Chapter 1

Researching and Writing on Contemporary Art and Artists

Christopher Wiley and Ian Pace

Researching and writing on contemporary art and artists take many forms: the scholar meticulously developing a journal article, book chapter or research monograph over many months or years; the journalist penning a review or opinion-piece, often working to a strict deadline; the writer affiliated with a specific arts institution or event, preparing a programme note, theatre booklet or exhibition handbook; the aficionado typing a personal blog entry, producing a fanzine or even just documenting a spontaneous insight via social media. In respect of art created, and artists who have lived, close to the present time, all such writers—and many more besides—may have developed a close relationship with their subject matter, with which they might have a myriad range of wider personal connections, some of which may affect their access to documents, interviews and other sources for their research. How can such authors engage with the art and the artist, yet maintain a respectable level of critical distance when researching and writing about them and their work?

This volume has its origins in recurrent dialogues between the two editors and others concerning the need for rigorous critical thinking about the very nature of researching and writing about contemporary artists and their output, as manifested in different types of discourse. In a multi-disciplinary scholarly field, this topic is very far from being exhausted, though some piecemeal aspects have, of course, received significant previous coverage in the literature. Several general volumes on writing about art consist primarily of student-facing guidance rather than scholarly critique of real-life practices (for example, Krüger 2008; Herbert 2012; Williams 2014; Barnett

2015), but there are a number of edited anthologies in which biographers reflect more generally upon their experiences in writing the lives of their subjects, such as Jeffrey Meyers's *The Craft of Literary Biography* (1985) and John Batchelor's *The Art of Literary Biography* (1995), some of whose contributors happen to have been writing on modern figures and/or those with whom the authors had personal connections. A range of other volumes (for example, Herndon and McLeod 1979; Hatcher 1985; Morphy and Perkins 2006) consider the subject from an anthropological perspective, frequently downplaying both art and artists in favour of wider cultural questions, but sometimes with material relevant to the issues of this volume (see Ian Pace's chapters for more on this subject). Journals such as *Performance Research* have carried articles documenting areas such as artistic practices and processes in relation to individual case studies of, as distinct from self-reflexively contemplating acts of researching and writing on, contemporary art and/or artists; similar engagement can be found in leading book-length studies of practice as research (for example, Allegue, Jones, Kershaw and Piccini 2009; Smith and Dean 2009; Freeman 2010; Nelson 2013). Many trade periodicals offer examples of writing on contemporary art, as distinct from the critical modes of writing under scrutiny in the current volume, which therefore raise a different set of, nonetheless pertinent, questions.

This collection, conversely, is characterised by two distinctive features. First, the emphasis is placed on specifically on contemporary artists and their outputs, and the issues that are uniquely raised by researching and writing about living or recently deceased figures, as distinct from those whose lives have taken place further from the present. Second, it brings together discourse on personages across the disciplines of music, literature, dance, theatre, the visual arts and more, in order to give sharper focus to issues shared across the arts as well offering opportunities for dialogue

between different artistic fields (involving differing numbers of individuals in the creative process, some very much focused on a single creator, others in which a range of people contribute) on the theory and practice of research. In these respects, the anthology aims to fill a valuable gap in scholarship by subjecting the theory and practice of writing about contemporary art and artists across the disciplines to sustained critical scrutiny from a range of different artistic viewpoints, discussing issues of writing about recent developments in the arts in order to raise the visibility of this area of scholarly enquiry.

The scope of the volume concerns figures active in the contemporary arts, understood to incorporate those living or recently deceased artists who have produced innovative, distinctive or otherwise leading work within the last c. 30 years. Coverage ranges from performers and performance artists, through dancers and choreographers, to composers, visual artists, literary authors and more, in addition to artists writing about their own creative practices and corresponding output, and those with whom individual authors have worked. It focuses upon the act of writing and the strategies, ideologies and assumptions contained therein, as well as the boundaries of what constitutes ‘writing’ about contemporary artists in its multifarious forms, involving iconoclastic and experimental approaches to such writing alongside more conventional representations. It is primarily concerned with critical modes of writing, as distinct from fan-based writing or descriptive writing, insofar as these discourses can be separated at the current time (on which point, see Wiley 2020, and Pace’s chapters in this volume), and it looks reflexively at such writing in the hope of providing more rigorous and ethically sound foundations for future practices of this type. Matters of ethics in relation to researching and writing on contemporary artists

are to be found throughout the collection, for example, in Lorraine York's chapter on scandal.

The advent of practice as research in the arts disciplines (various key texts about which are cited above) is a secondary concern of the volume, since many of the questions raised by researching and writing on other contemporary artists also relate to writing about oneself and one's own practice. This became a particularly cutting-edge issue ever since greater recognition in the academic realm of practice as research, beginning in Finland in the 1980s and 1990s and Australia in 1987, followed by the USA in the 1990s and elsewhere later in that decade, emerging in the UK around 1997 (see Kershaw 2009, 106; Cook 2015; Pace 2015b). This phenomenon engendered a range of debates about when and how exactly practice can be said to embody research, as have occupied many academics in the UK who are required to submit outputs to the Research Assessment Exercise (RAE), subsequently the Research Excellence Framework (REF), such that they are forced to justify their work in this respect. Some maintain that certain forms of creative practice can only become research when accompanied by *writing* (see, for example, Nelson 2013, 71–3; Vaes 2015); others believe that that the research can be embodied within the creative practice itself, a key issue in the debates following from John Croft's article (2015a), responses by Ian Pace (2015a) and Camden Reeves (2015), and a further contribution from Croft (2015b), in the journal *Tempo*, on music composition and performance. Others have grappled with the meaning of quality in such outputs (for example, Schippers 2007; Biggs and Karlsson 2011). Our volume incorporates contributions from artists as well as incorporating different forms of art—a visual essay and a music composition—in later sections alongside more conventional modes of scholarly enquiry, while Christopher Leedham and Martin Scheuregger's chapter on the written

component of music composition PhD degrees addresses the matter directly. It therefore responds to timely questions such as the validity of creative practice as research and its parity with more traditional humanities-oriented output.

In the wake of various revelations relating to artists' private lives and activities, some alleged to have committed sexual harassment and assault, and the subsequent #MeToo movement which began in Autumn 2017 following allegations against film producer Harvey Weinstein, new complications have arisen concerning how those writing about such artists respond to such knowledge. In Part I of the volume, Lorraine York offers a particular perspective on the vexed question of how to continue to undertake academic study of contemporary artists at a time during which they have been embroiled in disciplinary scandal, with reference to three inter-related controversies of Canadian literary celebrity that developed in 2016–17. First, a case involving allegations of sexual harassment at the University of British Columbia associated with the writer Steven Galloway, and articulated through a series of online statements including the 'UBC Accountable' letter (signed by household names including Margaret Atwood) and a subsequent counter-letter (though the case was eventually dismissed and UBC forced to pay damages to Galloway (Eagland 2018)). Second, the criticism on social media and other platforms faced by Joseph Boyden, author of the seminal UBC Accountable letter, disputing his claims of Indigenous identity and heritage. Third, an editorial written by Hal Niedzviecki in which he endorsed the appropriation of the stories of Indigenous communities by non-Indigenous writers in the name of diversity, including a suggestion for an 'Appropriation Prize' that, although tongue-in-cheek, nonetheless received high-profile support via Twitter. Drawing on the field of celebrity studies as well as scholarship on scandal itself, York argues that while it has often been expected that

scandal violates prevailing morals, the above controversies represent instances in which hegemonic institutions were among the sources of scandal, yielding an enhanced understanding in which scandal is no longer associated solely with the agency of an individual who is seen to be transgressive. She further suggests that scandal should be understood as lasting rather than fleeting, and that rather than merely excising scandalous artists from the institutions that once upheld them, we should knowingly question their past and present place within them mindful of scandal's persistent nature, in order to appreciate the full extent of the artists in a given field whom that scandal affects.

Hywel Dix's chapter engages with issues pertaining to the reception of contemporary writers, in particular those whose later work is negatively affected by comparison with their earlier successes upon which their reputation is primarily founded. Drawing parallels with career guidance counselling and using career construction theory as a springboard for discussion, Dix theorises the range of different career trajectories that may be experienced by authors depending on the level of critical acclaim they experience over time: some enjoy initial or sustained success in their careers, while others attain success more gradually or experience a mid-career peak or trough. Noting a common trajectory of decline in an artist's later output, Dix argues that the late-stage career—which may, in reality, fall at different stages of life for different authors depending on their unique career trajectory—should itself be scrutinised as a distinct category. He suggests that writers may become more self-reflective and self-aware about their practice in their later output, even when their earlier work has attained significant success, as exemplified by such phenomena as retrospective commentary on one's own work, the revisiting of previously employed

literary techniques, as well as specific modes of fictionalised criticism and autobiography.

The subject of Christopher Leedham and Martin Scheuregger's chapter is the written component that accompanies the musical portfolio of many composition PhD degrees in the UK, which finds a parallel in current practices with respect to the Research Excellence Framework for which submitting composers are expected to contextualise their work through a 300-word narrative statement (Pace 2015b). By means of an anonymous online survey of current and former UK PhD students, the authors uncover a range of different opinions concerning the value of this written component to the candidates' overall development as composers. While the survey yielded much evidence of a shared understanding amongst the students of the need for such a written element, there was less agreement as to whether this component should comprise a technical commentary, a reflective account or a conceptual and aesthetic context for the portfolio. Other key findings include that this writing was typically undertaken only in the latter stages of the PhD (thereby precluding contemporaneous reflection on the totality of the compositional process), and that the supervisor was the single biggest influence. Ultimately, Leedham and Scheuregger ask whether the purpose of the doctoral degree is one of training in composition or research through composition, and argue for a common understanding of the purpose of the written component to be adopted across the discipline, with defined approaches to writing.

In a two-part study, Ian Pace provides a rigorous critique of an existing body of work that applies ethnomusicological approaches specifically to writing on Western art music. He founds this critique upon a comparative examination of different definitions for the term 'ethnography' and a consideration of the history of the development of the field and the internal methodological and other criticisms it

has generated, concerns that are also highly relevant for ethnomusicology, which frequently employs ethnographic approaches. Certain ethnomusicologists have also posited their discipline as oppositional to what they hold to be the more traditional field of historical musicology, said to be focused on musical texts and sounds while resistant to more contextual, sociological approaches; conversely, Pace argues that this is a straw target dichotomy, while the overlooking of sonic and aural evidence in such studies significantly confines their coverage. Exploring the differences between journalistic and scholarly modes of writing and between descriptive and analytical discourses, Pace suggests that much ethnographic writing on music is indebted to simple description and taxonomy rather than analysis, as well as to long quotations from participant testimonies, and hence retains the external appearance of non-academic writing. This is demonstrated in some of the most lauded ethnographies of Western art music and its institutions that have appeared in recent decades, some of which he compares to more sensationalist journalism: both types lack a measured critical stance with respect to their subject matter, ignoring perspectives that do not accord with their one-sided presentation, and often arrive at relatively obvious and predictable conclusions. Nonetheless, he identifies a shift in this body of work, from early disparaging studies of institutions to the ascendancy of a more neutrally descriptive approach. In the second of his chapters, Pace applies some of these critical perspectives to recent ethnomusicological studies of the latter type, on a work by the composer Michael Finnissy, performed by the Kreutzer Quartet (by Amanda Bayley and Michael Clarke), on professional music-making in London (by Stephen Cottrell) and on the life and work of composer Kaija Saariaho (by Pirkko Moisala). While these vary in nature and their response to wider ethnographic debates, they share a reluctance to expose their objects of enquiry to due critique and questioning or to

embrace competing perspectives, which ultimately leads authors to adopt what can be an uncritically reverential, even hagiographic tone for their work.

The volume's Part II switches attention from more general critical perspectives on researching and writing about contemporary art and artists, to individual case studies from across the arts disciplines. Andy W. Smith explores the writing by and about acclaimed radical playwright Howard Barker, whose political plays of the 1970s gave way to a new dramatic form, the Theatre of Catastrophe, from the late 1980s, characterised by a reimagining of history. This, in turn, led to the founding in 1988 of Barker's own theatre company, The Wrestling School, in order to realise his unique artistic vision, with Barker himself assuming artistic control from 1993. Its productions have elicited a range of, mainly critical, reviews noting the lack of accessibility of his fringe theatre. To insulate himself from criticisms of the playwright who doubles as director, Barker created multiple secret alter-egos to disguise the extent of his aesthetic contribution to The Wrestling School productions, as well as to write about himself in a playfully innovative manner. His own memoirs were penned under the name of one of these pseudonyms, Eduardo Houth, with Barker referenced in the third person. Other of his alter-egos include costume designer Billie Kaiser and stage designer Tomas Leipzig, who were credited, complete with invented biographies—surreal to the point of absurdity—in production programmes. Barker's writings have developed in parallel with his artistic practice and hence reflect these outputs as well as his removal from the milieu of the theatrical mainstream.

Jill Brown discusses the challenges associated with writing about the lives and careers of two ballerinas, Sylvie Guillem and Misty Copeland, consideration of whose biographies exemplifies the changing status of the artist between different

generations. Notwithstanding the appearance of various media interviews as well as biographical books on each figure targeted at a general market, the information available on both is relatively scant, and few have critically appraised their activity as dancers in a scholarly manner. This paucity of material yields only disparate and conflicting snapshots of the artists' lives, leaving the biographer tasked with somehow reconciling them with one another. Guillem's eschewal of public attention in her career prompted Brown to turn instead to such sources as television appearances to supplement the dearth of more traditional forms of evidence, in the process discovering understandings of the subject that could not have been gleaned from more conventional texts. While Copeland hired a manager and became established as a brand identity, being apparently forthcoming about aspects of her personal life in the media, Brown discovered lacunae in writing about her life as well, since her early career was much less widely documented than Guillem's. Brown describes the biographer's processes of piecing together a story mosaic-like from this partial evidence, departing from a position of ignorance in order to reach one of new insights into the subjects, all the while aware of the biographer's mediating voice. Ultimately, she suggests, the difference in the ways in which the lives of these ballerinas have been chronicled speaks to the shift between the two from celebrating the artist in public to desiring engagement with their private self.

Vered Engelhard's chapter concerns the artist and philosopher Adrian Piper and the challenges that she presents to writers on her work owing to the multi-faceted nature of her activity. Specifically, Engelhard explores three of Piper's key works from the 1970s: *Context #7*, *Untitled Performance for Max's Kansas City* and *The Mythic Being*. *Context #7* (1970) was a piece of concept art in which viewers were encouraged to contribute responses on a blank notepad, and hence simultaneously

constitutes a form of writing as art and writing about art; while *Untitled Performance for Max's Kansas City* (1970) placed Piper's body on display as an object of art, silent, blinded and wearing earplugs. Both raise important questions relating to the ontological manifestation of the artworks, resulting from the tension between the works' difference from, and similarity to, existing artistic tradition. *The Mythic Being* (1973–5) took the idea of the subject itself being the object of art a stage further, being a collection of mantras recited from Piper's personal journal at public gatherings and published as a series of periodical advertisements. Developed over a period of three years, *The Mythic Being* assumed the guise of a 'black man' persona whom Piper held to be oppositional to herself, and thereby prompted viewers to confront issues of race, gender and morality. In directly addressing the viewer, Engelhard argues, Piper's artwork aspires to universality.

Joel M. Baldwin discusses Louis Andriessen and Elmer Schönberger's 1983 monograph on Stravinsky, *The Apollonian Clockwork*. This text stands out among the substantial body of literature on that composer, both for its coverage of lesser-known music alongside the more popular works, and its central inclusion of personal thoughts and anecdotes concerning the subject. In this respect, it eschews some of the meticulousness and objectivity of modern scholarly work studies in favour of a more playful, ironic approach. It therefore raises questions about the challenges and limitations faced by authors writing about contemporary artists to whom inevitably they are temporally close, prompting Baldwin to suggest that the adoption of a more subjective tenor may be just as valid and meaningful when it is not possible to write with the benefit of hindsight. Yet this need not lead to hagiographic writing, which would entail uncritical adoption of the 'official' position perpetuated by promoters and other champions of the subject. Rather, Andriessen and Schönberger are honest

and upfront that the residual memory of Stravinsky's output is such that they can only hope to offer a perspective coloured by those elements with which the music has historically been associated, and implicitly encourage readers to form their own opinions by presenting a personal position with which they might therefore agree or disagree.

Mimi Cabell and Phoebe Stubbs report on Contributors Inc., an artistic research project founded in 2015 that explores the contents lists in art and culture magazines archivally. Its purpose is to identify gender imbalance as well as other commercial and ideological shifts in the establishment and perpetuation of canons in the writing about contemporary art and artists, thereby calling into question the nature of art criticism as documented in key publications including *Cabinet* and particularly the leading New York-based art magazine *Artforum*. The 'Artfrom' and (ongoing) 'Arton' projects associated with the latter are concerned with the effect of both writers and the artists who are the subjects of their discourse upon art world canons, in order to identify the contribution of the magazine to the shaping of art criticism and correspondingly to the establishment of frames of reference for students and educators of art. Discussing a number of other recent investigations into gender imbalance in the art world, Cabell and Stubbs describe the procedure whereby they converted *Artforum's* contents lists into quantitative data for analysis. This process revealed the disproportionately small number of authors who had written for the magazine, especially at its inception, as well as its initially North Atlantic focus and its apparent avoidance of art that explicitly engaged with politics. The authors further detail the workshops they have consequently developed in order to advocate for greater awareness of the limited and highly subjective sense of the art world offered by some of its foremost publications.

Part III of the volume seeks to enable art to be considered on its own terms, and to hear the voices of the artists themselves, through a series of innovative modes of discourse. The first of these, by Joanne ‘Bob’ Whalley, is written as a visual essay that reveals a practice-as-research process using photographs as an integral part of its presentation. Practice as research is here conceived as the product of the totality of a practitioner’s experiences as brought to bear on their research, reading the epistemological spaces, navigating the various changes of direction, necessitating self-reflexivity. Considering practice as research as a process of occlusion, Whalley questions its nature as a dance-like engagement between writer and reader, in which the subject of the research is closed off to both. Ultimately she suggests whether the process of practice as research in fact reveals more than it occludes, whereby the less we are able to see, the more becomes visible to us.

The inclusion within this collection of Richard Birchall’s composition *Abstracts* demonstrates the possibilities for music itself to constitute an act of writing about contemporary art, if not also of its originating artist. Inspired by the works of the distinguished painter Christopher Le Brun, and in particular the use of colour in his paintings in an exhibition at Colnaghi Gallery, London in 2015, Birchall’s piece is written for solo piano in four sections. The creative stimulus derives from the entire experience of visiting the studio but more specifically from a single painting, ‘Cloud’. Birchall’s music represents this as viewed from four different distances and explores the contrasting understandings this generates of Le Brun’s work. The composition also constitutes the transference of art from one medium to another, drawing on parallels between colour of the painting and musical harmony, between the texture of the artwork and the texture of the music, and between the gradual recognition of

colour-curves (as one moves closer to the painting) and the emergence of discernible melodies in the music.

Annie Yim, in conversation with Christopher Wiley, discusses the MusicArt London initiative that she founded in 2015. Under Yim's artistic directorship, MusicArt has striven to celebrate the relationships and intersections between different arts disciplines, as well as to bring together old and new music. Its activities have comprised collaborations with gallerists, painters, composers, dancers and poets—including the painter Christopher Le Brun, the composers Richard Birchall and Raymond Yiu, the book artist Pauline Rafal, the choreographer Patricia Okenwa, and the poets Zaffar Kunial and Kayo Chingonyi—that have generated new multi-disciplinary artwork in a series of 'conceptual concerts'. Through its various projects, MusicArt has thereby sought to explore dialogues between the constituent arts, their shared aesthetics and the 'poetic concepts' concerned with the artistic imaginative processes themselves. A feature of MusicArt's performances has been the staging of public conversations between different contributing artists, intertwined within curated programmes of historical and contemporary music that are creatively combined with the other arts. It has thereby aspired to establish new musical contexts for existing art as well as to commission new work, including Richard Birchall's *Abstracts*, the context of whose composition is explored in this chapter.

Researching and writing about contemporary art and artists present unique challenges for scholars, students, professional critics and creative practitioners alike. In exploring a range of different forms of discourse on living or recently deceased subjects, this volume seeks to bring to light the common ground shared across the arts disciplines as well as setting the agenda for rigorous critical thinking on the nature of

the relationship between those who write about art and the artists about whom they write.

Bibliography

- Allegue, Ludivine, Simon Jones, Baz Kershaw and Angela Piccini, eds. 2009. *Practice-as-Research in Performance and Screen*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Barnet, Sylvan. 2015. *A Short Guide to Writing about Art*, 12th ed. Boston: Pearson Education.
- Batchelor, John, ed. 1995. *The Art of Literary Biography*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Biggs, Michael and Henrik Karlsson. 2011. 'Evaluating Quality in Artistic Research'. In *The Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts*, edited by Michael Biggs and Henrik Karlsson, 405–42. London: Routledge.
- Cook, Nicholas. 2015. 'Performing Research: Some Institutional Perspectives'. In *Artistic Practice as Research in Music: Theory, Criticism, Practice*, edited by Mine Doğantan-Dack, 11–32. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Croft, John. 2015a. 'Composition is not research'. *Tempo* 69, no.272: 6–11.
- Croft, John. 2015b. 'Composing, researching and ways of talking'. *Tempo* 70, no.275: 71–7.
- Eagland, Nick. 2018. 'Fired UBC prof Steven Galloway awarded damages in arbitration'. *Vancouver Sun*, 19 July 2018. Accessed 2 Aug. 2019.
<https://vancouversun.com/news/local-news/steven-galloway-awarded-damages-in-arbitration>

- Freeman, John. 2010. *Blood, Sweat & Theory: Research through Practice in Performance*. Faringdon: Libri.
- Hatcher, Evelyn Payne. 1985. *Art as Culture: An Introduction to the Anthropology of Art*. Lanham, MD and London: University Press of America.
- Herbert, Trevor. 2012. *Music in Words: A Guide to Research and Writing about Music*, 2nd ed. London: ABRSM.
- Herndon, Marcia and Norma McLeod. 1979. *Music as Culture*. Norwood, PA: Norwood Editions.
- Kershaw, Baz. 2009. 'Practice as Research through Performance'. In *Practice-Led Research, Research-Led Practice in the Creative Arts*, edited by Hazel Smith and Roger T. Dean, 104-25. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Krüger, Simone. 2008. *Ethnography in the Performing Arts: A Student Guide*. Accessed 3 Aug. 2019. <https://www.heacademy.ac.uk/system/files/Ethnography-in-the-Performing-Arts-A-Student-Guide.pdf>
- Meyers, Jeffrey, ed. 1985. *The Craft of Literary Biography*. London: Macmillan.
- Morphy, Howard and Morgan Perkins, ed. 2006. *The Anthropology of Art: A Reader*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Nelson, Robin. 2013. *Practice as Research in the Arts: Principles, Protocols, Pedagogies, Resistances*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Pace, Ian. 2015a. 'Composition and performance can be, and often have been, research'. *Tempo* 70, no.275: 60–70.
- Pace, Ian. 2015b. 'Those 300-word statements on Practice-as-Research for the RAE/REF—origins and stipulations'. Accessed 27 Feb. 2020. <http://openaccess.city.ac.uk/17489/1/Those%20300->

[word%20statements%20on%20Practice-as-
Research%20for%20the%20RAE%20%26%20REF.pdf](#)

Reeves, Camden. 2015. 'Composition, research and pseudo-science: a response to John Croft'. *Tempo* 70, no.275: 50–9.

Schippers, Huib. 2007. 'The Marriage of Art and Academia: Challenges and Opportunities for Music Research in Practice-based Environments'. *Dutch Journal of Music Theory* 12, no.1: 34–40.

Smith, Hazel and Roger T. Dean, eds. 2009. *Practice-Led Research, Research-Led Practice in the Creative Arts*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Vaes, Luke. 2015. 'When composition is not research', three parts. Accessed 2 Aug. 2019. <http://artisticresearchreports.blogspot.com/2015/06/when-composition-is-not-research.html>, <http://artisticresearchreports.blogspot.com/2015/06/when-composition-is-not-research-2.html>, and <http://artisticresearchreports.blogspot.com/2015/11/when-composition-is-not-research.html>

Wiley, Christopher. 2020 (forthcoming). 'Between "Scholarly Treatments" and "Fanzine Hype": The Mediation of Adulation and Academic Discourse in Popular Music Studies'. In *Writing About Contemporary Musicians: Promotion, Advocacy, Disinterest, Censure*, edited by Ian Pace and Christopher Wiley. Abingdon: Routledge.

Williams, Gilda. 2014. *How to Write about Contemporary Art*. London: Thames and Hudson.