ones which were dug up from the Shibayama grave mound which is located just 10 km away from the airport. The warrior Haniwa is ‘one of two dignified warriors, placed at the midpoint of the toward half of the forward low of a “Haniwa funeral procession”. This is one of the central images of a Himezuka Haniwa funeral procession and is one of the largest Haniwa statues.’\textsuperscript{22} And the
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woman Haniwa characterized by the double necklace is one of the rare cases of a female figure haniwa which could be fully restored.\textsuperscript{23}

The reason why replicas of those Haniwas were chosen to be shown is probably that their original figures are ‘designated as a Tangible Cultural Asset of Chiba Prefecture during 1971\textsuperscript{24}, and in 1987 they ‘had also been displayed at Galeries Nationales du Granpalaisin Paris, France and greatly admired as a world treasure.’\textsuperscript{25} That is, those images are regarded as objects which are able to represent Japanese cultural history, especially the culture of the city near the airport, and therefore the replicas are shown at the international airport with the purpose of showing typical Japanese ancient culture to visitors from all the world. However, even though it is obvious that they are representing part of Japanese culture, what is on display are replicas, not the originals. That is why they are not regarded as something which requires high security and are standing protected only by ropes and are placed in the access corridor for the train station in the underground floor of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} terminal. It might be because Haniwa is a cultural historical artefact that tells about cultural life from an ancient era and are not regarded as art. It is more important for the artefacts to explain about a cultural background and historical matters such as what kind of concept and idea made them, what materials they used, and their unique shapes rather than to show something original which Benjamin said contains “aura”. If it is a work of art, then to see the original and to feel its “aura” might be essential, but if it is not, then replicas can also work well, especially in the viewpoint of dissemination, because it is easier to display them if they do not need high security. The original cannot be made again and on that point, there is an enormous value in it. But in the situation where replicas can be used, since they can be made again, even though it will still be expensive to reproduce them, the value of being the one and only disappears in the replicas and that is why the possibilities of usage can be more casual and broader. But how about the lithographic stone displayed at Oslo airport then? Why should it be the original stone? Is not the stone a “tool” to create graphic? What is the meaning of showing the original?

As I mentioned above, the replicas of clay figures are placed on an underground floor. Since the departure gate is on the 3\textsuperscript{rd} floor and the arrival is on the 2\textsuperscript{nd} floor, only those who
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use the train will pass the figures, and the passengers using car or buss will not see them. Most of them probably do not know about the display of Haniwas, and even if they did already know, I doubt whether many would go down all the way to the underground floor only to see the statues. In addition, I guess many of the passengers who go by the statues do not have enough time to stop to look at them. Most of them are probably a bit in hurry because of their situations. Some have to pass the security check two hours before taking the airplane, or their train will go soon, or the airplane of acquaintances which they will meet at the arrival gate has already landed. Most of the people passing by are just giving a glance towards the figures.

On this point, the display at Oslo airport has succeeded in giving the passengers opportunity to see the display even though only passengers who will take an international flight have a chance to see and those who take a domestic flight and those who do not take an airplane are not allowed to. The passengers who will take an international flight are expected to be at the airport at least two hours before their departures, and most of them usually have extra time. To kill the time, some stroll through the duty-free shops or use a lounge or a restaurant, but stopping to see the two objects is an additional stress-free choice for them to spend time. It is effective strategic choice for disseminating Munch’s work and a representation of Oslo and Norway.

Before the opening of the project on on 27 November 2017 I carried out an interview with the curator at The Munch Museum, Gerd-Elise Mørland, who had responsibility for the project. About the reason why the airport was chosen as a place to show Munch’s works, she explained that the purpose of this project was to disseminate his works not only to art-lovers and art related people, but also to those who are not interested in art and Munch. A space in the airport seems therefore to be one of the perfect places to disseminate his works to people of varied lifestyles and cultural background from all over the world. Needless to say, Edvard Munch is one of the greatest artists who can represent Norway, and his degree of familiarity and popularity among people is already very high. But as a further dissemination, to induce a deeper understanding of his works and to promote the charms of them, it is still necessary to find new potential areas where the museum can introduce Munch to those who have not cared about art and him, and in this context the airport is a suitable space to meet various kinds of new audiences.
It is the very first time to show his lithographic stone outside the context of being a tool for making graphics as far as Mørland knows. Those two works at the airport are related to the exhibition, “Head by Head- Cronqvist/ Bjørlo/ Munch” which was held between 28 October 2017 and 28 January 2018 at The Munch Museum. The opening was supposed to be held in December 2017 for the first phase of the airport project and therefore works which have the same concepts as the exhibition at the museum were chosen. That means the display at the airport are synchronized with the museum and has a role of representing the exhibition at the museum as well. It has a possibility to warp a part of the narratives from the museum to the airport. For the works at the airport, the painting “Head by Head” (1905) and the lithographic stone “Separation II” (1896) were chosen. Both depict two heads which have the conflicting vectors which are eager to separate and to connect each other. While the narrative of the exhibition at the museum was to ‘study and illuminate the loneliness, the fragility and the sorrow within human existence’26, and showed the concept with the works by Munch and the other two modern artists, for the airport two Munch pieces featuring two heads were chosen as ones which could describe the theme clearly and exactly, and most suitable to the title of the exhibition “Head by Head”. Because of the limited space to hang works - only two works can fit in the case at the same time, they should be ones which can directly express that ‘the imbalance in the expressions of the two heads says much about the complex relationship between human beings and depicts how difficult it can be to achieve mutual trust, security and affinity’.27 Nevertheless, why was the lithographic stone chosen as one of the works on display instead of the other works with two heads? For instance, it could be fine to display a graphic work which was made by this stone. Is the stone considered as more valuable than the works on paper?

The noteworthy characters of the display at the airport are two points, showing the original works and showing a stone, which was originally a tool to create artworks. In short, to show the original works by Munch will represent the originality of Oslo. That will perhaps become a topic of conversation by tourists and make a big impact on them. Even those who are not usually interested in art, will come to see when the works are originals and created by the famous artist, and they may get a chance to feel an “aura” like pilgrims. It will not happen if the works are replicas, because they will be appreciated less. And displaying the stone is also characteristic. Mørland told in the interview that the project might become the first time
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to show his stones as art. At least in Norway she had not heard of this kind of display of the stones so far even though they are visually beautiful. So, it was definitely rare and would become an interesting event. The museum thought it was wasteful if the stones were just kept preserved away from the public, so they planned to throw the spot light on a part of Munch’s enormous works which have not seen the light of day. She emphasized that the stones were so charming that they deserve to be seen. Since they have not been showed as artworks, this project would become a new experiment in presenting a new side of the attraction in his works. To put it another way, the stone is exhibited as art in this project. The reason why that stone was chosen is that the drawing on it suited the theme of the exhibition at the museum as I mentioned above, and stones are not so fragile compared to the graphic works on paper, and it might be also because it is heavy and difficult to be stolen physically. But the most important reason is that the stone are regarded as an object which is worth being shown as art. That is, the museum considered the stones as art. As the evidence of the attitude to the stone, on the glass of the display box in front of the stone, it is written “An original artwork presented by The Munch Museum, Oslo” with Munch’s name and the title. The display box features two panels on the side which explain about the two works, but how many people will read it thoroughly? If they do not, they might not notice the stone was originally a tool called a lithographic stone. Even if they read, but if they do not have the knowledge about how to make a lithograph, they will not notice that it was a tool. Most of them will enjoy Munch’s “drawings” on the limestone, and the stone achieves a new role as an object which is supposed to be seen as “art”.

4.4.2. Differences from an exhibition in a museum

In this exhibition at the airport, the lithographic stone is regarded as art in the same way as a painting is. It is also synchronized with the exhibition at the museum, that is, as an artwork the stone tells the narratives which were told in the exhibition. It has gotten a role to tell the narratives as an art from the same position as the works in the museum. Then, what is the meaning of telling the narratives at the airport outside of the museum? An airport is not build for the purpose of viewing paintings and other art objects. In this section, I will focus on the differences between the spaces, the airport and the museum, and compare different effects between them. And then I will consider about what the meaning of showing the stone at the airport is.
Needless to say, a museum exists for exhibiting museum objects to visitors. To concentrate on experiencing the objects, the space is usually closed and separated from our daily life. It is the same as a theatre, and to create discourses with visitors, museums provide a closed world with objects. An airport could also be an unusual space for many people. It may be a special place for many passengers who do not take an airplane on a frequent basis. But the extraordinary is related to traveling, and the space is much more open. Many of passengers are in an unusual space, but there is no scenery to enter another world. When it comes to a museum or a theatre, people enter a building where they know what they will see, and go to an exhibition room or their seats through an entrance hall where they can prepare themselves for coming into the world which is separated from their usual life. However, for a display at an airport the object will be encountered in the space that exists for the purpose of taking an airplane. Considering the meaning of the extraordinary, that is, a space that is separated from everyday life, an airport shares some underlying characters with a museum and a theatre. But its extraordinary elements come as an extension of daily life, and it is not a space which is closed and prepares one for seeing certain things. A space at an airport is totally open, and various things unrelated to a display like shops, restaurants, boarding gates and benches for waiting are seen near it, and many passengers go by. It is not created for making audiences devote themselves to seeing objects. While an experience in a museum is subjective and it occurs in a space where a visitor can be absorbed in discourse with objects, one at an airport leans to being objective. Not only because of visual facts, but also the space is filled with various sounds which are not related to the objects, such as announcements for flights, conversations from a café, noises from baggage, and such elements will create a distance between an object and an audience. And the distance will generate the “distancing effect” conceptualized by Brecht. To show an object which it is usually displayed in a silent space made for exhibiting, in a space where it usually is not, it takes the audience from a passive viewing to a positive one. It gives a chance for the audience to wonder why it is here, what the purpose it is, why it was chosen to be exhibited here, and to see the object deeply. And in this project, the lithographic stone itself has the “distancing effect”. The “distancing effect” in this project is different in nature from the one in the Gauguin exhibition. It has been rare for a lithographic stone to be exhibited at a museum, so viewing a stone has the possibility to stop passengers and make them wonder what it is. It will be a trigger to see it and think.
In the interview with Mørland, she mentioned that the airport project will provide a possibility to expose Munch to those who are not inclined to visit a museum to see his works, such as a businessman who does not have the time to visit when coming to Oslo. While tourists can visit a museum as a destination as part of their trip schedule and locals can come casually, some do not have inclination to easily visit a museum. To disseminate Munch to those who do not have the chance to see his works, and to let them know about Munch and his works, the display at the airport is useful. While visitors at a museum come all the way to an exhibition by their own wish and seeing objects is their main purpose, the purpose of the passengers at an airport is not seeing a display. It goes without saying that their main purpose is taking an airplane. But therefore, it might sound paradoxical that it will become a good chance to lead those who are not interested in art and stay away from a museum to encounter objects. Because the exhibition space is open in contrast to a room at a museum, and it is easier to bring people to seeing objects physically. If those who are not used to going to a museum are asked to visit an exhibition, then some will be so much on their guard and assume the experience will be boring. But if it is just a circumstantial encounter with an abject while they are killing time before taking a flight, they will not take a cautious stance and will find a new relationship with museum objects. For the purpose to attract such people who are unfamiliar with museums, an open space is more effective that a room for an exhibition. It should be an open space where anyone can “stop” to see, not a closed space which has to be “entered”.

So, an open space to exhibit is strategic in the context of dissemination. And to attract a large number of unspecified individuals, it is important that objects on display have some elements which can attract a varied section of the general public, such as “easy to understand”, “beautiful visually”, and “famous”. When it comes to museum lovers, they will not be satisfied only with famous and popular pieces, and may be willing to meet something unknown to them. But to catch the general public, objects have to be viewed as worth seeing. There are demands towards the objects to have some attractive elements in them like “well-known”, “looks expensive”, or “rare to see”. Does the Munch’s lithographic stone have these kinds of elements?

Those who are familiar with visiting museums come to an exhibition often knowing what will meet them there. Therefore, they will be able to assume what kind of narratives will be told before they meet objects. Contrary to that, most of the passengers at the airport likely
only encounter works of art occasionally. Could the lithographic stone express a narrative effectively to them?

When a passenger head to gate D, they see the lithographic stone first. Its composition is a mirrored version of his famous painting “Separation” (1896) [figure 15]. While in the painting a man is positioned to the left and a woman and a seashore is drawn to the right, and both figures have complete bodies, in the stone they are just showed with their upper bodies and the positions have been switched. The painting is one of his most famous works and many have probably seen it somewhere. In addition, Munch created the paintings “Melancoly” [figure 16] using the same composition several times since 1891 and in those paintings a man appears to the right and a seashore is to the left. So due to those 2 images, some will fell that they have already seen the work on the stone somewhere else. But it is not a painting or graphics either, but a white stone. Here the material itself as stone will attract the interest of many passengers. If they are familiar to art, then they will notice it is a matrix to create a lithograph. But for most of the general public, the stone will give an impression of being a drawing which was drawn on the stone for some purpose. Since the passengers encounter the stone first, before the painting, and at first glance they get only information about the name of the artist and the title, and that it is an original “artwork” explained by the letters written on the glass, so probably most of them will regard the stone as something which is created as a work of art. The lithographic stone is a limestone, so without information or prior knowledge, it possibly looks similar to a fragment of a decorative wall from the ruins of Rome or Greece.

By giving a new role as a work of art to the matrix, which was originally a tool to create graphic works, it has succeeded in telling the context behind the artwork and the narratives which were told at the museum. In this way, by pulling forth and making visible concepts which are invisible, like human’s inner loneliness, the two works offers an experience as in “The Holy Theatre”. At the same time, in this project there is a purpose to promote dissemination towards the general public and popularize it, so it also has a character as “The Rough Theatre” as well. In the conclusion of the theory by Brook, (Brook 2008: 110-157) he defined “The Immediate Theatre” which has elements of both “The Holy Theatre” and “The Rough Theatre” as a shape that his theater will aim for. In this exhibition the stone is defined as an artwork, transformed from a tool to an art, and got a role to tell narratives about the concepts and ideas, renouncing the role of explaining a creation process, and by that
the stone has got value by representing Munch to all the world. At the same time, through the unique character of its material limestone, it gained the possibility to attract the curiosity of the general public. By being seen from a new viewpoint, the stone has achieved a new “affordance” as an artwork, and makes a new relationship with the audience, and shows new possibilities for a matrix in an exhibition. That is, this airport exhibition has both elements “The Holy Theatre” by telling narratives and making invisible concepts visible using two works of art, and “The Rough Theatre” by being conscious of the discourse with the general public through promoting dissemination, so the display is showed in the way of “The Immediate Theatre”, - it can be rephrase “The Holy Exhibition”, “The Rough Exhibition” and “The Immediate Exhibition” here-. And what makes this display “The immediate Exhibition” is the discovery of an affordance of the lithographic stone as artwork.
Chapter 5: Discussion; what do the matrices do in front of the visitors?

In chapter four I investigated three types of display, and here I define what kind of status the stones acquire.

1) Musealia

2) Rough object in Holy exhibition

3) Holy object in Rough exhibition

As for case one, the display is in theory accessible for everyone, however it is practically inaccessible and the museum has not disseminated information about it to the public. Therefore, it is essentially only for researchers and museum employees, and because of this, with the absence of dissemination and a lack of narrative in the display (they are just hung together in groups of similar themes), their status remains as “musealia” which are decoratively placed in a space for preservation. In short, they are beautiful research objects. They are not piled up in a storage, but their place of preservation shows their possibilities to be exhibited to the public. In this current form they would satisfy those who would come to see them just because they were used by the famous painter Edvard Munch. And because of it this display if accessible to the public would possess the character as “The Deadly Theater”, but so far, they are musealia waiting for a chance to appear in front of a general audience.

Here I would like to explain the elements of the theatrical classifications by Brook. Each element which the categories of theatre have can be applied both to objects and narratives in an exhibition. That is, for instance, an object can be a Holy object, and an exhibition can also be Holy exhibition, and they often have different elements from each other. And to define the elements in short, “Holy” means containing a nature of the “Invisible-Made-Visible”, and “Rough” is an orientation leaning towards the general public. In the following sections, I will see concretely which elements the lithographic stones had.
5.1. Discussing the significance of the stones as part of a display

For case two, I view the lithographic stone as a “rough” object exhibited in a “holy” exhibition. I will discuss why the stone was “rough” in the context of an exhibition which showed a conservation process. Is showing matrices like lithographic stones such as in case two the same as showing conservation? When showing the process of conservation and tools used for that which has usually been hidden from visitors, the viewers can experience the objects closer and in a new context, and feel the warmth of human beings—that is of the conservators—and they can also feel the actual sense of conservation. Satisfying the visitor’s curiosity of how the conservation is performed. Viewing such exhibitions is not learning or studying how to perform conservation, i.e. it is not teaching the skills, but “showing” how it is done. In other words, by giving a vicarious experience of the conservation process and knowledge of the hidden process, it is possible to renew something in the eyes of audiences. It has an educational effect, and by giving the viewers some distance in appreciating the objects, it can deepen their understanding and way of appreciating the works.

Both showing conservation processes and matrices make audiences notice the work lying behind the objects, and leads them to use their head, and stops the audience just looking through objects and being satisfied without thinking. In this case, the Brechtian Verfremdungseffect ("distancing effect") is evoked.

I will furthermore contrast it to a backstage tour at a theatre or an opera house. Since it can be said that both creating and conservation processes are performed in place which can be said to be the backstage, is a backstage tour the same as an exhibition which shows matrices? The answer is no, because during a backstage tour, what is be shown and explained are about stage sets which corresponds to display cases and lights at a museum, and its architecture, and are not about an interpretation of a program (corresponding to narratives in a museum) and the actors who express the interpretation (corresponding to objects in a museum). So, a backstage tour is rather “laying their cards on the table” like a magician. And mostly it will not give participants an occasion to be made to think either.

In case two a lithographic stone got a role that came closer to the general public who may not have a specialized knowledge about the techniques for making graphic works, and by that the stone got an element as “rough”. In this case, the other matrices, the woodcuts also got the same status as “rough” objects. And since the matrices gave visitors concrete images
of the creation processes, that is, by making the invisible visible, the exhibition became a “Holy” one. Visitors sees objects only through their own experiences. So, if they have witnessed or experienced the creation process, their understanding about works will be deeper. To show the creation process is significant in encouraging the visitors in getting ‘new eyes’. And since the exhibition includes both the elements “holy” and “rough”, it achieved a status as an “immediate” exhibition.

5.2. Discussing the significance of the stones from an art perspective

As for case three, I conclude that the lithographic stone is “Holy”, and the project at the airport is “Rough”. Since the drawing on the lithographic stone is the strokes made by Munch, and because of his attitude towards creating lithography, - he seemed not to care if the image was mirrored or not, and often drew directly on the stone without first making a draft on a paper-, it can be said the stone has an “aura” similar to his paintings. As an example, while the letters by professional calligrapher could become artworks (ex. Many private letters written by Chinese famous calligraphers are treated as works of art in museums and has become examples for learning calligraphy.), letters written by Munch are not regarded as works of art. They are materials for researching, but are not regarded as art, because calligraphy was not his field. But when it comes to drawing, it is his profession. So, they deserve to be exhibited as artistic objects. In addition, the museum presented the stone as “artwork”, so it was defined as art by the museum for the project. While performing the role of artwork, it expressed the concept of human emotion in the same context as in the exhibition at the museum. In the project, its role as artwork was emphasized rather than an educational role telling about the creation process of lithography, and made invisible feelings visible on the surface of the stones as a two-dimensional existence. In this way the stone has become a “holy” object. And it has been displayed in the very open space where many international travellers go by, and the location of the display is closer to the public than in an exhibition room in a museum. In this context, the project got a “rough” element. So, this project also became an “immediate” display.
Chapter 6: Conclusion

What is the definition of Munch’s lithographic stones? Through the three case studies, I witnessed that the status of his stones moved between matrices, musealia, objects, and artworks. So, here, I conclude that the originality of Munch’s lithographic stones lies in its character of mobility – the stone are a floating existence between the making process and the aesthetic world, evolving their status towards being artworks, and being between “holy” and “rough”. But does this originality apply to other matrices?

The answer is no, because the other types of matrices are difficult to see as works of art. They can be “art” in an exhibition of curation, but works of art has to be an existence which can express the creator’s intentions, and to express that it is important that it is visible. Lithography using stones is a special technique that shows the artist’s strokes, and the strokes on the stones are easy to see compared to other matrices such as woodblock or zinc plate, so in this sense, the stones have an opportunity to show their affordance as artworks. Not only Munch’s stones, but also lithographic stones which were used for printing graphic art by other artists, like by Toulouse-Lautrec, have a potential to be works of art.

However, I will point out one other uniqueness of Munch’s lithographic stones. According to Benjamin, the original artwork exists just here and now. (Benjamin 2011: 114-119) So, it means the original work is strongly connected to its existence, and therefore it is often regarded that there is importance in seeing it directly. That is, the original is an object for worship whilst a reproduction undertakes the role of “being on display”. In other words, a reproduction possesses the value of being able to be shown more widely whilst losing the value as an object for worship.

Many of Munch’s graphic works were printed more than once for economic reasons and for effective dissemination. (Woll 2001: 11-23) He assumed that graphics were easier to sell than paintings because the former were much cheaper than the latter. He actually printed so much that he said, ‘I only find that I have printed too much’. (Woll 2001: 22) In contrast to the status of the prints, a lithographic stone as a matrix which has created reproductions and still has a potential to reproduce (whether it will be used for that, or not-) is one of a kind. That is, his lithographic stones have a character as being “the original”, and by adding the essence of art works through displaying them and by inserting a narrative, an affordance as an object to be appreciated like in the case of the lithographic stone at the airport was brought
out from it, and it has gotten back “aura”. When matrices get other roles than being objects in archives, they get the possibility to get back “aura” which they lost once. And this “aura” contributes to make Munch’s lithographic stones art.
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