THE PERSISTENCE OF DANCE

Choreography as Concept and Material in Contemporary Art

Erin Brannigan

The Persistence of Dance

The Persistence of Dance

Choreography as Concept and Material in Contemporary Art

Erin Brannigan

University of Michigan Press
Ann Arbor

For questions or permissions, please contact um.press.perms@umich.edu

Published in the United States of America by the
University of Michigan Press
Manufactured in the United States of America
Printed on acid-free paper
First published November 2023

A CIP catalog record for this book is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication data has been applied for.

ISBN 978-0-472-07648-2 (hardcover : alk. paper)
ISBN 978-0-472-05648-4 (paper : alk. paper)
ISBN 978-0-472-90389-4 (open access ebook)

DOI: https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.12347133

The University of Michigan Press's open access publishing program is made possible thanks to additional funding from the University of Michigan Office of the Provost and the generous support of contributing libraries.

To Sunny and Billy Westbury

Contents

Part II. Dance and the Museum

Part III. Between the Twentieth and Twenty-First Centuries

Part IV: Concept and Material

Part V: Beyond Dancing in the Gallery

Digital materials related to this title can be found on the Fulcrum platform via the following citable URL: https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.12347133

Acknowledgments

I acknowledge the Bidjigal people of the Eora Nation on whose unceded land I work and live in Sydney, Australia. I pay my respects to elders past and present and extend that respect to any First Nations readers of my book. "Always Was, Always Will Be, Aboriginal Land."

I began work on this book and its companion, *Choreography, Visual Art and Experimental Composition 1950s-1970s* (London: Routledge, 2022) in 2012, so *The Persistence of Dance* has been over 10 years in the making. I would first like to thank my family for their patience, support and love—Joe, Sunny and Billy Westbury. I couldn't do the work I do without you. To mum, Maura Brannigan, and my siblings, Sonia, Kerrie, and Sean, your unconditional love is my anchor. Thank you also to my close friends who sustain me.

Thanks to my colleagues and friends who provided such important feedback on drafts of this book and its chapters. This includes my Writing Dancing group for our 13 years of creative collaboration and support, especially Julie-Anne Long, Justine Shih Pearson, Nikki Heywood, Cleo Mees, Rhiannon Newton, Bryoni Trezise, Nalina Wait, Amanda Card, Nuria Rodriguez Riestra, and Clare Grant; and Susan Best who has been so generous with feedback on this second volume. To my research colleagues on *Precarious Movements: Choreography and the Museum*—Lisa Catt, Rochelle Haley, Amita Kirpalani, Shelley Lasica, Louise Lawson, Hannah Mathews, Carolyn Murphy, Zoe Theodore, and Pip Wallis, —thank you for the collaborative work that has informed this book. A very special thanks to the artists who helped me think through their practice, particularly Lizzie Thomson and Matthew Day with whom I worked during the early stages of the project between 2012-2015 when I was still formulating an approach, and Lasica whose thinking and doing anchors so many of my key concepts and definitions. My enormous gratitude to the generous artists who agreed to

be interviewed for this book; Lasica, Maria Hassabi, Adam Linder, Agatha Gothe-Snape, Latai Taumoepeau, Zoe Theodore, Deanne Butterworth, and Jo Lloyd. Thanks to all the artists whose work I engage with and for the encouragement many of you extended to me. I thank Sarah Michelson, Jonathan Burrows, Philipp Gehmacher, Xavier Le Roy, and Boris Charmatz for the rich work that has fuelled this project. My fascination with your creative imagination and audacity sustained me over the years of writing, and I miss having you in my head already.

For practical help with manuscript preparation I thank Sara Haddad and Lizzie Thomson. Thanks to all the archive and library staff who have been so helpful, especially Anna Rutkowska at UNSW. This project was supported by several research grants through the School of Arts and Media, and publication support from the Faculty of Arts, Design and Architecture, University of New South Wales, a Special Study Program sabbatical in 2016, and an Australian Research Council Grant for *Experimental Humanities* (2013-2016) shared with Stephen Muecke and Edward Scheer who were very generous with those funds. The Australian Research Council Grant for *Precarious Movements* (2021-2024) supported the final manuscript preparation. To my anonymous reviewers, the collegial service we do for one another is interpreted so widely. Thank you for the diligence and care you took with my work and the extended responses you crafted. Your generosity helped me write a better book.

PART I

State of the Art

The introductory section of *The Persistence of Dance: Choreography as Concept and Material in Contemporary Art* begins by defining its field of study. This work is distinct from contemporary dance presented on the stage that has its lineage in theater and classical ballet and is, rather, contemporary choreography where the central preoccupations and conditions correspond to those driving the broader contemporary arts: *dance as a contemporary art medium*. Such work has been exposed as both a crucial catalyst for innovation within broader aesthetic developments, and a distinct permutation of art categories such as the post-conceptual. This goes beyond superficial associations of dance and choreography with strategies such as the experience economy and participatory aesthetics that have been employed in the service of a reinvention of the museum. *The Persistence of Dance* addresses the question of what dance histories, practices, and knowledges bring to contemporary art in its broadest sense in the first decade of the new millennium. Chapter 1 introduces the project of the book. Key artists, theorists, terms, and methodologies are introduced, and the chapter ends with a survey of the book's chapters. The introductory case study, *Devotion Study #1—The American Dancer* (2011) by American choreographer Sarah Michelson, exemplifies the work under discussion: a self-reflexive, durational choreography with telescopic range and disciplinary rigor. Chapter 2 outlines the methodology of attending to the poetics or the *work of the work* of dance where the case studies exemplify methods of *experimental composition*. Foundational dance principles and key choreographic concepts that draw on a dance lineage focused on the materiality of the body and its biological parameters are described: *the mind-body*, *singularity/collectivity*, *presence/participation*, *process, practice, composition* and *performance*. These add new analytical tools to the rich

history of formal analysis within art theory, and through their inclusion within an intermedial context we can rediscover them in a new light. The analysis and definition of these terms are drawn from multiple sources on choreography across the twentieth and into the twenty-first centuries and scaffold the discussion of case studies across the book, articulating with the material elements of dance unpacked in Part IV: *breath*, *weight*, *tone*, *movement*, *force/energy/effort*, *rhythm*, and *space-time*.

Chapter 1

Unassertive Persistence

Dance beyond Theater

1.1 Introduction

The Persistence of Dance: Choreography as Concept and Material in Contemporary Art seeks to understand a new field of creative work that has garnered attention from our major art institutions, changed the way that dance circulates in cultural economies, and become an exemplar of post-disciplinary art.[1] This work is distinct from contemporary dance presented on the stage that has its lineage in theater and classical ballet, and is, rather, choreographic works where the central preoccupations and conditions correspond to those driving the broader contemporary arts: *dance as contemporary art medium*.[2] It is also distinguished from performance art, which is understood as an expansion of visual arts practitioners into theater and has been defined as a "genre of the visual arts"; the dance-based works under discussion here would be more accurately aligned with a different lineage—choreographers such as Anna Halprin, Simone Forti, and Trisha Brown who forged unprecedented intermedial modes of dance.[3] Such work, currently exemplified in case studies by artists such as Sarah Michelson, Maria Hassabi, and Latai Taumoepeau, is neither subsumed into the logic of the visual arts from outside nor an invention from within, but figures within an inclusive understanding of contemporary art. Recent research has revealed the crucial role such work has played within broader aesthetic developments in the arts since the mid-twentieth century, and its position in the contemporary situation as a distinct permutation of art categories such as the post-conceptual and post-disciplinary. This history, and its trajectories into the present and future, have nothing to do with the superficial associations of dance and choreography with museum strategies of renewal such as *the experience economy* and *participatory aesthetics* that have railroaded more robust analysis of this important field.[4]

Among what some have described as a domination of dance and choreography within the recent performative turn in the museal sector, definitions, specificities, and careful framing have often been lacking.[5] Various iterations of *dance in the gallery* have included adaptations of stage-based works for the new context, works made for proscenium theaters located in multi-arts centers (such as the Walker Art Center, Minneapolis and the Centre Pompidou, Paris), new works responding to exhibitions and permanent collections, and public programs engaging visitors in the practice of dancing. This project seeks to refine definitions of this broader field by following artists' self-determination and intentions. As *Artforum* editor David Velasco notes, there is a "dissonance between those who aspire to the museum or think inside its terms and those for whom it's simply another horizontal 'space' to work in."[6] In order to overcome broad generalizations and associated misrepresentations, *The Persistence of Dance* turns to key works and exhibitions amongst the broader performative turn, and relies on the commentary of the artists themselves, to unpack the specificities of this still emerging field. While the aforementioned activities have their own benefits and challenges, the focus will be on choreographic works that, to reiterate, share the preoccupations driving the field of contemporary art; they are presented as a part of that field, both inside and outside the major arts institutions.

Situating the current field in dialogue with preceding periods of intense dance-visual arts exchange is crucial to the mapping ambitions of *The Persistence of Dance*. A recent wave of literature has revised the narratives of the mid-century period through a focus on individual dance artists, such as the work of Carrie Lambert-Beatty on Yvonne Rainer, Meredith Morse on Forti, and Susan Rosenberg on Brown.[7] This revision of the historical backstory to the current situation has been important in making sense of the new choreographic work—how it can be defined, characterized, contextualized, and analyzed in terms of its specific lineage back to the work of John Cage, Halprin, and Neo-Dada. In the following I refer to the *second-wave dance avant-garde*, which was centered in post-Merce Cunningham New York from the mid-1950s to the mid-1970s, and the *third-wave dance avant-garde* beginning in Europe in the early 1990s and continuing until the present in local occurrences. The deeply intermedial condition of dance since its emergence at the turn of the twentieth century, post-classical ballet, is beyond the scope of this work, but that historical backstory informs a resistance to arguing for innovation where there is often, in fact, a return.[8] A central premise of this book and its compan-

ion, *Choreography, Visual Art and Experimental Composition 1950s-1970s* (2022), on the earlier, second-wave avant-garde—that the interdisciplinary depends upon the disciplinary—acknowledges a delicate balance in the field between the corporeally focused findings of disciplinary leaders, and the special condition of dance as *always already intermedial*.[9] *The Persistence of Dance* thus insists on a disciplinary identity for the art form historically, in response to the more recent expansion of *choreography* as a practice, object, metaphor, and concept.[10] From Forti's seminal work in Yoko Ono's loft in the early 1960s, to Michelson's disciplinary incursion in the Whitney Museum of American Art in the 2010s, the case studies here exemplify a sharpening of the medium-specificity of dance in the intermedial field of the contemporary arts where all arts are (apparently) equal, and discipline comes in the form of a rigorous, critical survey of the state of play. So while the approach in this book acknowledges that notions of post-discipline, a-discipline, indetermined, and generic art are all relevant to the field under discussion due to the significant role of dance in the intermedial revolution of 1960s North American experimentation, I ultimately plump for *post-dance* as a category within which to discuss the future of the still emerging field of *dance as a contemporary art medium* to retain hard-won and highly specific disciplinary knowledges and practices.

1.2 Intermedial Methods for Intermedial Practices

If Western dance in its interdisciplinary formulation was confronted mid-twentieth century by Forti et al., it re-emerged in the twenty-first century within a complex set of relations between, first, intensified and widespread experimental and intermedial/post-medium creative practices; second, a crisis in disciplinary terminology; and third, the visual arts' turn to performance more generally, and dance specifically. These are the key developments that broadly frame the project of this book. The following thus centers its critical work on creative practices within the associated network of institutions, discourses, and traditions with which such developments interface: dance training, dance studies, dance studios/centers, museums of art, galleries, art theory, art criticism, historiographies, canons, contracts, literacies, ethics, writing, sculpture, theater, archives, capitalist economies, and curatorial practices. So transmedial practice and the accompanying inter- and intra-disciplinary scholarship have, as Australian art theorist Terry Smith declares, paved the way toward what I hope

approximates "a genuinely contemporary art-historical" position that can hold all that is of relevance to the work of the work.[11]

Curated exhibitions have set the terms for much of the recent framing of the dance-visual arts story, which is taking time to emerge in the critical and academic literature of artist-theorists, critics, and scholars. The post-2007 work of curators such as Sabine Breitwieser, Corinne Diserens, Eva Schmidt, Catherine Wood, Stephanie Rosenthal, Helen Molesworth, Carlos Basualdo and Erica F. Battle, Ana Janevski, Thomas J. Lax, Martha Joseph, and in Australia, Hannah Mathews, Lisa Havilah with Emma Saunders and Susan Gibb, and Zoe Theodore, is of interest to this project. Their exhibitions have brought to light the work of artists both historical and contemporary between, across, and among choreography and contemporary art. However, with its own rich history of analysis and practice, dance literacy within the visual arts context has been exposed as a blind spot. This has had repercussions regarding contemporary art historiographies, but also curatorial practices, associated presentation opportunities, and access to/for audiences, and is symptomatic of the power imbalance between the visual and performing arts. As Smith writes, contemporary art is "a trendsetting force within international high culture" and certainly trumps contemporary dance in terms of visibility, influence, and scales of economy.[12] And as Tate Modern Director of Programme Catherine Wood points out, this suggests we pause and consider what dance has to gain in this new order.[13] The pressing question of the inclusion of dance in art collections and archives is driving points of tension between museum and choreographic processes that are underscored by issues of power and authority.[14] Elsewhere I have described within the character of dance "an unassertiveness that is constitutional and productive, rather than negative, [which] allows the discipline to advance into territories that are undefined and thus still under-negotiation, in a persistent and tenacious way."[15] With dance becoming "the newest desirable art object," *agency* and *intention* become central and need to be balanced with the openness of the form.[16]

Institutional critique has always accompanied the development of dance as a contemporary art; the form has historically dealt with complexities around the fixity of the art object, documentation, commodification, and subjectivity, and has demonstrated a resistance to institutional spaces. Upon entering the museum or gallery, dance is forcing institutional change not only at the level of internal procedures for collection, conservation, and archiving, but the very architectural context of the museum as

well as its ethical practices of care and stewardship. However, the important recent work within museum studies on the impact of performance and choreographic practices on curatorial, public programs, infrastructure, and conservation work is peripheral to what follows.[17]

The Persistence of Dance centers the question of what kind of dance is appearing in galleries and museums across the turn of the twentieth century and why. This can only be understood in relation to both the discipline-specific *and* shared histories, practices, and knowledges across dance and the contemporary arts, which are revealed by attending to the *work of the work*. Such an approach is anchored by the material-conceptual bind that has framed developments since the 1960s. New understandings result from a turn to medium-specific dance elements such as *breath*, *weight*, *tone*, *movement (qualities)*, *force/energy*, *rhythm*, and *space-time*, which supplement and sometimes replace visual arts elements such as line, figure, surface, volume, color, etc. Dance elements, compositional practices, and choreographic concepts offer much to the rich and historical field of formal analysis within art theory and update the toolkits available to match contemporary practices. In the eleven case studies in this book, dance tests its disciplinary terms through intermedial exchange, and the approach taken in what follows—which Smith might describe as part of the "historical materialist critique" of art—perhaps argues for some commonalities or "consistent dimensions" across these works at the very moment that contemporary art is often defined as "periodless," "posthistorical," and "anachronic."[18] Such a move is dependent on the genealogies established across this book which follow those set out in *Choreography, Visual Art and Experimental Composition 1950s-1970s*.

An imperative for dance to reclaim its own language, which has appeared since the turn of the twenty-first century within both practice and commentary, follows a prior movement across the 1990s to shed dance of *dance* at the very moment it entered into a newly intense dialogue with the other arts. This reclaiming supports the disciplinary work in my approach and extends to general artistic principles such as labor, process, context, presence, concept, material, authorship, and subject, which also feature in dance and choreography. In the following case studies, such terms are *fleshed out* through an *incorporation* of how they persist in these new choreographic manifestations. Through such a method, aesthetic strategies and features that were developed in the second-wave dance avant-garde such as an interest in presence, an anti-representational mode, an emphasis on process over product, a critique of visuality and movement, and self-

reflexivity, can be identified in the more recent work of artists such as Michelson, Meg Stuart, Boris Charmatz, Hassabi, Shelley Lasica, Agatha Gothe-Snape, Adam Linder, Taumoepeau, and Xavier Le Roy to argue for a continuity between the earlier period and the current third-wave dance avant-garde.[19] Other artists who belong to this configuration would include Latifa Laâbissi, María La Ribot, Alexandra Pirici, Trajal Harrell, Nadia Lauro, Senga Nengudi, Melati Suryodarmo, Jennifer Lacey, Ralph Lemon, Sara Wookey, Tino Sehgal, Pablo Bronstein, and François Chaignaud and Cecilia Bengolea, and a new generation including Yve Laris Cohen, Miriam Kongstad, Malik Nashad Sharpe, Ligia Lewis, Andros Zins-Browne, Isabel Lewis, Jimmy Robert, Mel O'Callaghan, Gerard & Kelly, Daina Ashbee, Eisa Jocson, Paul Maheke, Alex Baczyński-Jenkins, Jahra Wasasala, Tamara Cubas, River Lin, and Isaac Chong Wai. I begin with Michelson in Part I to draw out the key themes of this book and bring us closer to understanding the topography of this still emerging field of practice.

A focus on *the practice of producing works of art*, that is, *composition*, differentiates my approach from an interest in the archival impulse of the museal turn to performance, a separate and rich field of investigation that appears here only in the notion of the body-archive as a material, processual, and resistant feature of the discipline.[20] Choosing this method of analysis has also led to a general (but not total) exclusion of philosophy and critical theory. This has constituted a discipline in itself and a way of working that is out of step with current popular methodologies.[21] We have recently seen the most significant philosophical turn in dance studies since the work around Michel Foucault and the subjected body of the (ballet) dancer in the late 1980s to early 2000s.[22] Monographs on the state of the art released in the last decade make substantial use of continental philosophy—particularly the work of Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari—including books by Jenn Joy, Petra Sabisch, André Lepecki, Bojana Cvejić, Ramsay Burt, and Derek McCormack.[23] This body of work in many ways constitutes a Deleuzian turn in dance studies. In counterpoint to this excellent work, in the following chapters I do not bring a toolkit of methodological apparatuses to my encounter with interdisciplinary creative practice (in dance studies typically philosophical lenses such as phenomenology or post-structuralism, but also anthropology, sociology, or musicology), but frameworks and concepts drawn from theories of composition, and utilizing specific terms for particular works that undertake singular compositional experiments.

1.3 Revision and Specificity: *Choreography as a Contemporary Art Medium*

Part of the task here is to reassess the use of terminologies such as *avant-garde*, *intermedial*, *conceptual*, *material*, as well as *choreography*, *dance*, and *dancing*, in light of claims made by, and on behalf of, a group of European choreographers working since the early 1990s. Geographic, economic, and cultural specificities are exposed as major players in the public profile of this group referred to as "conceptual," a cohort of artists also closely associated with the engagement between dance and the art museum. An expansion of the field of dance as a contemporary art medium beyond this group contributes to decentralizing the critical debates that shape not only historiographies, but the kind of work being made. Paradigms from art history such as modern, post-modern, Minimalism, and conceptualism, which have often been applied to contemporary dance in misleading ways, are confronted by putting dance analysis into dialogue with art theory to arrive at a more representative account of the current state of affairs. Overall, the (relatively) new and international field of choreography as a contemporary art medium is considered in light of the ongoing contributions dance-based knowledges make to progressive art practices, including non-object-based or dematerialized art, and post-conceptual, post-disciplinary, and participatory practices. This lens incorporates the "prehistory of contemporary within modern art," a project that dance has been largely excluded from but to which it can offer rich models of contemporaneity such as "the ontology of the present . . . what it is to be in time."[24]

Finally, the dance-gallery interface is a stubbornly white space. African-American choreographer Ralph Lemon is an important and high-profile spokesperson on this; he quips (good-humoredly) that Michelson's work "is the whitest" work he's seen.[25] He also describes the layers of minoring at play here when he notes that being a dancer in the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) atrium (as opposed to its main galleries), was "about being in that body politic and that kind of ghetto" and "less about being black and more about being a dance person."[26] Systemic racism within the relatively minor form of contemporary dance is writ large once you reach a sub-genre within it such as dance as a contemporary art medium where the endemic white privilege of "high" art weighs in. In Australia, important work by First Nations artists such as Latai Taumoepeau (Tongan-Australian), Vicki

Van Hout (Indigenous Australian), and Brian Fuata (Samoan-Australian) is emerging as some of the strongest in the field. And, internationally, artists have diversified from the narrow racial and socio-cultural profile of the North American second-wave to include Vera Mantero (Portuguese), María La Ribot (Spanish/Swiss), Maria Hassabi (Cypriot), Trajal Harrell (African-American), and Miguel Gutierrez (Colombian-American) who are highly visible and subject to rigorous critical attention. The latter's "Does Abstraction Belong to White People?" is a powerful statement on "the politics of race in contemporary dance," and joins work by Lemon that confronts the tensions between a predominantly conceptual, analytical field of contemporary dance, and the realities of race, community, politics, and culture that increasingly partner with the same.[27] African-American scholar Thomas F. DeFrantz has also been increasingly active as both a commentator and curator specifically regarding the racial inequities in the field of dance as a contemporary art medium.[28]

In *Choreography, Visual Arts and Experimental Composition 1950s-1970s*, the historical background for the current work across dance and the gallery required attention to an influential group of artists made up of white, middle-class, educated, English-speaking Americans and Europeans. Their influence was ensured by privileges such as their democratic society, access to relevant and sometimes powerful cultural resources and organizations, international and national mobility, and the benefits of philanthropic traditions and government arts subsidies that supported national cultural priorities. Other artists highly relevant to the discussion of the field's emergence, including Lygia Clark and Hélio Oiticica living and working in Brazil, and Cuban-American Ana Mendieta, have been written into this narrative by theorists such as Lepecki, and in curatorial work by Rosenthal and others. The important but unrealized project of Adriano Pedrosa, Julia Bryan-Wilson, and Olivia Ardui, *Histórias da Dança / Histories of Dance* (2020), at Museu de Arte de São Paulo Assis Chateaubriand in Brazil, expands the historical field globally and the catalogue and anthology are manuals for future revisions.[29] Important essays by Lepecki and DeFrantz cogently set out the terms for a curatorial way forward that acknowledges the legacy of "neoliberal imperial colonialism" inherent to current systems of curatorial care, inclusivity, and institutional framing, and seeks a different apparatus that might encourage deeper change through attention to "sensation," "microecologies," and other "radical or antinormative potentialities."[30]

One contribution this book makes to decentralizing the current field

is the introduction of important case studies from the South Oceanic, including the work of Taumoepeau alongside other Australian artists of settler descent—Lasica, Linder, and Gothe-Snape. Writing from the geographical (if not socio-economic) periphery in Australia throws fresh light on the legacies of North American art as they continue to inform and shape local activities, while recognizing local knowledges and practices that have previously been excluded from our art historiographies. I work in Sydney, Australia on the land of the Gadigal and Bidjigal people of the Eora Nation. This locates my position as an Australian of Irish and Danish political exile, convict, and settler descent working within the Western tradition of contemporary art and dance, with awareness of the much deeper cultural traditions that bind music, dance, painting, sculpture, and site in the art of our Indigenous people. I pay my respects to elders past and present and extend those respects to all First Nations readers. I anticipate a growth in self-determined trajectories and opportunities for local First Nations choreographers engaging with choreographic and visual arts disciplines, processes and contexts already begun by artists such as Amrita Hepi, Van Hout, Tammi Gissell, Daniel Riley, and Dalisa Pigram. "Always Was, Always Will Be, Aboriginal Land."

1.4 Scoping the Field: Across Theory and Practice

As noted previously, Michelson, as a UK-born, New York-based choreographer, is a key case study in this project and an analysis of her work, *Devotion Study #1—The American Dancer* (2012) follows as Case Study 1. Her works made for the gallery help map out some of the key arguments in this book. The central position of the conceptual here aligns with the broader shift in progressive art toward the conceptual and post-conceptual since the mid-twentieth century. The following notes the continuity between the emergence of this tendency in relation to Minimalism and Neo-Dada and current dance-gallery work in order to insist on a role for dance as a contemporary art medium within this development. So rather than see the recent museal turn to dance as a new migration or intermedial experiment, we can understand how it is the most recent expression of an historical exchange. Links such as those between Brown and Michelson are integral for understanding the recent work at the interface between dance and the visual arts, and this book bridges those two periods of experimentation in dance: the second-wave dance avant-garde and the third-wave dance

avant-garde that began in Europe in the early 1990s and is still underway. Chapter 4 directly addresses continuities and innovations between the recent and earlier, mid-century period, building on the work of Cvejić, Lepecki, and Rudi Laermans who also address the legacy of conceptual art vis-à-vis the third-wave dance avant-garde. Avant-garde is understood here, following art theorist Peter Bürger, as a critique of the autonomy of art through a narrowing of the art-life divide, thus constituting an attack on established and stable (autonomous) forms of art.[31] *The Persistence of Dance* also recognizes the complicity between originality and repetition in avant-garde art in step with art theorist Rosalind Krauss's understanding of the term. The North American art theorist writes that "the actual practice of vanguard art tends to reveal that 'originality' is a working assumption that itself emerges from a ground of repetition and recurrence."[32]

The two periods under discussion both feature the use of the term "conceptual," and have examples of the intermedial practices operating between dance and visual art cultures that I refer to as dance as a contemporary art medium. Both set such activity against a lineage of dance that is committed to theatrical presentations and codified dance languages. They reference, repeat, and diverge from that lineage which has existed since the early twentieth century and which has been identified (often using the language of visual arts) as modern, minimalist, post-modern, dance theater, contemporary, conceptual and post-dance. Dance as a contemporary art medium parses dance cultures, knowledges, and practices with the cultures, knowledges, and practices circulating in the broader contemporary arts in a history of exchange that can be personal and specific, or generic and random, and is part of the move toward what Krauss refers to as "post-medium."[33]

Using terms in dance theory and history that artists do not use confidently in their own historical situation is problematic, and attempts by dance artists to engage directly and critically with -isms formulated in the visual arts can set the terms for their place in history, as we shall see in the case of "conceptual dance" in Chapter 4. However, given the proximity of artists and ideas across disciplinary divides since the 1950s (at least), it is not surprising that dance engages wholeheartedly and critically with such terms. One of the conclusions drawn in this book is the asynchronous complicity of dance in the formulation of notions of *the conceptual* in art practices, and the significant distinctions the art form evidences in its manifestation of the same.[34] Dance as a contemporary art medium is a part of the broader contemporary dance activity that has played a major

role in shaping a uniquely disciplinary take on conceptuality which, I will argue, features (1) a specific take on the role of its materials therein; and (2) the uniquely covert, unstable, and multiplicitous nature of the operations and condition of its concepts. Building this argument, then, requires attention to the material of dance in its grammatical and social condition as a discipline among other disciplines in Chapters 2 and 7.

Case studies are drawn from a field of choreographic work within the third-wave dance avant-garde that has taken a leading role in an inter- or transmedial field for contemporary art as we move further into the twenty-first century. In many of the cases that follow, the work does in fact manifest as dancers dancing in a gallery or art museum space. This "pointy end" of the broader intermedial situation brings some of the central issues into high relief, particularly those relating to the political and economic tensions that haunt the dance-gallery liaison and which provide a backdrop to my focus on the approach to experimental intermedial composition in each case study. Lepecki and Mark Franko ask, "what are the conditions of labour of the dancer and choreographer in the framework of museum performance?" and refer to Bruce Nauman's score directive to "hire a dancer," which describes curator Mathieu Copeland's approach discussed in Case Study 3.[35] Their line of questioning has been repeated recently by Catherine Damman, in relation to *Judson Dance Theater: The Work is Never Done*:

> The issue was never whether dance belongs in the museum or gallery, but rather what we do with dance—and how we treat dancers—once it's there . . . Modest demands might look something like this: Pay attention to dancers, to dancing itself, and to the specificities of dance history and forms.[36]

Following Damman on the specificities within the field, it is in the work of individual artists and artist-led exhibitions where we find the most progressive formulations of the dance-visual arts dialogue emerging from communities of practice and criticality. Such work is at the center of what follows, and their specificity necessarily reveals the actual conditions for the artists, both practical and aesthetic, and how these two facets inform each other. Supporting information is gleaned from interviews, reviews, and profiles, but also artists' contributions to panels and seminars that accompany exhibitions, discourse that is unevenly transposed into texts that are accessible and enduring.

The eleven case studies demonstrate how dance and choreography are in dialogue with both the art *context* (galleries, museums, and their apparatuses) and contemporary art *practices*, and are participating in a new exchange that repeats the conditions of Neo-Dada where the dance artists were largely in control of their engagement with the visual arts, defying the dancer-as-dupe narrative that recurs in the discourse on the field.[37] In fact we have seen a significant shift away from the hire-a-dancer model that was at the center of disciplinary tensions in the early 2000s, particularly in North America, toward a commission-a-dance-artist model in the case of the new generation of artists listed above. Case studies include much-cited male French conceptual artists such as Charmatz but move beyond the same to decentralize the field from a politically and geographically limited inheritance as noted, expanding the idea of a third-wave avant-garde to include important forerunners such as Stuart (USA/Germany), and artists outside the American-European axis, mapping a more diverse international field. Added to the key case studies of Michelson (UK/USA) and Hassabi (Cyprus/USA), are those of Australian artists Taumoepeau (Australian/Tonga), Lasica (Australia), Linder (Australia/Germany/USA), and Gothe-Snape (Australia). Each brings to the foreground specific elements such as repetition, duration, sensation, attention, physical virtuosity, improvisation, presence, and subjectivity. Other artists discussed include Le Roy (France), Sehgal (UK), Chrysa Parkinson (Belgium), William Forsythe (Germany/USA), and Philipp Gehmacher (Austria).[38] I have attempted to include artists working on modest *and* highly visible projects, representing a diversity of cultural and economic contexts, but also varied disciplinary profiles in relation to their engagement with dance and choreography. For example, Gothe-Snape identifies primarily as a visual artist but has trained broadly across body-based practices.

I have also interviewed many and recall Alain Badiou's observation on the vagaries of writing on living artists: "if they contradict you completely it's a weakness."[39] While I take full responsibility for this text and its arguments, there are elements of collaboration that have emerged from this process and I am very grateful for the generosity of those artists who agreed to share their perspectives with me (Lasica and her collaborators, Linder, Hassabi, Taumoepeau, and Gothe-Snape). Such collaborations have sometimes helped address the issue of "availability" from Smith's list of challenges for any commentator on contemporary work, an issue particularly pertinent due to the "local prejudice of contemporary dance," in the words of Fabián Barba.[40] While I have primarily limited my examples to

works and exhibitions I have encountered in person, there are some historically significant cases that needed addressing for which I depend on interviews, video footage, photographs, and secondary sources.

Alongside innovations in practice, the writing of historians, theorists, and the artists themselves seeks to reinstate dance as a participant in, and generator of, the micro- and macro-ecologies that shaped contemporary art practice in the twentieth century and continue to shape it in the twenty-first. David Velasco and his team's impetus in publishing the MoMA *Modern Dance* series of publications is the latest iteration in a larger project to bring dance out from the shadows of the modern art monolith and articulate its singularity in relation to the same, but also to decenter historical narratives by viewing them from a new position.[41] From American art and film critic Annette Michelson to Lambert-Beatty, Anna Chave to Velasco, champions needed to emerge on the "other side" to realize this shift in perspective, but they have been slow coming. The work of British art theorist and philosopher Peter Osborne, alongside the writings of artist-theorists Henry Flynt and Sol LeWitt on which he draws, and Robert Pincus-Witten, provide a theoretical framework for connecting the second- and third-wave dance avant-garde that supports the importance of dance's contributions to our post-conceptual present. Osborne also models a close reading of the work of artist-theorists that forms the backbone of the method employed here and to which I shall return. Other visual arts scholars who provide relevant perspectives on the current condition of contemporary art include Hal Foster, Lucy Lippard, Robert Pincus-Witten, Alexander Alberro, Zöe Sutherland, and Claire Bishop. Theorists working within dance and performance studies who have turned their attention to the field under discussion include Noémie Solomon, Thomas F. DeFrantz, Bojana Cvejić, Catherine Damman, Isabelle Ginot, Jeroen Peeters, Ramsay Burt, Petra Sabisch, Rudi Laermans, André Lepecki, Mark Franko, and Alessandra Nicifero. Others, such as Marcella Lista, Kirsten Maar, Pamela Bianchi, and Josefine Wikström, have brought dance knowledges into their work in art theory and curation. This list includes some of the most recent thinking around the dance-gallery activity that is rapidly shifting, changing course, and evolving. To swim in the *current* is always an experiment, and my particular improvisation is heavy with citations and call-outs in order to map an emergent field of practice *and* discourse for respondents to come.

To briefly summarize the shape of *The Persistence of Dance*, the work of the dance and visual arts theorists, historians, and critics mentioned

above provide a complex field of discursive lenses that support my critical engagement with specific works, artists, and exhibitions within the field of dance as a contemporary art medium. This approach coalesces in Part II with the story of the emerging field as it has been presented via curatorial frameworks. Gallery and museum practices have played a major role in identifying key artists, setting the terms for how the field interfaces with its public, and creating the historical narratives within which such work is understood. Individual artist studies also appear in Part II, and include the important and pioneering work of Stuart, whose early gallery-based work has been largely overlooked and has been followed by her recent return to visual arts contexts. Part III attends to the male French conceptual artists who have come to represent the established dance avant-garde—Le Roy and Charmatz—to understand: (1) the emergence of the critical categories of *conceptual dance* and *choreography as concept* and associated redefinitions of key terms *dance* and *choreography*; (2) the continuities with the previous generation of iconoclasts and any new innovations; and (3) any bearing this has on the field of creative work I define as dance as a contemporary art medium, in order to finesse our definitions of the types of work that have appeared in galleries and museums. A close consideration of Charmatz's *Museé de la danse* (2009-2018) and *Manger* (2014) is helpful, particularly when put into dialogue with the more recent work of Adam Linder and the other case studies in Parts IV and V: Shelley Lasica, Maria Hassabi, and Agatha Gothe-Snape. Exploring the usefulness of the categories *conceptual* and *post-conceptual* in Parts III to V continues work begun in *Choreography, Visual Art and Experimental Composition 1950s-1970s* on the function of visual art categories and labels within dance studies, and helps clarify the historical, cultural, aesthetic, analytical, philosophical, and practical grounds on which the two art forms currently meet.

In Parts IV and V, artists working with choreography among the international contemporary art milieu are discussed not so much in relation to their "art historical inheritances," or through the performance studies lens that has dominated much discussion of the field, as pointed out by Wikström, but by considering their invention of new authorial modalities, working methodologies, and material manifestations that underscore the inheritance that dance as an art form has delivered to the contemporary arts at large.[42] The book concludes with the persistence of dance within the current post-context with a definition of *post-dance*. The "post" of "dance" can be understood with the help of Osborne who is describing the "post" of "conceptual" and "structuralism":

> . . . postconceptual art stands to conceptual art not as postmodern art was thought to stand to modern art, but rather as poststructuralism may be taken to stand to structuralism: namely, as its philosophical comprehension and the elaboration of its consequences.[43]

So, post-dance can be seen as an elaboration of the consequences of the project of contemporary dance as it played out in the twentieth century, the period in which it was also born. It allows us to imagine a specific field of creative practice engaged in the ongoing re-invention of dance and choreography in the twenty-first century both in terms of re-location (within the contemporary arts broadly rather than theater) and re-turn (to practices that it itself contributed uncredited knowledges to), as well as one that aspires to a general condition that is post-colonial, post-heteronormative, post-ableist, and post-neuronormative. The final case study, Latai Taumoepeau, orients us toward the future of the dance-gallery relationship, demonstrating the decolonizing, decentering, and indigenizing strategies that are reshaping the contemporary art world.

One last comment on the structure of the book. The five parts are divided into chapters and case studies to avoid hierarchical relations between theory and practice in the units of the book. The reader will find some of both in all sections as they have informed each other in developing the arguments that follow. While there is a narrative flow and sequential construction of my case for a distinct set of artists working between and across the cultures of dance and contemporary art, the challenges of a deeply intermedial project are accounted for in this design as readers with specialized knowledge in one field or another can choose their own journey between sections, rehearsing aspects of either art theory or dance analysis, exhibition chronologies, and choreographic histories. I expect the reader can choreograph their own dance among the various assemblages that constitute this work.

Case Study 1

Sarah Michelson—Choreography as Concept, Dancing as Material

Choreographer Sarah Michelson, an artist-in-residence at the Whitney Biennial 2012, won the Bucksbaum Award for best work for *Devotion Study #1—The American Dancer* (2012). For the first time a choreographic piece had taken the main prize in a visual arts exhibition for emerging American artists that has established the careers of many major names since becoming an annual event in 1932. This indicator of our post-medium condition spotlighted an artist who states emphatically that she is "A CHOREOGRAPHER" and who has both tested dance critics' measures for the art form *and* asserted a commitment to the discipline.[1] Michelson's residency seemed to be a turning point in the history of The Whitney, occurring at a time when the institution secured dedicated spaces for performance in a new building that opened three years later in 2015. The "multi-use space for film, video and the performing arts" joined Tate Modern's Turbine Hall as a performance-ready space in a major art institution, this time within The Whitney complex in the heart of New York.[2] However, in 2014 Michelson told her friend, *Time Out* critic Gia Kourlas, that she was ready "to go back" to her "home," the theater.[3] What was it about *Devotion Study #1*, an explicitly theatrical work, that pulled focus at the very moment the interest in dance from the visual arts world was at an all-time high?

Devotion Study #1 brilliantly and conscientiously brings the encounter between the discipline of dance and the visual arts institution into high relief, a strategy shared by many of the case studies that follow.[4] Distanced from the European focus on non-dance at this time, Michelson's work appeared at the height of the curatorial interest in dance and cut through with boldly disciplinary preoccupations couched in conceptual terms. The disciplinary work included turning The Whitney gallery space into a theater space, drawing attention to its floor as Michelson's primary

Sarah Michelson, *Devotion Study #1—The American Dancer*, February 26, 2012 at 2012 Whitney Biennial, Whitney Museum of American Art, New York. Photograph © Paula Court.

surface, stressing the limited temporal duration of the work through repetition, highlighting the agency of the dancers whose labor was foregrounded, referencing the American modern dance heritage that belongs to New York, and citing the reductive strategies through which dance and the visual arts moved into such close proximity in the mid-twentieth century.[5] David Velasco notes that while Michelson had presented her choreography in the museum before this work, this is "the first to be sited in a museum gallery, to be not just proximate to the corridors of visual art but *of* them."[6] The focus on dancing in the museum or gallery as contemporary art—not part of public programs or relegated to archival work—is the subject of this book as we observe choreography moving into museum collections, including the museum's struggle to formulate an ethical framework for their dealings with dance and dancers.[7] As I trace developments from the mid-twentieth century to the recent field of work at the interface between dance and the gallery, we find the conceptual and material intricately bound to each other, quite often *through the conversion of material realities into conceptual propositions*.

Michelson was drawn to the vast fourth-floor gallery space of The Whitney (rather than the second floor where Whitney "legacy" works have taken place), which she set with minimal staging elements designed by herself with others: simple costumes, floor graphics, a neon sculpture of Michelson by Charlotte Cullinan, text by Richard Maxwell read live by Michelson and Biennial curator Jay Sanders who were seated in the audience, sound, and lighting. The choreography consisted of five dancers entering the 5000-foot-square space one at a time, walking backwards in a variation of a triplet (a Merce Cunningham travelling step in three-quarter time, one flat step, two on a rise), arms raised horizontally, in time with a metronome beating at 152 beats per minute. Moments of stillness gave the dancers some reprieve as they stood, stationary, for a pause that Michelson stretched to ten minutes, a much-needed rest but one which extended the parameters of inactivity-as-agency to an almost untenable degree. The dance repeated one movement—walking—which continued for one hour and 20 minutes for Nicole Mannarino who was the first and last dancer to appear in the space.

Michelson describes it as "an exhibition of the dancer's devotion to dance."[8] She elaborates: "we spend our lives and our beings and our money, hours and hours in the studio . . . this form, this interest, and it's our lives . . . this is what I have done with my life, this is it."[9] The large neon image of Michelson mentioned above looked down on the dancers from one of the walls. Esteemed dance critic Deborah Jowitt describes how "the dancing becomes increasingly amazing" due to the dancers' commitment to their task.[10] Michelson states:

> The rehearsal process was definitely a labor of love. Especially between me and [dancers] Eleanor [Hullihan] and Nicole Mannarino . . . it was about the task, and how the dancers kept trying to apply themselves to the task . . . I started thinking about the American dancer in *Devotion* (2011). I started understanding it as a kind of clarity, like Modernism with a capital M.[11]

The figure of "the American dancer" is evoked in *Devotion Study #1*, in tune with the earlier *Devotion* presented at The Kitchen and the Walker Art Center, in which Michelson employed what Velasco describes as a "mythopoetic" mode.[12]

That figure also played an important role in the mid-twentieth-century Neo-Dada configuration dominated by John Cage, Cunningham, and Robert Rauschenberg outlined in *Choreography, Visual Art and Experimental*

Composition 1950s-1970s, and in the ensuing historical shift toward conceptual art that is discussed in Chapter 6.[13] Cunningham, Michelson's teacher in the early 1990s, had passed away two years prior to the premiere of *Devotion Study #1*. She told curator Philip Bither that she found herself explaining who he was to one of her young dancers, Non Griffiths.[14] The discipline and labor that Rauschenberg so admired in Cunningham's company was part of a longer tradition of rigor, both physical and conceptual, that contemporary dance brought to the renovation of classical ballet. Focused work with the materiality of the body remained central to the experiments of the second-wave dance avant-garde that embraced the pedestrian, utilitarian, and aleatory, experiments which are referred to in the account of dance elements in Chapter 7. The proximity of medium/material and experimental composition in the work of the mid-twentieth-century dance artists was linked to other key concerns such as process, improvisation, and performance. Michelson presses this history through the commitment of her dancers to the task at hand, underlining the disciplinary through a kind of "dignity," in Velasco's words, that equates to a kind of advocacy.[15]

Michelson's comparison of her American dancer with Modernism underlines the reference to the historical figure in her work, a critically distant view presenting us with *the dancer as an idea*. The dancers' physical duress that is much commented on in reviews, presents dance as a *discipline* in the sense of Foucault's systematic subjection of the individual to an external code.[16] This subjection becomes "impossible to dodge," in André Lepecki's words.[17] But the terser demonstration of consensual subjection through the exposition of labor by the sweat-drenched dancer is converted, as Lepecki points out, to devotion through the work's title.[18] This confers agency back to the dancer who demonstrates unreasonable, irrational but dedicated behavior underscoring both the strength and mystery of disciplinary work. Michelson thus presents us with dance in its disciplinary condition, drawing momentum from its proximity to contemporary art to re-stage the question, "what is a dance?"[19] The result is summarized by her colleague Ralph Lemon: the work "changes contemporary dance as I know it."[20]

In *Devotion Study #1* this revival of an older disciplinary formation for the choreographer-dancer relationship was addressed with sardonic wit in the god-like neon presence of Michelson above the action. Michelson's use of portraiture (of herself and her dancers) mobilized a visual art trope to glibly raise the profile of her collaborators to "stars," and she made a

pin-up of Mannarino whose image, "hippie-angelic in her electric-blue jumpsuit," has come to stand for the prize-winning work.[21] Presenting the work as part of the Whitney Biennial 2012, the importance of the choreographer-dancer relationship across the history of contemporary dance was spotlighted in the novel context of the art museum with its different conditions regarding agency and authorship. When the media of the artwork are living, complex subjects, how does the institution navigate their status? Where some of the exhibitions cited in *The Persistence of Dance* model a dancer-for-hire paradigm, Michelson's relationship with her dancers is informed by their specificity and singularity. She states, "the shows themselves aren't just about dance steps . . . they're about the people who are doing them and where."[22] Kourlas goes so far as to say that in Michelson's prior work with Mike Iveson, Parker Lutz, and Greg Zuccolo (2002-2005), the audience were privy to "a private world," where the dancers' "presence defined the works more than the choreography did."[23]

Minimal differences became dramatic shifts in this austere work (Jowitt registers surprise when they bend forward at some point), but the visual arts audiences started drifting away after about eight minutes.[24] In a 2010 interview with Lemon, Michelson describes how her work is "really directed toward a certain kind of dance lover, someone who's watching—really watching, and watching in context, and watching completely."[25]

> Loads and loads of people walked out, which I started to find quite energizing . . . In a weird way, dance audiences are incredible and dance is really fucking hard to watch. We're dedicated to this rigor of watching as well as making it new. It is an entire rigor that we have. Not that an art audience couldn't have that, but we just have the practice of it. That felt rewarding and clarifying in a strange way.[26]

The contract between dancer and audience regarding labor is undertheorized in dance studies. While dance spectatorship has been understood kinaesthetically, the commitment of dance audiences has a temporality and perceptual depth that requires cultivation and immersion which works in tandem with affective forces. *How to Look at Dance* is a guidebook for the general public that is yet to be written, and the communities of criticality in localized dance oeuvres are currently where such training occurs. Velasco notes of *Devotion Study #1*, "the devoted audience meets the devoted dancer," not only in terms of attention and rigor, but also regarding intradisciplinary references (to Cunningham and Tharp in particular).[27]

Michelson's interest in the context of a given work is clear in both her choreographic output, and in her discussions of her practice in which she refers to it repeatedly. Velasco notes her intra-textual inclusion of "institutional agents and supports" in her work, with curators, programmers, and directors featured in person or through portraiture as scenography. This sits alongside a wily colonization of institutional architectures. It all adds up to a telescopic vision including "the site, the network, the milieu," triggered by the task of creation itself.[28] But it begins with the physical realities of the space. Her preoccupation with the floor of the gallery saw her map the original blueprint of The Whitney onto an installed sprung floor as a surface for the work. In her following choreography in the same space—*4* (2014)—she and curator Sanders painted 220 squares of flooring in the same colors as the existing tiles (an inappropriate dance surface), noting that the floor in that work is "maybe the most important thing about that dance."[29] Attention to the floor of the gallery space underlines the re-orientation of the visual paradigm from the vertical walls to the horizontal plane of the floor in the dance-gallery encounter. New perspectives on the material forms of the art institution through the introduction of dancing bodies into its spaces was combined here with a critique of art as commodity, testing the limits of materiality, objectification, and accumulative value with the factory-line approach to the floor panel paintings and the fact that Michelson's choreographies do not form a repertoire of works to be repeated. Her works have, at most, two consecutive seasons, and each work departs significantly from the former in style and form, responding to specific contexts, with degrees of self-quotation self-consciously nodding toward an ongoing body of work.[30]

In relation to *Devotion Study #1*, Michelson's telescopic grasp of context was applied to the task set for her "of making contemporary the legacy of performance in the Whitney."[31] Reviewing the work, Jowitt notes that the first time she saw dancing at The Whitney "it was in 1971 and Trisha Brown's dancers were walking on two walls of one of the huge galleries."[32] Brown was performing for the first time in The Whitney and the work was *Walking on the Wall* (1971), part of her cycle called *Equipment Pieces*. As part of *Another fearless dance concert*, Brown's choreography *was* the art in the space curated by herself, in the same way *Devotion Study #1* and *4* were. Susan Rosenberg notes that Brown "located dance on every available wall space: the floor, three adjacent walls, and the ceiling."[33] Michelson contemporized the legacy of performance at The Whitney by bringing explicit disciplinary business from dance such as the dancer's labor (as

devotion), authorial signature (ironically), and singularity and specificity ("these dancers, this work") into the art institution as concepts refined through reflexivity. However, Brown had led the way regarding dance-fundamentals-as-concept (gravity), a critique of presentation surfaces in the gallery, and spatio-temporal iteration (the "study," the cycle) in her earlier work. The pioneering work of Brown is the historical precondition for Michelson's intermedial encounter in The Whitney. Such continuities and departures between the second- and third-wave dance avant-garde are discussed in Part III, specifically in relation to their ongoing dialogue with the visual arts. But first, setting out the knowledges and tools of dance up front in Chapter 2 establishes some disciplinary foundations that have been put into dialogue with other fields of art (specifically sculpture) since the emergence of contemporary dance as a discrete art form, and understands those knowledges and tools specifically in light of this interface.

Chapter 2

Intermedial Methodologies

Dance Composition and the Work of the Work

2.1. Introduction

Practical negotiations between artistic media are an opportunity for dance, as a relatively unassertive art form, to sharpen its own terms through active, dialogic deployment. In 1987, Australian choreographer Shelley Lasica, who was already working in gallery contexts at the time, wrote an article pre-empting the position taken in this book and its companion on the disciplinary versus the interdisciplinary. She critiques the operations of historiography (in this instance Sally Banes's accounts of American "post-modern" dance), raising many issues that it would take years for others to arrive at. This includes her take on the complexity of the backstory for the emerging field of dance as a contemporary art which she traces to Anna Halprin. Her comments on the way forward for critical work within the field of dance studies are prophetic and worth repeating at length:

> . . . there are two ways to go: to align dance with other art forms such the visual arts, to beg that it be seen and given the same critical space and import; or to allow dance to find its own language and sources—to see it for what it is and not in terms of 'the other.' It is finally unacceptable to impose the discourse of one activity onto another and hope that it fits somehow; to do so is to underline dance's supposed inferiority as a medium. But perhaps it is not a matter of an either/or situation . . . what is proposed is a discussion of modernism and postmodernism *in relation to* dance, not simply a discussion of modern and post-modern dance.[1]

In an associated footnote, Lasica also warns against dance studies hiding behind "great thinkers" as a distraction from "discussing the work itself."[2] What follows continues a critical project that grounds itself in the "language and sources" of contemporary dance and the specificities of particular works, while acknowledging the aesthetic conditions of Modernism and its post- (in particular the legacies of conceptual work) as the ground that dance shares with the other arts, thus bringing disciplinary tools to intermedial discourses.

Central to this work is the premise that contemporary dance is a form of *experimental composition*.[3] Such creative work is produced through, performed with, and requires analysis engaging in an "experimental attitude," defined by Australian theorist Stephen Muecke as "keeping things alive in their place."[4] Such experiments involve being context-aware, sensitive to participatory networks, self-reflective, speculative, inventive, and affirmative. This prioritizes the local conditions of the work of art regarding its disciplinary origins, performance context, and moment of execution, down to the detail of corporeal specificity and the manipulation of identifiable elements of the composition such as tone, texture, and weight. In this way I hope to stay true to the "signature of the thing," to use Muecke's phrase, to remain within its orbit or influence.[5]

So this book aims to engage with the poetics of each case study, where poetics refers to "the resources that the practice itself has chosen," and for this reason draws on a dance lineage focused on the materiality of the body, its biological parameters, mind-body operations, and the resulting elements specific to the art form of dance.[6] The radical developments in dance in the twentieth century catalyzed a (generalized) disciplinary shift in the mid-century from spectacle to experience, from projected body-image to sensation, which took the disciplinary explorations of the art form to a new level. The history of dance composition (which is covered in detail so well elsewhere), forms the backdrop for a survey of dance principles (this chapter) and dance elements (Chapter 7) which draws on dance and choreographic analysis, including European body cultures, American modernists, African-American dance scholars, and French movement analysis.[7] That history is as radical as it is brief—stepping into the deconstructive tendencies of the modernist/post-modernist project almost from the art form's inception at the beginning of the twentieth century.[8] This genealogy stretches back to the nineteenth century in the work of Frenchmen François Delsarte and Émile Jaques-Dalcroze, through the work of

modernists such as Doris Humphrey and Rudolf von Laban, across the mid-twentieth-century lineage of Margaret H'Doubler, Halprin, and Simone Forti, and the emergence of Western somatic practices through the work of Mabel Elsworth Todd and Bonnie Bainbridge Cohen et al., to the late twentieth-century wave of French movement analysis in the work of Laurence Louppe and kinesiologist and movement researcher Hubert Godard, and the concurrent revisions of the African-American scholars. *The Persistence of Dance* thus contributes to a new chapter in dance composition studies spearheaded by figures within French, Belgian and American dance theory, which engages intensively with practice through collaboration with artist-experts.[9]

2.2 Poetics as Method

Louppe's concept of the "poetics of contemporary dance" provides a method that is committed to artist-led knowledges and processes and allows for rigorous attention to the characteristic elements, terms of production, and modes of circulation particular to a given artwork:

> A poetics seeks to define and uncover in a work of art what touches us, animates our sensibility, and resonates in our imagination. Thus, poetics is the ensemble of creative conducts that give birth, meaning and sensuous existence to a work. . . . It does not only tell us what a work of art does to us, it teaches us how it is made.[10]

As this quote describes, poetics is focused on the internal operations (practices), sensuous form (products), and spectatorial affects (sensations) of a work of art, understanding the latter through the former. The work is not autonomous of the affects it engages, but is constituted through them; as Louppe states, "every work of art is a dialogue."[11] In addition, poetics is not an analytical method that takes up "a critical position outside the making of dance."[12] For this reason it does not focus on interpretation and decoding meaning (although these things are not excluded), but rather "the implicit prerequisites out of which the realm of appearances opens up."[13] This attention to *the work of the work* as it exists in its encounter with the world sits squarely with Louppe's aim to assert the discipline of dance within its twentieth-century milieu.[14]

Louppe sets out the parameters of her task in *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*:

> Only a considerable corporeal and philosophical labour to renew theoretical tools will allow us to advance towards the unknown along a path that contemporary dance has been down so many times before: to set free the luminous modes of practice (more than of representation) . . . without ever allowing a limit to be set.[15]

Questions of method, history, practice, knowledge, and potential/limitation frame her project and set out the terms for what follows here. Repetition, revision, return: these apparently oppositional forces to freedom and advancement are the very ground that opens practice to the contemporary, that heterogeneous collusion of what is present. Australian dance scholar Sally Gardner corroborates the need to further develop tools for articulating and disseminating dance practices and knowledges:

> If there is a dearth of shared, experiential, embodied reference points for sharing dance research, there is also no ready-to-hand, widely accepted professional or disciplinary dance discourse. Verbalising about dance is by definition interdisciplinary.[16]

Here Gardner underlines the deeply interdisciplinary history of dance composition studies. Health reform at the turn of the twentieth century provided the context for focused attention on our bodies and the knowledges and aesthetic possibilities held there. The field of somatics developed as an "alternative science," challenging the establishment with anecdotally based accounts of mind-body research that were, ultimately, run out of town (in the case of Todd at least).[17] Elsewhere, choreographic tools were developed, formalized, and disseminated in classrooms and publications. The knowledges accumulating from these areas of research formed the basis of the developing field of contemporary dance, which also drew on philosophy (e.g., John Dewey, Friedrich Nietzsche), science (biology, anatomy), music (composition and performance), and technology (photography, electric light, cinema). The terminology describing this new art form borrowed from all of these fields, but Gardner is also pointing to the special relationship between dancing and language, in and of itself, which constitutes a translation from one medium to another.

2.3 Writing Dancing

If dance is—relative to the other arts—undisciplined, unregulated, and unassertive, one danger is that the achievements of dance may be obfuscated when a lack of regulation combines with a resistance to translation into the language of institutionalized knowledge. But this translation is not without its challenges. Choreographer Mette Ingvartsen, who developed platforms for sharing choreographic tools and methods, puts it simply: "verbal articulation and discursive practice is not the most evident mode of expression in relation to dance as an art form that is primarily physical, corporeal, and non-verbal."[18] Louppe describes how contemporary dance engages body zones "which have not yet mastered a discourse . . . (the chest, the thorax, back and shoulders)," looking back to Vaslav Nijinsky's reformulation of the geography of the body to open up movement possibilities, and citing other historical examples of object-like heads and unsupportive feet.[19] Working in a field engaging heavily with the operations of *sensation*, which is bound to perception and the operations of the body, the conversion to language as a linear grammatical system can be reductive, approximate, and even misleading. So, I proceed with an acceptance of the limitations of the medium through which we all work, whether it is choreography or writing.

Theorists who lay out some dance elements, and who will be referenced throughout the book, include Humphrey, Susan Melrose, André Lepecki, Gardner, Bojana Cvejić, and Bojana Kunst. Humphrey's theory of dance composition is built upon the foundations of design, dynamics, rhythm, and motivation, a focus that owes much to her interest in architecture and visuality, and the use of musical models for organizing movement.[20] Melrose's recent article on the creative process in dance takes the late Rosemary Butcher's choreographies as her subject. She speaks of dance as being "outside of language" and troubles concepts of authorship, collaboration, reiteration, and work with characteristics such as multiplicity, singularity, and rhythmicity.[21] In her contribution to the *Post-Dance* publication of 2017, Kunst focuses on "the doing of dance" and its time, space, movement, physicality, energy, rhythm, power, exchange, context, weight, and materiality.[22] Lepecki's contribution to the *Move. Choreographing You* catalogue cites "corporeality, movement, and ephemerality" as elements "that had been deemed constitutive (and exclusive to) dance as an art form."[23] And, in her essay, "Notes on Choreography," Gardner focuses on

movement, kinaesthetics, process, intersubjectivity, and a resistance to language.[24] All of these themes, as well as other important writing that seeks to account for the parameters of the still emerging form, are present in the chapters and case studies that follow.

Among the dancer-theorists cited in this book, a key figure is Jonathan Burrows whose book *A Choreographer's Handbook* exemplifies a poetic and rigorous approach to compositional discourse for dance. Burrows and his creative partner, Matteo Fargion, are presented in the *Motion Bank* project (an online digital repository of choreographers' scores), alongside Deborah Hay, Bebe Miller, Thomas Hauert, and William Forsythe.[25] Anne Teresa De Keersmaeker's work with Cvejić on her book series has been important in uncovering the choreographic practice of a leading artist in the field. The Sarma website, facilitated by Belgian dramaturg, performer, and theorist, Myriam van Imschoot, hosts an important cluster of writers including Mette Ingvartsen, Chrysa Parkinson, Daniel Linehan, Eleanor Bauer, and many others. And in the United States, Jennifer Lacey, Tere O'Connor, Jennifer Monson, and Ralph Lemon represent some of the voices found in the *Movement Research* journal coming out of New York. Australian dance artists writing about their practice include Lasica, Rhiannon Newton, Lizzie Thomson, Vicki Van Hout, Matthew Day, and Rebecca Hilton. The writing of dance artists has been the greatest pleasure to read throughout the process of writing this book, and much more could be done to honor this specific genre of artist-writing that so rigorously brings the thinking-doing body to light.

2.4 The Limit Features of Dance's Social Condition (Part 1)

Regarding intermedial work, as Dorothea von Hantelmann states, "when you mix something, it's good to know your ingredients. That's one lesson to be learnt from the avant-gardes: conventions are quite powerful."[26] In Chapter 7, dance elements are described as we head into case studies that exemplify the persistence of dance as a discipline in this intermedial work: *breath*, *weight*, *tone*, *movement (qualities)*, *force/energy/effort*, *rhythm*, and *space-time*. These terms are directly related to the physiological operations of the body and constitute a set of discipline-specific variables for dance. Other foundational principles frame and support these terms and the more global concerns of choreography as an art form are discussed in

this chapter: *the mind-body*, *singularity/collectivity*, *presence/participation*, *process, practice, composition, and performance*.

The conservatism that haunts any project interested in disciplinary formations provides a challenge: to account for the *limit-features* of an art form that constitute its *social condition* and identity, while concurrently describing the radical testing of those limits within experimental practice. A focus on elements that have constituted the *grammatical parameters* of dance must necessarily take into account the role of the same as points for resistance, subversion, critique, revision and dismissal.[27] Hence a return to the body and movement in what follows, elements of the art form that have provided the richest fields of limitation and transgression in recent work. Through such a revision, I can offer a set of elements for dance in its post-disciplinary, intermedial condition, bringing us closer to an account of their influence among key moments in the expanded field of contemporary art.

I must also acknowledge that there can be no question of constructing a comprehensive account of such materials. As Louppe points out, Laban's four factors—and any account of fundamentals—are "only a step in the search for 'choreographic materials' that are more global and also more disseminated so as to escape fixed frames of adjudication."[28] There is no attempt here, for instance, to account for choreographic strategies, or "ideas" in Forsythe's terms; that "class of ideas" that can be contained in the term "choreography" and which describe "a possible course of action" (e.g., fragmentation, repetition, interruption, etc.).[29] The focus here is firmly on dancing as the material of choreographic experiments. So I proceed with an understanding that this is a relational and contingent exercise. Cultural, biographical, and social experiences and understandings of these terms cannot be elided in attending to specific case studies.[30] Readers familiar with the dance studies heritage may see the inclusion of this focus as a retrograde step, recalling regulatory prescriptions that fuelled the radical rejection of dance and its trappings in the 1990s. However, in the intermedial context of this project, an account of the tools and strategies discovered and developed within dance is intended to redress an imbalance in visual arts texts that reveal an ignorance of such histories. Curator Yvane Chapuis writes, "the fine arts have, for almost two hundred years, produced a reflexive discourse that dance knows little about."[31] The opposite is actually the case: very little visual arts criticism references or includes dance theory and analysis. Underlining a tradition of disciplinary

clarity in the field of dance in this study of deeply intermedial practices aims to even up the balance between the two critical fields to match developments in practice.

Mind-Body

Some attention to the first and most significant of the foundational principles, the *mind-body*, will open onto others. This key concept is the source of many of the other foundations of dance: *presence* and *awareness* as the conditions for feeding receptivity and sensitivity; *process* as the mode for an expansion of the pre- and post-cognitive; *imagination* as the field of exploration and instigation; and a shuttling between *subject* and *collective* or context involving a decentering of a controlling consciousness to be open to other proximate forces and subjectivities. This follows Laurence Louppe and other artists and theorists writing about dance practice and composition who find the mind-body processes that drive movement invention and performance to be at the heart of the art form. As a corollary, for Louppe the central characteristic of contemporary dance is the explicit rejection of the mind-body divide.[32] Mind-body dualism is an invention of modern philosophy, a field that has struggled ever since to overcome that divide.[33] In his essay, "Can Thought Go On Without A Body?," written in the late 1980s, philosopher Jean-François Lyotard states:

> The body might be considered the hardware of the complex technical device that is human thought. If this body is not properly functioning, the ever so complex operations, the meta-regulations to the third or fourth power, the controlled deregulations of which you philosophers are so fond, are impossible.[34]

So even here, as Lyotard is attempting to redress the prioritizing of the mind in philosophy, the body is still in service of thought and the operations of philosophy that depend on the same. The notion that the body may operate in a system of knowledge acquisition or experience that doesn't culminate in language-based operations has only recently found adequate articulation in theories relating to affect with their provenance in the writings of Baruch Spinoza. As Gilles Deleuze states:

> The body is no longer the obstacle that separates thought from itself, that which it has to overcome to reach thinking. It is on the contrary that which

> it plunges into or must plunge into, in order to reach the unthought, that is life.[35]

Dance-based tools such as kinaesthetic awareness, muscle memory, and body consciousness have named and thus helped mobilize and refine precognitive bodily processes and experiences *through practice*—which is the only way to know and understand how they operate. Dance artist and theorist Nalina Wait's definition of the sensorium and proprioception are at the heart of *kinaesthesia, and here she* describes the material or medium at work:

> Sensorium is a biological term for the network of somaesthetic receptors and processing centres for the sensory modalities that cover the skin, skeletal muscles, bones, joints, fascia, epithelia (tissue that lines the surface of the body, alimentary canal, and other hollow organs), cardiovascular system, and internal organs. The sensorium includes proprioception, temperature, nociception (pain), haptic perception (touch), exteroception (the perception of the outside world), and introception (the perception of internal organs and sensations). The sensorium collects and sends information about what the body is doing and feeling to the central nervous system which processes this information and then directs the physiological systems (muscular, endocrine, circulatory, respiratory, and digestive) to respond in the way that best supports the continuation of life (homeostasis)[36]

Processes and associated practices that attend to, and develop, kineasthetic awareness support the suspension of the good-bad paradigm of mimetically focused dance methods so that the work of movement exploration can begin.

Kinaesthetically aware processes are resistant to the scopic and are grounded instead in *sensations*, *intensities*, and the *imagination*; they exemplify practices "where the body-subject goes looking for itself."[37] Swedish choreographer Jefta van Dinther refers to this complex, unstable work in the realm of senses and experience as the work of "devotion," recalling Sarah Michelson, *Devotion Study #1—The American Dancer* (2012), Case Study 1, which also links devotion and dancing. He evokes the contemporaneous experience of the viewer:

> There is a devotion to our own bodily experience, i.e. creating a sensorial body, not set in time nor space, and a trust that through this experience

> an audience can have an experience. We as performers work on ourselves, affect ourselves, do and undo ourselves. We use our bodies to do that, explicitly and actively . . .[38]

Louppe's notion, that dance is "the experimental/experiential scene of being," resonates with van Dinther's description here of the labor of the dancer being on and through themselves as medium (mind-body), doing and undoing subjectivities through physical work, and recalling descriptions earlier regarding the shift from spectacle to sensation in mid-twentieth-century dance.[39]

It also becomes apparent how mind-body work with corporeal sensations and intensities calls for a shift in the field of *perception* from being dominated by vision to becoming decentered, plurisensorial, responsive, mobile, and virtuosic. As choreographer Anne Collod puts it, "dance is an experience of the importance of the phenomena of perception."[40] However, this model of perception is unchained from patterns of recognition and seeking the familiar, and is closer to *attention* as an open, dispersed, and non-assertive form of information-gathering mobilized by/mobilizing affect and sensation.[41] In 2011, I described this model of information-gathering in dance as "somatic intelligence" via Australian theorists Jane Goodall and William McClure. Working in this way, the dancer can circumvent the dangers of speechlessness associated with affect and sensation by channelling incoming stimuli into a corporeal loop so that what is experienced through the body stays with corporeal modes of expression, movement, and exchange.[42] Other theorists have described this as "thinking through the body."[43]

I would, however, like to reconsider the use of terms such as *thought*, *information*, and *intelligence* to ask: what is the appropriate verb for the process through which dancing comes into being? If it's not "thinking through dance," what is it? What is it to stay in the zone of sensation, expanding and thickening the experiential field before recognition, using methods such as interruption, repetition, exhaustion, or constant variation? And how can we name this? What is the verb for this "embodied decision-making" characterized by a decentralized multiplicity within each movement and between each moment that is corporeal/somatic, but also fed by "mental, imaginative, memory-based and responsive processes"?[44] This action that is self-reflexive, relational, expanded, and durational? Is this a very specific type of poetic thought that is characterized by a commitment to the multiplicities of the decentered corporeal field, suspending the

shift away from experience and toward cognition? Is it, as Australian dance artist Rhiannon Newton suggests in her choreographic work, more aptly described as "doing dancing"?[45] Dance artist Chrysa Parkinson says, "if you think of the material of performance as perception, or as relationship (as Deborah [Hay] would say), then some form of 'doing it' to understand it makes sense."[46] Dancing, then, exists in the doing, and understanding it is therefore contingent upon the doing and can't exist without it. As Newton says, a focus on doing "takes attention away from pre-emptive or reflective cognition." *Doing dancing*.[47]

Singularity/Collectivity

The focus on mind-body processes not only takes us to the origins of movement invention; it is also the source of a singularity that has been considered a characteristic of contemporary dance. As Godard states, "it's always a matter of a unique dancer in relation to a unique spectator."[48] In recent definitions of dance and choreography, a traditional understanding of singularity has been set against a new emphasis on collectivity (to which I shall return). According to the dance-as-singularity thesis, every individual negotiates the world via a specific gestural orientation or "corporeal signature" shaped by tangible cultural influences, invisible forces, and degrees of unconscious physiological work.[49] Melrose describes this "named, potentially singular, skilled dancer" as a product of the dancer's "bodywork as well as her ways of being in the world."[50] Elsewhere, I have described this as the dancer's idiogest: "the gestural parameters, performative domain, or corporeal specificity" of the dancer.[51] Dance emerges from, and reflexively plays with, this notion of singularity. If the medium of dance (the dancer in this instance) is specific, complex, and unrepeatable in its unique condition regarding physiology, training, disposition, spatiotemporal context, and presence within an encounter, it is also "knowing" of such conditions in its self-reflexivity.

At the center of Louppe's understanding of the project of contemporary dance is the assertion that "action is the consciousness of a subject in the world."[52] Her book features choreographers from the late twentieth century whose research propelled them toward "heterogeneous and profoundly individual vision[s]."[53] Some dance theorists identify an attempt in more recent dance work to disconnect notions of particularity or individuality from the dancer in order to debunk "the figure of artist as unique and original source of the new [sic]," in line with the critique of the subject in the

post-structuralist project.[54] One could add into the mix here Yvonne Rainer's counter-argument in 1976 on the impossibility of a "neutral" body.[55] This came from an artist whose early experiments with the object-subject bind of dance (and those of her peers) were a development of Merce Cunningham's experiments with the same through his repression of traditional forms of expression in the dancer. Kunst describes the concept of "autonomy" as "one of the basic aesthetic utopias of early contemporary dance" that "seems today to be in ruins, together with its emancipatory effects and self-rotating exclusiveness."[56] However, in a 2003 article, Burrows and his one-time collaborator Jan Ritsema describe "the feeling that we are composed by our life in which we perceive and experiment and are perceived and experimented on by other internal and external parts," linking this to Spinoza's "celebration of individuality."[57] So questions of the subjection and/or empowerment of the subject in and through dance persist.

The broader critique of the subject within philosophical discourse impacted dance studies most significantly in the application of Michel Foucault's theories of the subjected body to various critical projects. Foucault's work described the impossibility of the body-subject escaping subjection to sociocultural conditioning, and this theory was applied to various codified dance forms whose centrality within dance pedagogy was being challenged.[58] Unfortunately, *all* dancing bodies were equally condemned through the application of Foucault's subjected body discourse, with slivers of hope coming to light recently through attention to Foucault's 1966 radio interview, "Utopian Body," in which proprioception figures as an exit from subjection.[59]

An alternative discourse on the dancing subject is Kunst's definition of *autonomy*. In her revision of the term, autonomy in dance "is not a static essentialist concept" bound to "originality," but "an artificial process where links of representation and necessity to the modern subject can be disclosed."[60]

> [For philosophers, dance's] autonomous streak reveals a different (perhaps imaginary and artificial) *history* . . . a history of evasiveness and instability, where representation is inefficient due to a freedom lurking in stitches and cracks; a place where the body is allowed to glitter without form, freely generating a playful tension between its presence and disappearance. It is not a history of representation any longer, of taking the place of the Other—it is an artificial, playful process of performing, where different potentialities of embodiments are disclosed.[61]

This resonates with van Dinther's "devotion" of the dancer to working on the unstable material of their own dancing body, and with the description of dance earlier as emerging from, and reflexively playing with, a specific physical world—embracing its inherent "instability" and constant modification, tiny discrepancies (in "stitches and cracks"), ephemerality ("glitter without form"), and the materiality and fragility of its "presence." In such a scenario, individuality is put into play with many other forces and options. For instance, Burrows and Ritsema comment on "the pleasure of recognising individuality as a product of all possible possibilities."[62] This network of *specificities*, *possibilities*, *and limitations* produces the autonomy and singularity of the dance.

The apparent opposite of singularity is "collectivity," and here I quote American choreographer Jennifer Lacey on the collective imperative in dance/choreography as a practice:

> Dance is about people spending time together, thinking by behaving, and modify [*sic*] their thoughts by modifying their behavior: it is potentially a very powerful work.[63]

The collective dimension of choreography returns us to questions of the art form's disposition as unassertive, open, and inclusive, and thus, its particular facility for intermedial experiments. It could be persuasively argued that theater and film are infinitely more collective than dance as an art as dance is often developed through solo practice. But the special condition of dance as social, relational, and medial is set out in scholar-artist Noémie Solomon's notion of *en-dehors* as "a constitutive technology of the choreographic discipline that shapes the dancing body and its conditions of visibility"; an "ontological and ethical impulse" outwards, upon which the very condition of singularity depends on the establishment of difference.[64]

In a 2008 interview with Christophe Wavelet, French choreographers Jérôme Bel and Xavier Le Roy agree that the main difference between dance and the visual arts—specifically in training and creative process—is that the visual arts promotes the singularity of the artist, while "choreographies suppose a certain communion: of bodies, of movements, of their capacities, and their way of offering all of these a visibility."[65] Le Roy went so far as to base a teaching method on this; "the aim is to start afresh from the fact that all choreography in general presupposes a collective experience. It's no doubt the specificity that is characteristic of this field of art."[66] How-

ever, comments from Bel on his process suggest that his emergence as an "auteur" depended upon a very singular experience. When asked how he tried out his choreographic ideas, he answers, "in isolation. Alone."[67] On his work *Jérôme Bel* (1995) he states:

> as I had, first of all, worked out everything alone, I was able to show [the performers] the actions necessary . . . As the propositions were very specific, there wasn't much to discuss. The aim was to be concise and efficient.[68]

For Bel, collectivity moves away from the very traditional model of the choreographer-dancer relationship described here when he turns to his understanding of "the audience function" as the site of the work's "resolution." He states, "what interests me isn't the performance, it's what it articulates, what it addresses to all those who come that night to see/receive it: the audience," as "ephemeral community."[69] So the collective impulse of dance includes not only the choreographers and dancers, but also the audience, the component of the mise-en-scène of performance that Frédéric Pouillaude so nicely links to the very term *contemporary*. He describes contemporaneity as "*a neutral simultaneity*, a *contingent coexistence* . . . all that belongs to a particular time."[70] This definition can be applied to "the contemporaneity of performers and onlookers," but also to the performance itself, which "conserves the heterogeneity of the spectacular elements without hierarchizing them."[71] It also chimes with art theorist Terry Smith's notion that "contemporaneity is the fundamental condition of our times," and that "being with" (con) "time" (tempus) is what makes contemporary art contemporary in ways that are distinct from the modern and post-modern.[72] If this is the case, it explains the currency of choreography as a model for an "ontology of the present" suited to such a condition.[73]

A *non-hierarchical community* describes the aspiration of some of the most radical dance experiments of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, including collaborative creative teams exemplified in the Cage-Cunningham-Rauschenberg legacy. Contemporary choreographer Trajal Harrell has evoked the Judson community as exemplary regarding models of an ethical-social context for art and art-making, citing "rapport" as key to his practice:

> I think in dance, unlike any other field, the support from those with whom you compete for support is . . . critical. How many of us could have any

> kind of work without the professional support of our colleagues? The same colleagues we compete with for money, gigs, re-cognition, etc. . . . I think the precarious economics of dance requires a kind of mutual collegiality that isn't necessary in, say, the visual arts where there is more potential for economic freedom.[74]

The "audience of artists" that Catherine Craft has written about in relation to the mid-century North American art scene operates in an even more intense way in the close communities of artists working in independent contemporary dance, where discussions about the lack of life-work division frame broader ramifications regarding modes of process, practice, and production.[75]

Presence/Participation[76]

When asked what is essential to dance, Jonathan Burrows answered, "presence":

> For in this immaterial and impermanent of art forms in an increasingly disposable global art market, no structure, score, improvisation, material, image, movement or idea can ever matter enough to argue. In this we begin and end with the image of a human being walking onstage to endure, resist or confront an audience, whose discomfort reveals something to us about our own uncertainty and bloody-mindedness in the world.[77]

Burrows is arguing that what is essential to the art form is not so much the content of a dance (method, resources, concepts), which rate little in generic art economies, but the time-space of a confrontation or co-presence and what that encounter does to its participants: the affects and effects of presence. Perhaps this is what Mary Wigman meant in 1963 when she described how, in her work as a choreographer, she "toiled and worked on the human being, with the human being, and for the human being."[78]

To consider the presence of the dancing body is to turn wholeheartedly to the subject-object issue as it relates to dance. As Sally Gardner and many others have pointed out, "body-subjects are both the agents and the objects of their own actions and are continually transformed by them . . . bodies exist only insofar as these emerge in the dynamic particularity from the flux and organizing forces of social actions, movements and

vitalities."[79] These subject-objects are the *processing centers* within specific situations, with agency, responsiveness, and adaptability, characteristics that set them apart from other gallery-based phenomena. Carolyn Brown describes her memories of dancing with the Merce Cunningham Company in 1953:

> I remember almost nothing. The essence of performing is its 'newness'—no mind, no memory. Just that brief time when one has a chance to be whole, when seemingly disconnected threads of one's being are woven and intertwined into the complete present. No other. No past. No future. No mind as an entity distinct from the body.[80]

Present tense and presence are interwoven here and recall the autonomy of dance; according to Kunst, "autonomy is not about the *exclusiveness* of the moment, but about *different possibilities of presence and being in the present*."[81]

A playfulness with the "different possibilities of presence and being in the present" exemplifies the autonomy of dance, pointing to an agency that interferes with repressive models of subjection or a simple collapsing of the subject and object. As a verb formation, the notion of *doing* dancing introduced earlier cleaves some space between the dancing as an outcome and the doing as a process. "Being with dance," as Newton terms it, puts the subject into a *relation* with dancing, a virtual distance that interferes with the direct inspiration or intuition cited by artists such as Isadora Duncan. This space could be characterized by what Newton describes as "an increasingly specific logic between the dancer, the environment and the accumulating dance," which is not necessarily cognitive, but is experimental and contingent.[82] In such a situation—exemplified in the historic and contemporary dance avant-garde—the role of a dance foundation such as presence is not denied, but expanded, tested, and revised. As Kunst says:

> This moment of presence has nothing to do with authenticity, originality, with geography or territory, but with an always artificial construction of autonomy—which itself is nothing more than a *masquerade*, an artificial tactic of presence and being present at the same time, a strategy that potentially discloses a different moment.[83]

Some strategies that have been identified among this general critique of presence include stasis, replication, documentation, duration, and dis-

appearance. On the latter, Lepecki writes, "what could this daring thing be in dance, since invisibility, imperceptibility, and modesty all go against the consistent privileging of 'presence' in Western theatrical dance? This privileging of presence seems to be predicated on a 'powerful narcissistic capacity'."[84] So the critique of presence in dance is linked to questions of authorship, and the question of where the dance begins and ends in terms of subjectivity.

In Burrows's account, presence depends upon a witness—the audience. The participatory potential of dance in terms of spectatorship is linked to its profile as a collective method, as described above, and is one of its most appealing aspects in the museum context which has been traditionally yoked to artifacts, material archives, and objects.[85] In the approach to spectatorship within dance studies, social dance has a special place regarding participatory practices. In a theater dance context, various theories have attempted to account for the phenomena of experiencing movement when *watching* dance in a co-present situation. *Kinaesthetic empathy* has been in circulation for some time and an early version was introduced in 1946 by dance critic John Martin who wrote of "the inherent contagion of bodily movement, which makes the onlooker feel sympathetically in his own musculature the exertions he sees in somebody else's musculature."[86] Mary M. Smyth took a more scientific approach to the subject in 1984, concluding that "if there is kinesthetic communication such that we experience a sense of movement when we do not move, then this must be mediated via the other senses and we need to ask how this can be done."[87] The discovery of mirror neurons, "synaptic connections in the cortex that fire both when one sees an action and when one does that action," offered one scientific explanation for the phenomena.[88] However, the plurisensoriality hinted at by Smyth (and mentioned in the discussion of the mind-body) is addressed at length in the work of Godard.

In Godard's discussion with interviewer Suely Rolnik, titled "Blindsight," he draws on his important work in dance and movement research and analysis to describe sensorial aspects of the art encounter as participatory, non-vision-centric experiences.[89] His focus here is on the work of visual artist Lygia Clark in order to describe a new type of visual art work in the mid-twentieth century that was calling for (or responding to) alternative modes of perception. He fleshes out the spectatorial dimension of the plurisensorial work described earlier in relation to the mind-body of the dancer, bringing the two together. Drawing on his knowledge of kinesiology, biomechanics, and physical rehabilitation, Godard explains

subjective vision—as opposed to objective vision—as "subcortical," where "the person blends into the context. There is no longer a subject and an object, but a participation in a general context."[90] This vision is not related to time, gravity, history of the subject, or interpretation, but is "more of the order of 'geographic' vision" informed as the subject moves in space-time.[91] He refers to this type of vision as "blindsight" and describes not being able to see the chair directly in front of you but still being able to negotiate around it *indirectly*.[92] This begins to sound less like vision and more like a network of sensorial exchanges shaping our experience of being and moving in the physical world. He refers to this as "intersensorial plasticity" or "plurisensoriality."[93]

Godard goes on to discuss movement development in contemporary dance in relation to this nexus between perception and movement production: if one's perception is expanded through engaging blindsight or plurisensoriality, then one's experience of space and movement potential is expanded and with this, the possible "movement of thought."[94]

> For a dancer, [plurisensoriality] is fundamental; dancers must be able to reproduce a movement they have seen, match it with a musical sound, and modulate their motor function accordingly . . . the work carried out in contemporary dance aims to do away with this compartmentalization [of the senses] which is caused by the catastrophe of language, by history.[95]

He applies this to the dance practice of contact improvisation which he posits as being beyond vision: "to try to be face-to-face with the other as weight, as contour, as colour, as a gesture, and to be in the urgency of these primal things—a kind of incredible vigilance . . . it is a peripheral, panoramic sight . . . which is the blindspot."[96] Godard thus outlines a model of participation in the art event that is informed by dance practice and clinical knowledge, and which offers an alternative to the static, occular-centric regime of the direct gaze of the visual art spectator that has been critiqued by new art practices and their commentators such as Claire Bishop, Susan Best, Amelia Jones, and Lucy Lippard.[97] These sophisticated ways of thinking about collectivity, presence and participation drawn from dance studies constitute a rich alternative to the reductive discourse and practices associated with the participatory or social turn driving the experience economy in museums and galleries in which dance has been expected to play a part.

Process[98]

Process in a dance context is usually associated with composition or choreography as opposed to training or performance, a stage of development that is invisibilized, that is, absorbed into a final, stable outcome.[99] As Parkinson notes, "most processes are finished once the piece is constructed."[100] In fact, choreography has been used as an analogy or concept to think through many processes resulting in both stable and unstable outcomes, including curation, as well as beyond the arts, say, in the emergence of social formations and political manoeuvres, as will be discussed in Chapter 5.[101] For Bojana Cvejić, "choreography stresses the design of procedures that regulate a process . . . This resonates with choreographers' and performance-makers' current theoretical, self-reflective obsession with working methods, procedures, formats, and performance scores."[102] The shift toward method over matter in dance, as in the other arts, began in earnest in the mid-twentieth-century milieu. Throughout this period, choreographic process was thoroughly worked over, reinvented, and radicalized through aleatory processes, game structures, rules and limitations, and improvisation. The legacy of this has had far-reaching effects. Parkinson notes that "contemporary dance is very good at creating original procedures. We are brilliant at finding rules and limitations to specify what we do. We are always making things up."[103] During the earlier period and up to the present, process as the condition of being ongoing, incomplete, and unstable has also been applied to other aspects of dance.

The strong affiliation that the choreographic arts have with process underlines the comparative material conditions of dance. Choreography is not reducible to a single performance, while painting, for instance, can be the equivalent of a static, commodified, singular object. Process is endemic to the form and is something in which it excels. Improvised performance in any media has claims to a special exhibition of process, collapsing composition and performance, but also often blurring with methods of training or practice. Beyond this special case, evidence of process is available in many forms across the arts (amended manuscripts, brush strokes, evidence of technical virtuosity), but these things are most often subordinate to a final, authoritative rendering or version. For dance, there is a role for process in all facets of the medium:

- the ongoing process of technical and creative aptitude that requires attention to a physical *practice*;

- the labour of *composition* which can require singular or collective effort over time and may remain open to change, that is, remain in process within performance; and
- the process of *performance* which can alter any stable or authoritative choreography through context.

Practice

In tune with the poetic method's emphasis on process and continuity of practice, many dance artists see performances as windows to an expanded situation that encompasses past, present, and future, and a gamut of activities and degrees of perceptibility. European-based Parkinson has written beautifully about dance practice, something she engages in and mentors others through. Asked to define practice she responds:

> I started with the idea that there's something I do that is not training, process, or product, and that this thing is what underlies the decisions I make about training, process, and product. And I wanted to call that thing my practice . . . Then I thought maybe I could say the underlying, over-arching thing I do is 'giving and getting attention.' Then, more recently, I thought maybe my practice is just performance . . . The most important thing to me about identifying my practice is noticing it change, letting it change . . . Once a practice is static, it's no longer functional. It becomes a marketable object, a product. Practices have to remain volatile, unstable enough to change.[104]

So practice is both the ground for, and the totality of, the work of the dancer-choreographer. It resists stabilization through naming, being a process that is continually changing and developing, and may have a special manifestation in and through performance—both on and off stage.[105] Here I distinguish practice from both choreographic process *and* performance as product, as a distinct field. In this way it could be linked to training and technique; "habitual or regular activity" in Parkinson's account.[106] However, I do follow Parkinson in acknowledging the co-dependence of the three fields of process in most dance artists' working life as a part of their dance practice.

Composition

For Louppe, Alain Badiou (via Nietzsche), and others, choreography is a process of restriction and restraint, a setting of limits upon the always already expressive body. This could be applied to both predetermined and spontaneous choreographic composition. Louppe describes dance as "an art of subtraction which offers, said Laban, *a restricted gamut of authorized motifs*."[107] Badiou notes, "this is perhaps Nietzsche's most important insight: Beyond [*sic*] exhibition of movements or the quickness of their external designs, dance is what testifies to the force of restraint at the heart of these movements."[108] Choice-making—as a form of restraint—is at the heart of dance composition; a simple but important point given that any movement whatever describes the broad field of contemporary dance practices. Choice-making as a process can be determined by any number of methods (e.g., random structures, sensory stimulation, chance systems, formulas, biographical information), and as noted, in most works of art this phase ends once the work is completed.

Many choreographers include choice-making options within their work—versions of structured improvisations using some of the mechanisms mentioned above, or entirely improvised works that represent one end of the spectrum regarding process as practice, also mentioned above. However, dancer Steve Paxton argues for a continuation of choice-making by the dancer in the act of dancing, no matter how fixed the choreographic framework. Paxton comments on his experience performing Simone Forti's *Slant Board* (1961):

> Simone told us (the initial cast) that she worked hard to have an idea and wanted to see those thoughts without other people's ideas mixing in . . . But upon the slant board or in the fountain of people, I noticed I was constantly making choices. There was no time to get out of my thought to explore hers . . . soon we were involved in making choice after choice after choice, each choice amplified by the sense of will which accompanied it.[109]

Paxton refers to a proximity between his own thought processes and the act of dancing (i.e., *doing* dancing) that squeezes out external choreographic directives under the command of a subjective "will." If action is intention, an internalization of the imperative may involve degrees of decentering choreographic commands.[110] Dancer and academic Megan Nicely echoes this sentiment: "dances—or more specifically their cho-

reographic directives—can . . . be considered less as stable entities than propositions for rewriting through movement."[111] Which leads us to . . .

Performance

The context and event of performance alter the nature of a choreographic work; dancing is affected by the space-time in which it appears with degrees of consciousness about this. So, in comparison to other works of art, dance and performance have the unique capacity to adapt to their environment. They can be in an evolving dialogue with their context, enabling the processual development that embeds the situation in the work. Paxton's description of performing *Slant Board* is one example of the performer's role in keeping the process of choreography alive.

In 2013, Parkinson and colleagues curated *The Dancer as Agent* conference that aimed "to shed light on performing dance artists[']approaches and the impact of experiential authorship on artistic production and research."[112] Questions of agency, authorship, and power underlay the discussions and uncovered the interdependency of practice, composition, and performance. Parkinson writes, "we create a lot of procedures. Often these procedures are transferred to other contexts . . . Who owns a procedure? How do you stop a procedure from moving? Would you even want to?"[113] The recent interest in the dancer as agent is surprisingly overdue and reveals the body archive as an unstable and uncontainable locus of shared knowledges and methods. Alongside an unrepeatable combination of experiences, habits, and capacities that constitute the idiogest of a particular dancer are patterns of creative behavior, indoctrinating technologies, and shared means of emancipating the body from the same. The medium of the dancer is in constant process; a center of indetermination and the source of a characteristic *instability* in the art form that has an impact on any attempts to stabilize the concepts that drive the work, as we will see in Chapter 6.

Many of our foundational elements are drawn together in this discussion of process. The durational aspects of process are essential to the presence/participation it involves, its status as an event or encounter that is experienced both collectively and as a unique, corporeal experience. The strong affiliations of dance with process sharpen its profile as unstable, contingent, experimental/experiential, multiplicitous, and changeable, even in its most conservative form as tourable repertoire. Burrows has often reiterated his understanding of dance as fundamentally unstable.

Here he refers to the relationship between his accounts of his practice in written articles and the practice itself, over time:

> When we repeat our own history like this, we are trying to make sense of the past and also to hold the future steady. We do this although we know there is no sense to be made, and no steadiness to be borrowed, but we are overwhelmed by possibilities and this repetition is sometimes all we have to guide ourselves by.[114]

Key terms in Burrows's choreographic discourse are repetition and anticipation, which underline and play with "problems" of stability in dance.

2.5 Conclusion

This work on foundational dance principles, and attention to the histories and labour of dance analysis, is essential to articulating how dance as a contemporary art medium has, on the one hand, contributed concepts and practices to the increasingly generic or non-medium specific field of contemporary art, and on the other, instituted its own disciplinary actualization of conceptual work with the materials that constitute it. Experiments with composition have allowed the art form to explore the sensations, intensities, and imagination of the mind-body as medium to produce choreographies that are self-reflexive, relational, expanded, and durational. Such creative work has offered much to the toolkit of the arts from which it borrows as much as gives. The special role of process that has been described at length and across all stages of the work of choreography—practice, composition, and performance—explains how the art form is able to suspend the materials and concepts within a given work in a state of "evasiveness," "instability," and "potentiality," to recall Kunst's terms, so that the qualities of its primary medium—the body—can persist in all of its complexities. This chapter also clarifies the focus of the present book on composition and aesthetics over questions of the dance archive in relation to museal imperatives and the politics of institutional processes and best practices. These are both very worthy topics that have been attended to elsewhere, and with the completion of further work around the latter we will no doubt see dance artists who choose to work within the horizon of contemporary art expanding aesthetic potentials ad infinitum.

PART II

Dance and the Museum

Having set out some of the disciplinary characteristics that help distinguish the particularly choreographic concerns shaping recent contemporary art, in this section a survey of specific exhibitions and curatorial approaches describes the current contexts in which such contemporary work is being presented and what this reveals about the new field. It also clarifies the diversity of creative practices umbrellaed within the field, which is complicated due not only to the convergence of two artistic disciplines (practices, knowledges, economies, cultures, heritages, communities), but associated desires, intentions, agendas, remits, policies, and ambitions that are as influential on the field if less transparent. The section begins with a case study from the 1990s, *This Is the Show and the Show Is Many Things / Extra Muros* (1994), curated by Bart De Baere and which featured the work of American choreographer Meg Stuart. Stuart's proto-conceptual work and the collaboration's processual nature re-introduced dance to the contemporary art museum as a significant force following the innovations of the mid-century avant-garde. Chapter 3 overviews the programming of curators such as Corinne Diserens, Catherine Wood, Stephanie Rosenthal, Helen Molesworth, and many others since 2007, which has brought to light the work of artists both historical and contemporary between, across, and among choreography and contemporary art. Selected exhibition Case Studies 2 to 5, presented in Belgium, Switzerland, France, Sydney, and Melbourne (*This Is the Show and the Show Is Many Things / Extra Muros* [1994], *A Choreographed Exhibition* [2007], *Ghost Telephone* [2016], and *To Do / To Make* [2018]), respectively reveal the format as the primary context within which current artistic developments in this field have been made public. Operating within a post-disciplinary context, these exhibitions model diverse approaches to the curatorial-choreographic relationship, ranging

from institutional prescriptions to localized, community-based initiatives. What they reveal collectively, and with degrees of self-awareness, are the many and varied aesthetic and practical points of confluence, exchange, and tension that describe the dance-gallery relationship. Through attention to the practices of exhibition-making, the stakes for dance become clear at the level of composition, physical conditions, cultural processes, discursive privileges, desire, and related issues of power and agency.

Case Study 2

Meg Stuart and Bart De Baere—Choreography and/as Collaboration[1]

American choreographer Meg Stuart's development of her practice as an expanded field of dance within the particularly intermedial scene in Belgium (which produced Les Ballets C de la B and the early experiments of Anne Teresa De Keersmaeker, Jan Fabre, and Wim Vandekeybus), provided the right kind of dancing for what is now considered a seminal exhibition engaging with "relational aesthetics": *This Is the Show and the Show Is Many Things / Extra Muros* at the Museum of Contemporary Art (now S.M.A.K.), Ghent, curated by Bart De Baere.[2] Nineteen ninety-four was also the year in which Stuart set up her company, Damaged Goods, and themes developed there are in nascent form here, as we will see: "absence, exposure and privateness" and "notions of presentation."[3] Rudi Laermans comments on the impact Stuart had in Flanders and Belgium, noting that her first two works, *Disfigure Study* (1991) and *No Longer Readymade* (1993), marked "a decisive turn" in "*the twofold trend towards [the] intellectualization of contemporary dance, its increasing position during the 1990s as a medium for both critical cultural reflection and artistic self-reflection*," addressing "the body's dominant culturalization" and "the prevailing definitions of the medium of dance." Laermans goes on to credit Stuart with ushering in the field of "so-called conceptual dance."[4]

Stuart writes that De Baere "asked the company to make a performance intervention" in a context "determined by the visual artists."[5] This work is a distinct (and overlooked) precursor of the current field of practice, specifically examples of choreographic works for the gallery that are devised to negotiate existing or surrounding artworks such as Case Study 4, Adrian Heathfield's *Ghost Telephone* (2016). It could be considered an early post-conceptual project which is in line with De Baere's own retrospective framing of the event, and this might explain why Stuart has only

a tentative association with conceptual dance as it has been recently theorized, advancing ahead of the core field of artists. De Baere's exhibition was conceived as "a museum without walls . . . finding a different space for contemporary art," using all of the spaces in the building (including the basement) just prior to the museum's contemporary collection being given its own space.[6] Rather than control the terms of the artists' and performers' engagement with the institution as we see in other curatorial approaches in this part of *The Persistence of Dance*, De Baere set up a framework within which the artists were free to respond as they saw fit. Given the project's strategies such as working processually in the gallery, exhibiting unfinished works, and being reflexive about the relationships between works, this was the ideal situation for dance to reappear in the contemporary art museum since the innovations of the mid-century avant-garde.

Stuart's contribution, which had no title beyond the exhibition name, consisted of "eighteen actions" both improvised and set and performed by thirty-three participants including "dancers, non-dancers, actors and artists" in all parts of the museum building. She notes that this was her first opportunity to work outside a theater and in a gallery, and was fascinated "to see how each spectator, no longer captive in a theater, determined his own timing and sequence of the performance as he was visiting the exhibition."[7] The work was thus all encompassing and everywhere:

> As the visitor walked through the museum he simultaneously walked through (and into) the performance. It is his pace—not the choreographers [sic]—that determined the perimeters of each action. Each room in the exhibition—each corner, each corridor—was a viable stage.[8]

For Stuart, "the dance can be seen as physical notes on the exhibition," a corporeal commentary, with some actions integrating elements from other artworks presented, some occupying the spaces of the other art, and some being unnoticeable beside the rest of the work.[9] In the video documentation we see snippets of some of these strategies of *incorporation*, *replacement*, and *integration*. Performers occupy the same space as large objects such as stones and inflatable clear balls, presenting as just another inert object. Elsewhere a figure lies on the ground, mummified by packing tape, trying on objecthood. An elbow protrudes in isolation through a hole in a wooden wall, a defamiliarized joint finding a place among another work. Performers approximate other visitors, peering out of windows and doors as people pass by, or performing moments of intimacy such as kissing or

whispering in busy thoroughfares. Dance in its unassertive, improvisatory, inclusive, collective, physical, and processual condition provides the gestures of commentary, response, and connection that negotiate between art objects, artists, and visitors.

As noted, certain types of dance have been more present in the gallery than others, and Stuart's oeuvre does not have consistent examples of museum presentations. However, there are points of rigorous contact to the visual arts in her early works, particularly in her creative development research where she often engaged visual artists as collaborating designers, and more recently has returned to working in galleries and museums. As dramaturg on *No Longer Readymade* (1993), which had a theater presentation, André Lepecki notes that much attention was given to Marcel Duchamp's ideas about art.[10] This was followed by Stuart's "first large-scale explicit collaboration with a visual artist," German installation artist Via Lewandowsky, on *Swallow My Yellow Smile* (1994), commissioned by Deutsche Oper Berlin.[11] Stuart notes that the following *Insert Skin* series (1996-1998) "attempts to make a direct physical connection between the two mediums," commissioning visual artworks from collaborators and putting art as "costume" ("image" or "prop") into dialogue with a "physical body."[12] In *Crash Landing* (1996-1999), a huge and inclusive project over five editions involving eighty artists from various disciplines, including many of the key players in conceptual dance (Xavier Le Roy, Jérôme Bel, Boris Charmatz, María La Ribot, Vera Mantero, and others), installation artist Lawrence Malstaf "transferred processes" to dance and turned Stuart into an object, "becoming plastic."[13] More recently, as mentioned, Stuart has returned to the museum. *knots and then* (2019) was created for, and collected by, the Archiv der Avantgarden (AdA) in Dresden, and was an improvisation amongst their collection aimed at "revising, reimagining, untying, undoing, and living through the archive. "[14] *rune* (2021) was created for the Berlin *Sculpture Festival* with dancer Sigal Zouk and musician Klaus Janek. The performers use their shared history and other materials to improvise in response to the exhibition: "she questions what a sculpture made of dance and sound could look like."[15] *confirm humanity* (2022) is "a solo choreography for two dancers" performed by Stuart and Varinia Canto Vila that expresses the contingency of our humanity through the capacities of the contemporary body and was part of the *Lifes* exhibition at Hammer Museum in Los Angeles.[16] This exhibition seemed to allow its participants unprecedented freedom to contribute and collaborate in the spirit of *This Is the Show and the Show Is Many Things / Extra Muros*, with

a focus on interdisciplinary work, agency, bodies and spaces, and sensory experience.

Significantly for the context of this book, in Stuart's early work there is also an interest in the visual arts at a compositional level. This includes an approach to the body as material rather than subjecthood, an interest in stasis and contemplation regarding spectatorship, and an emphasis on image-making for meaning production. Physical presence has also been a persistent concern. Stuart describes how

> visual artists gave me the courage to question my modes of expression and gave me the power to take distance from the languages of Limon, Cunningham and Release. They somehow gave me a license to not dance at all and made me understand that things could be translated . . . spending time in galleries with visual art I learned that another sort of time was required for an image or intention to resonate . . . I wanted to offer that time on stage too.[17]

Another Stuart scholar, Jeroen Peeters, notes that Stuart's interest in image-making was always in dialogue with the "sensory and organic workings" of the body.[18] He sees an interest in the mind-body in Stuart's work, described in Chapter 2 as the first dance principle, as the site of subjective processing and becoming that draws on "signals, energy, concepts, images, identities and archetypes," but producing external effects that often lead to the drama of extreme actions and physical conditions.[19] Peeters isolates the body's negotiation of these internal and external aspects of dance as a pronounced point of tension in Stuart's work, and links this to disciplinary formulations:

> It would undoubtedly be possible to write the history of modern and contemporary dance as a negotiation between the visual logic of an ideal image of the body, and the organic logic of a body that moves on the basis of proprioception or a heightened internal sensorial awareness. It would be naïve to assume a strict opposition between an image-based and a physical body, but by considering their tensile relations the body can emerge as a discursive site.[20]

In Chapter 1, I described this shift from spectacle to experience, from projected body-image to sensation in the mid-twentieth century as dance discovered somatics and rejected codified forms of movement. We shall

see a similar interest in the body as discursive site in the work of Stuart's colleague, Charmatz, who challenges the system from within major choreographic institutions, and also Bel and Le Roy who began their experiments with a return to the proscenium theater as performance site (discussed in Part IV). These artists also share a tendency toward minimalism where the tensions between visual logic/registration and corporeal sensation/experience can play out in a clear field.

Stuart's interest in drama is strong and she has been at the cutting edge of dance theater since she began making work. However, her seminal work regarding the emergent third-wave dance avant-garde, which was in contact with the gallery and visual artists, dealt with important issues such as duration, co-habitation, presence, perception, and repetition, all of which would endure in this field. *This Is the Show and the Show Is Many Things*, an example of dancing in a gallery space which co-inhabits with other artists' work, was a precedent for works by Charmatz, such as *20 Dancers for the XX Century* (2013-2017) discussed in Part IV, and as mentioned, Heathfield's *Ghost Telephone*, underscoring such continuities and Stuart's status as an innovator.

Chapter 3

The Museum and Dance Since the 1990s

3.1 Introduction

In 2013 an exhibition came to my town—*13 Rooms* curated by Hans Ulrich Obrist and Klaus Biesenbach.[1] It was described by the curators as an exhibition of "living sculptures" featuring "protagonists" who were mostly trained dancers, and the local dance community voiced its discomfort at the hire-a-dancer economy of this star-curator-led project.[2] During the course of the exhibition, a cast of around 100 performers realized works by artists such as Marina Abramović (*Luminosity*, 1997) and Joan Jonas (*Mirror Check*, 1970). The performers were treated as exchangeable "bodies for hire," overlooking any singularities, and were barely credited for their work. This local case chimed with existing international debates around the presence of dance, and the knowledges developed and refined in the discipline, in museum contexts.[3] In the second decade of the twenty-first century, what seemed to be needed in such contexts was an assertion of dance knowledges and a new visibility for the legacies that had produced them.

Attention to historical precedents of dance as a contemporary art began in the early 2000s with exhibitions such as *Yvonne Rainer: Radical Juxtapositions 1961-2002*, curated by Sid Sachs in 2002; *Dancing Around the Bride: Cage, Cunningham, Johns, Rauschenberg, and Duchamp*, curated by Carlos Basualdo and Erica F. Battle in 2012; and other surveys and presentations of the work of Rainer, Trisha Brown, and Simone Forti.[4] In 2018-2019, the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) in New York presented its first stand-alone dance exhibition of scale, *Judson Dance Theater: The Work is Never Done*, appropriately celebrating the legacy of the downtown dance scene of the 1960s and 1970s.[5] This felt like a turning point; the institution was honoring dance as an art form on par with the other disciplines represented in our major art museums. But now that dance was in, was this really where it belonged? The primarily white artists represented

there suddenly appeared so obvious and comfortable in the linear histories of fine art canons.[6] Was dance abandoning its counter-cultural kudos that had kept things a bit murky in the shadows? Now there seemed to be no turning back; resistance on the part of dance seemed pointless given the evidence on display, in this exhibition and elsewhere, of the key involvement of dance artists in the major aesthetic shifts of the twentieth century.[7] It became clear that if this fact were to be adequately acknowledged it had to happen in the museum, the institutional heart of contemporary art, using the powerful tools of documentation, acquisition, and archive that were at their disposal.

The historical relationship between dance and the visual arts at an institutional level might find its analogy in the Donald B. and Catherine C. Marron Atrium space in MoMA as described by *Artforum* editor David Velasco:

> Unclaimed, unprotected, the Atrium is allowed to be 'other' things to 'other' people, a space for those who are adjacent to the visual arts canon articulated in the Museum's galleries but for whom that canon never really worked.[8]

The monolithic specter of the Western canon of modern art has been a reference point for the artists and theorists of dance as the corporeal art developed concurrently across the twentieth century, but the two have never quite lined up, aesthetically, chronologically, or politically. As French dance theorist Isabelle Ginot notes, "we cannot be certain that the observations inspired by the contemporary art scene can simply be transferred to the contemporary dance scene."[9] Debates around the appropriateness of terms such as *modern*, *contemporary*, and *post-modern* to specific moments in the history of dance after the revolutions at the turn of the twentieth century are ongoing.[10] The latest contribution is Velasco's pitch to subsume the art form into the termino-logic of MoMA so that modern dance includes everything from George Balanchine to Sarah Michelson; in Velasco's words, "thinking the modern larger."[11] Bringing dance out of the shadows and into the protection of the canon poses a threat to the "unclaimable," resistant, unstable, and incorporeal realities of historic practices that don't read clearly in their new context. An advocatorial impulse, a desire to claim ground for dance among the scene of contemporary art since the 1950s, runs the risk of diminishing the otherness that has been of so much value to this singularly *undisciplined discipline*.[12]

This chapter confronts the points of connection and divergence between dance and the visual arts as they are being mapped within museums and galleries, including the special role of *process* in relation to dance practices. Attention to exhibitions and curation is in line with current art criticism and theory that recognizes the rise of such practices since the 1990s as, in some cases, usurping the functions of both the artist and the art critic as chronicled by French artist Daniel Buren and other art commentators.[13] The contributions of dance to new developments in the contemporary arts are outlined, alongside the programming of curators such as Corinne Diserens, Catherine Wood, Stephanie Rosenthal, Helen Molesworth, and many others since 2007, which has brought to light the work of artists both historical and contemporary between, across, and among choreography and contemporary art.

3.2 The Resistance of Dance

While this book engages with aesthetic labels from the visual arts canon, it also notes the ultimate shortcomings of those terms and the principles they are in dialogue with when it comes to fully accounting for the practices and knowledges of dance as it has developed as a contemporary art form (i.e., not classical or traditional). This opens a space in which to *move* by acknowledging that the canon, in Velasco's words, "never really worked" for dance. Beyond the always present interface with the visual arts was a multiplicity of influences, realities, and traditions that kept dance "unclaimed" and "unprotected": biology, physical labor, floor surfaces, degrees of visibility, mismatched monikers, community, bodily lineages, touring, poverty, experimental music, somatics, and real estate, to name just a few. The break with institutionalized dance at the turn of the twentieth century through the development of new and unprecedented dance practices was so absolute that a new history began that is primarily gleaned through corporeal inheritances, uncertain memories, inexact reviews, and shameless imitators. As choreographer Jonathan Burrows puts it, "we enjoy this place of privileged deviancy that pulls people in, and has nothing to do with history but is about defiant and intelligent becoming."[14]

The resistance or alternative status of dance in comparison to the relatively stable canons of the visual arts is connected to its deep dialogue,

since the turn of the twentieth century, with *context*, a key element of the art form associated with *process*. Escaping from the bourgeois theater at the end of the nineteenth century into burlesque venues, domestic spaces, schools, outdoor settings, and cinema screens, and then in the mid-twentieth century to community halls, studios, churches, galleries, rooftops, parks, gymnasiums, and loft spaces, contemporary dance was embodying Buren's critique of the process-to-product model of art regarding its habitats (studio to gallery) well before the visual arts did.[15] In his 1971 essay "The Function of the Studio," Buren argues for the artist's studio as the correct home of an art work, and that once removed from there the work-of-art's function changes as other desires, juxtapositions, economies, and architectures are introduced by the "foreign" situations in which it finds itself.[16] In the case of dance, issues regarding a gap between the work and its situation are circumvented, to a large extent, by it being realized with each iteration in situ (for example, in the work of Maria Hassabi), or bringing the audience to its place of work (the studio and university hall performances of the mid-century choreographers). Furthermore, the serious blurring of art-life divisions in the dance sector contrasts, to a large degree, with an emphasis on professionalism, studio-based solitude, and art-as-commodity traditions in the visual arts, particularly at the beginning of this story in the 1950s when such notions were gaining real momentum. The undisciplined, open, social, and intersubjective qualities of dance have, in fact, been points of desire for visual artists since Robert Rauschenberg's associations with the New York dance avant-garde in the 1960s.

Beyond an historical aversion to institutional spaces, dance as an apparently ephemeral art form has also confronted challenges such as the persistence of the art object, adequate means of documentation, financial return on costly layout, audience accessibility, and a resistance to translation into language through its practices and performance iterations. This brought dance to issues such as the dematerialization of art, the nature of creative labor and the archive, (post-internet) art criticism, experience as economy, and participatory aesthetics early on, issues that are now center stage for our museums and galleries. In this sense, the interest in dance and choreography at our major art organizations now outstrips the interest in performance art, as theorists have recently affirmed.[17] At New York's MoMA and London's Tate Modern, two of the world's most high-profile modern art museums, dance content has been favored in perfor-

mance programming as part of either public programs or exhibitions.[18] The performative turn has also given rise to the *performance curator*, a new role pioneered by curators such as Wood and one that has been much discussed in both performance and visual arts discourses.[19]

With dance having a perceived advantage in key areas of interest to the gallery, agency and intention become paramount as major histories come into dialogue with apparently minor ones. This quote from Jérôme Bel around 2010 describes a directive *coming from* the galleries:

> . . . for several years now I've failed to find a solution to the London Tate Modern's demand for an exhibition of dance . . . I never managed to find an adequate connection between the museum framework and dance . . . we must try and solve this problem: dance is starting to be recognized as art. In the end it's as if you had to enter the museum to be legitimized! As a result, pressure to exhibit is growing.[20]

The attraction of relatively well-resourced, architecturally impressive, internationally recognized art institutions needs to be weighed up, as Bel notes, with the fact that they may curate the form in alignment with their own "framework" and beyond the artists' chosen trajectories. Seasoned gallery invitee, choreographer, and filmmaker Yvonne Rainer is less starry-eyed about the attention:

> I used to think that the museum surround ensures that aesthetic illusion, by refocusing the spectator's gaze, packs the most powerful punch. But in this age of chronically frustrated desires do we want to see more than a painting of a sleeping gypsy? Do you want to see more than the body of a sleeping dancer? Do you want to touch her? Do you want to test her, feel her? Who upstages whom? Does the institution's survival depend on accommodating such an appetite? Must it now provide sensation at the expense of reflection? Spectacle at the expense of ideas? Voyeurism at the expense of contemplation? Should we call this phenomenon a new form of 'co-optation' of or by the artist? Must the dancer or performance artist cooperate, collude, or resist?[21]

We shall see how Bel's and Rainer's skeptical attitudes are repeated by artists such as Xavier Le Roy, Jennifer Lacey, and Michelson, as a crucial part of how these artists engage with the gallery as a context for their work.

3.3 Curation since the 2000s: Revision, Appropriation, and Potential

New curatorial approaches to integrating dance into exhibition programming began around the same time as the historical work just described and have contributed to defining the contemporary field and projecting future possibilities. Museum für Gegenwartskunst Siegen presented *Dancing, Seeing* (February 18-May 28, 2007) curated by Eva Schmidt, an important precedent in presenting dance artists alongside visual artists within the body of the exhibition.[22] Diserens, whose exhibition *Peripheral Vision and Collective Body* (2008) at Museion, Bolzano in South Tyrol, Italy was another early venture into this terrain, described a "désir désespéré du musée pour la danse" that informs a self-awareness in her curation.[23] Further, Wood's appointment as the first Senior Curator, International Art (Performance) at Tate Modern led to some considered and powerful programming in new and appropriate spaces. Wood explained to Bishop how "the museum's interest in programming dance emerged organically from working with younger artists who were appropriating dance, or were interested in choreographing social relations."[24] A similar pattern has emerged at MoMA and other major museums with the appointment of staff specific to the field of dance and performance. But perhaps the most progressive programming is happening at smaller organizations such as Block Universe festival and Performance Exchange platform in London; Something Great Collection in Berlin; and If I Can't Dance, I don't want to be part of your revolution in Amsterdam, where emerging artists are being showcased, the roster of artists is diversifying to under-represented and highly innovative new artists, and revised commissioning and presenting models are very much under construction at the time of writing.[25]

The Australian context provides an interesting counterpoint to the international centers of Europe and America in what follows, demonstrating the reach of the intermedial revolution. Melbourne-based artist Shelley Lasica has been working at the interface between dance and the visual arts since the 1980s and has influenced a new generation of artists who have chosen the gallery as one, if not their primary, venue. Smaller galleries such as Gertrude Contemporary and West Space in Melbourne, and Firstdraft and Artspace in Sydney, have been presenting choreographic works since the 1990s.[26] An early exhibition project at Campbelltown Arts Centre in Sydney in 2009 curated by Emma Saunders and Lisa Havilah, *What I Think About When I Think About Dancing*, experimented with plac-

ing choreography front and center in a gallery space far enough from Sydney's center, and adaptable enough (grey enough), to accommodate the risk.[27] The curatorial projects of Hannah Mathews in Melbourne, such as *Framed Movements* (2014), which presented Maria Hassabi's *INTERMISSION* (Case Study 9), have also had an influence on the local scene.[28] For the 2016 Biennale of Sydney, under the curatorial leadership of Stephanie Rosenthal who had curated *Move. Choreographing You* for the Hayward Gallery in London (October 13, 2010-January 9, 2011), there was an unprecedented focus on performance. This included numerous choreographers: Boris Charmatz, William Forsythe, Adam Linder, Mette Edvardsen, Brooke Stamp (working with Gothe-Snape), and artists in Adrian Heathfield's *Ghost Telephone* program (Case Study 4). Charmatz delivered the Biennale keynote, and other public program events focused on choreography.[29] Around the same time, a choreographic prize—the first of its kind in Australia—was established by a local philanthropist and was open to artists with a reputation outside the discipline but with a "choreographic idea," and one visual artist—Shaun Gladwell—was supported through the scheme in its inaugural year.[30]

Given this brief survey, it seems important to reconsider claims that the high visibility of dance and choreography in our major arts institutions was, and is, primarily driven by a widely criticized opportunism that links dance and performance to a reinvention of the gallery/museum.[31] In this scenario, dance artists are "dupes" who are only in responsive mode, willing to provide the museum what it needs at its own cost. I return to this debate in Chapter 5, but Wood's observation of an artist-led shift that curators were following *toward* dance and choreography allows for the possibility of changes that were happening at the level of practice and in the independent sector of the contemporary arts, where relatively risk-free conditions were providing the opportunity for intermedial experiments that were then filtering their way upwards and into the major institutions. I also highlight Wood's reservations, which are in line with those of Bojana Cvejić, Benjamin Buchloh, and Hal Foster. Wood notes that "Foster links the institutional embrace of 'experimental performance and dance' to contemporary art's pervasive state of indeterminacy and provisionality." She adds:

> . . . these artistic strategies are now celebrated blindly for their own sake . . . performance, which sets its own formats and positions, has become the central arena for this larger state of play.[32]

The post-categorical condition of art, *historically incorporating dance and performance*, is linked to the current general commodification of the arts by Cvejić and others who warn of the colonizing power of the visual arts which may subsume the creative practice and production of performance (and other ephemeral arts practices) into its economy.[33] In 2015 Wood was explicit about what she saw appearing in galleries:

> a return of highly determined, practiced, and composed art, typically by way of other disciplines, whether in the form of curators inviting practitioners of theater, dance, or music to perform in museums or galleries, or artists borrowing these disciplines wholesale as ready-made formats. This prompts us to ask new questions about contemporary art's limits and its needs, its rapacious consumption of other disciplinary specificities.[34]

As I argue in Chapter 5, this view of the dance-gallery relation overlooks the contributions of dance to the invention of post-disciplinarity and the historical fact of its embeddedness in the story of contemporary art in its broadest definition.[35] *Dance cannot be colonized if it had a role in the formation of the current state of the arts*, or if its artists currently self-identify as belonging to that world. However, this is not to say that more cannot be done to ensure that dance, dancers, and choreographers are well cared for as they navigate a new position inside the museum. I defer on this point to Rainer:

> What can (or should) the museum offer dance in the way of value, movement, time, materiality, permanence?
>
> Value: A living wage (or more, in accordance with art world economic norms), prestige, validation
> Movement: Lots of it
> Time: Ephemerality
> Materiality: Documentation, default décor (dancing with the collection), sprung flooring, dressing rooms, comfortable seating for spectators
> Permanence: Archival documentation, residencies for choreographers[36]

Finally, both dance and visual art have ventured far from their siloed definitions (noting that disciplinary siloing is something specific to the white history of contemporary art, something I return to in Case Study

11). It is true to say that inequities in power and visibility have real effects on artworks and their artists; however, the expansion of choreography as a field *in practice* is a given; dance was *always already intermedial*. Developments in dancescreen, dance technology, site-specific dance, dance theater, and many other intermedial practices vouch for this beyond the group of experimental dance practitioners that one might categorize as presenting dance as a contemporary art form. However, the current expansion of choreography *as a concept*, discussed in Chapter 5, is tightly yoked to the terms and conditions of the broader contemporary arts which, in our most influential historiographies, is dominated by the aesthetic, cultural, and political economies of the visual arts. Charmatz has claimed, "I have a feeling that it is at once wide-ranging and precise that the physical and conceptual tools dance has developed in recent years can permanently modify art in a broad sense."[37] This project observes dance and choreography closely as it is practiced in new venues and systems, such as Case Study 3, Mathieu Copeland's *A Choreographed Exhibition* (2007), to map the conditions that the art form both instigates and finds itself subjected to. In this way, I hope to bring to light the ongoing contributions of dance to the most progressive modifications within the arts that Charmatz is referring to.

3.4 Exhibiting Dance, Now and Then: Exclusions and Specificities

Having set out some disciplinary tools in Chapter 2 that will help us distinguish the particularly choreographic concerns found in some recent contemporary art and beginning with the collaboration between curator Bart De Baere and choreographer Meg Stuart in the early 1990s, in Part II I describe specific exhibitions and curatorial contexts in which such contemporary work is presented. The examples reveal much about the new field, building on case studies such as *13 Rooms* (2013) and *Judson Dance Theater: The Work is Never Done* (2018/2019), which were discussed (respectively) in relation to issues such as the precarity of dancer agency and knowledges in curator-led surveys, and an historical approach that has "legitimized" (and institutionalized) dance by establishing certain genealogies and cross-disciplinary exchanges on visual arts territory and within its terms. I also reveal the diversity of practices (artistic, curatorial, institutional) within a field that is complicated due not only to the convergence of two artistic disciplines with their own knowledges, econo-

mies, cultures, heritages, and communities, but associated desires, intentions, agendas, remits, policies, and ambitions that are as influential if less transparent. This section of the book also marks a move away from historically oriented exhibitions such as *13 Rooms*, *Judson Dance Theater: The Work is Never Done*, and *Move. Choreographing You* (2011), with a turn to the ways in which current work is being programmed.[38]

Selected exhibitions presented in Belgium, Switzerland, France, Sydney, and Melbourne between 1994 and 2021 reinforce this mode of presentation as the primary site where current artistic developments in the field have been made public. Velasco sums up the frenzy of dance gallery activity that was peaking internationally in 2012, placing it within the context of the symbolic death of modern dance in the person of Merce Cunningham, and the passing of 50 years since the heyday of "post-modern" dance in the form of Judson Dance Theater. His account is comprehensive, and I quote him at length:

> . . . the backdrop of the fiftieth anniversary of that magic fiasco—that 'parade of formal explorations,' as Paxton has put it—called Judson. And all this was in the wake of a still too quiet but resounding event in the dance landscape—the recent folding of the Merce Cunningham Dance Company, the historic sine qua non for Cunningham technique, whose dissolution marked the symbolic burial of 'modern' dance. And all this was part of a more coherent integration of something called 'dance' into the body of something called 'the museum': Sarah Michelson and Michael Clark at the Whitney Museum of American Art for the Whitney Biennial; Anne Teresa De Keersmaeker, Boris Charmatz, and Nina Beier at the new Tanks at Tate Modern in London; Xavier Le Roy at the Fundació Antoni Tàpies in Barcelona; Paxton, Bel, Michelson, Faustin Linyekula, Dean Moss, and Deborah Hay at MoMA for 'Some sweet day.' Each venue offered a different model for how to do dance, and 'Some sweet day' in particular—with its galvanic weekly conversations and eschatological title—took as its very subject a rethinking of how choreographers and dancers and art institutions and publics might (and do) commit to one another. Of how they might (and do) comprehend 'dance.' And each artist in his or her own way worked against these overdetermined spaces and categories, reconsidering the logic of the museum and producing new hybrid audiences as they went.[39]

Velasco's identification in the early 2010s of "a more coherent integration of something called 'dance' into the body of something called 'the

museum'," and the artists and institutions he calls out, indicates the high profile of this seismic shift and the kinds of power relationships involved. Integrating dance into "the body" of the museum or gallery suggests a one-way flow, and as noted, there has been much speculation about the desires, intentions, and policies that have fueled this interest on the part of the institution. At the beginning of the twenty-first century, and with the passing of Katherine Dunham (1909-2006), Cunningham (1919-2009), Pina Bausch (1940-2009), and later, Brown (1936-2017), curators at major visual arts institutions began to shape new accounts of dance histories and program choreography in their spaces. At The Whitney and MoMA in New York, Tate Modern and the Barbican in London, the Louvre in Paris, and Fundació Antoni Tàpies in Barcelona, curators were crafting historiographies and mapping lineages linking the mid-century dance avant-garde to the present activity in the field. However, as Velasco also suggests, the resistant, undisciplined nature of dance, described earlier as being at risk of diminishing its otherness when it appears in such institutions, often made the *context* of the museum or gallery central to its aesthetic project, "reconsidering the logic of the museum" as it passed through it.

3.5 Conclusion

In comparison to the mid-twentieth century, where exhibitions and exchanges between the visual and performing arts were almost exclusively driven by artists outside the physical and administrative parameters of major art institutions, since the 1990s curators within those institutions have played an integral role in determining the conditions within which choreography is presented as a contemporary art medium.[40] As noted previously, this is in step with a general rise in the responsibilities and power of curators, with Buren going so far as stating in 2003 that "today, it is possible to imagine that we are not far-off from having a large-scale international exhibition directed by a great organizer-author who proposes the first exhibition without any artists at all!"[41] With this shift in situation, galleries and museums have taken on the responsibility of drawing attention to, and framing, the contributions dance continues to make to broader aesthetic developments. Such framings have taken the form of public programs, commissioning physical interventions in and responses to museum spaces, retrospectives of specific artists, and remounts of historical choreographic works. Such activities may have little to do with the

work that artists are undertaking in practice, or they may align beautifully with the preoccupations of the artists themselves. The framing of developments in the field by major institutions through their curatorial and programming activities may have led to a certain antagonistic or combative mood in critical writings about dance and the visual arts. Such a tone is not representative of artists' practices that enjoy higher degrees of self-determination and agency, or balanced curator-artist collaboration, as seen in the examples in this book. In an effort to indicate the full range of presentational opportunities in the field, and the important definitional work they do, the following exhibition case studies model diverse approaches to the curatorial-artistic relationship, ranging from institutional prescriptions to localized, community-based initiatives.

What they reveal collectively, and with degrees of self-awareness, are the many and varied aesthetic and practical points of confluence, exchange, and tension that describe the dance-gallery relationship. Through attention to the practices of exhibition-making, the stakes for dance become clear at the level of creative practice, physical conditions, cultural processes, discursive privileges, desire, and related issues of power and agency. *This Is the Show and the Show Is Many Things / Extra Muros* (1994), curated by De Baere at the Museum of Contemporary Art (now S.M.A.K.), Ghent, was an experimental exhibition that invited a choreographed intervention/response from Stuart. *A Choreographed Exhibition* (2007), curated by UK-based curator Mathieu Copeland for galleries in Switzerland and France, was an extreme experiment where a curator set the conceptual framework, compositional terms, presentation structure, and contributors for their curatorial vision. *Ghost Telephone* (2016), curated by Adrian Heathfield, was a collaboration with four artists on a chain of performances within a Biennale framework at the AGNSW in Sydney. And finally, *To Do/To Make* (2018), curated by choreographer Shelley Lasica and curator-theorist Zoe Theodore in Melbourne, modelled an artist-led, local, embedded, and democratic approach that recalls the radical experiments in programming in the downtown New York art scene in the 1960s.

As noted, much of the second-wave dance avant-garde work was initially presented by artist-curators programming peers (and often including themselves). Male artists such as La Monte Young, Allan Kaprow, Robert Whitman, Claes Oldenburg, and Red Grooms were operating as artist-curators in downtown New York galleries and studios such as Yoko Ono's 112 Chambers Street Loft (1960-1961) where Forti's first works were shown on the East Coast; Hansa Gallery (1952-1959); Tan-

ager Gallery (1952-1962); City Gallery (1958-1959); Delancey Street Museum (1959-1960); Reuben Gallery (1959-1961); and the Judson Memorial Church Gallery (1969-1961). Dance historian Sally Banes notes that "it was in these galleries and through these networks that so many performances were given."[42] This period was followed by innovative programming at major museums such as The Whitney, the Walker Art Center, and the Guggenheim where curators located choreographic works within the galleries' main programming. This fed into a processual turn in groundbreaking exhibitions across the late 1960s and early 1970s such as Harald Szeemann's *Live in Your Head: When Attitudes Become Form* at Kunsthalle Bern (1970) and Marcia Tucker's *Anti-illusion, Procedures/Materials* (1969) at The Whitney, and Fabio Sargentini's curation at Galleria L'Attico in Rome, which all pioneered transdisciplinary curation. The new focus is summed up by John Brockman who produced *Intermedia '68*, a program of work that echoed *9 Evenings: Theatre and Engineering* produced by Robert Rauschenberg in 1966, and which toured a college circuit in the United States: "these people traffic in experience, not objects . . . who wants objects? . . . What's interesting is process—seeing, feeling, sensation, and environment."[43] Elsewhere I argue that these major exhibitions, and many more, failed to include relevant dance artists and thus excluded key works from specific lineages.[44] Thus, the recent curatorial attention to mid-century dance artists such as Forti, Brown, and Rainer is corrective and/or revisionist. Then, as now, a paradigm shift from objects to experience in the field of contemporary art coincides with an increased engagement with corporeally-oriented creative practices. As art historian Pamela Bianchi notes, "the new material . . . is nothing more than the body in movement, intended both as the spectatorship body and as an authorial body;" however, curatorial and broader institutional work has been slow to develop the right kinds of support for this shift, as the case studies reveal.[45]

One of the aims of this book is to define specific fields of work at the interface between dance and visual art, and through the following exhibition examples one can begin to understand the different kinds of practices and creative works that have featured in museum and gallery spaces, often without adequate articulation of specificities. Among these exhibitions we find choreographic scores to be enacted by a hired dancer, choreographic responses by carefully selected dance artists to collections, exhibitions or biennale contexts, and choreographies presented as discrete works of art in gallery spaces. The works themselves, following the Stuart and Michelson

case studies, set out some of the key aesthetic, conceptual, and material preoccupations of the field, including its genealogies and histories. This selective survey thus sets the scene for the case studies in Parts III, IV, and V where the work of singular artists demonstrates the rich potential of artist-led experiments in which the instigators have taken a full and rigorous account of the terrain into which they venture.

Case Study 3

Curation as Choreography—Copeland's *Choreographing Exhibitions* (2007)

In 2007, Mathieu Copeland curated *A Choreographed Exhibition* for the Kunst Halle in St. Gallen, Switzerland, and the Centre d'Art Contemporain de la Ferme du Buisson, France:

> . . . an exhibition only composed of movements. For over a month and a half, three dancers from the Tanzkompanie Theater St. Gallen are present in the kunsthalle during the opening hours to perform in space the choreography of movements, patterns and choreographed gestures, following the scores and instructions as provided by the invited artists, dancers, and choreographers.[1]

Artists contributing scores and instructions included Roman Ondák (visual artist), Jennifer Lacey (choreographer), Jonah Bokaer (visual artist and choreographer), Philipp Egli (choreographer), Karl Holmqvist (visual artist and poet), Michael Parsons (composer), and Fia Backström (visual artist) together with Michael Portnoy. Pablo Leon de la Barra gives an account of specific works within the exhibition:

> Roman Ondák communicates an attitude of disdain in his piece 'Insiders,' requesting the dancers to wear their clothes inside-out and to ignore their surrounding reality. Michael Parsons re-actualises his seminal 'Walking Piece' from 1968 [sic], and through a new score instructs the three dancers on how to walk in the space of the Kunsthalle, thus generating an open piece of visual music. Karl Holmqvist creates a polyphony of voices in asking the dancers to read different lyrics from various songs whilst performing cleaning gestures.[2]

This exhibition replaced the art object with the dancing body in a project that employed simple transference as its strategy; as one of the dancers, Carole Perdereau, stated, "the exhibition exhibits us."[3] Through this simple comparison, the approach laid bare the conditions of both visual arts and dance regarding such things as objecthood, subjectivity, work practice, space, time, rhythm, movement, and spectatorial processes. While such a reduced approach to dance in the gallery has occurred before and since (nothing was in the space but the dancing bodies), Copeland's attention to critical discourse surrounding the project, including his curatorial statements, suggests a radicality by framing *A Choreographed Exhibition* as a clear convergence of concept, material, and action in line with Hal Foster's schema for the preoccupations of the experimental arts since the 1960s.[4] This exhibition also demonstrated the reasons why the visual arts in its institutional formations (in comparison to individual artists) was so interested in dance and choreography at this historical moment, where the points of confluence, productive tension, and difference lay regarding the relationship with dance as an art form, and how choreographers, dancers, and their collaborators were finding their own way in this cultural and aesthetic space.

In Copeland's account, the exhibition realized a critical proposition:

> . . . if, classically, the curator curates the exhibition, the artists create the art, the question becomes one of the status of those who 'embody' the pieces. Subjects that, despite appearing as objectified, object to being an object . . . the relation to the spectators is thus fundamentally shaken, as they no longer evolve around objects, but twist around subjects and become carried with these conflicting movements . . . In a space where nothing is present but movement, in a gallery left empty and devoid of any 'props,' only the opening hours and the duration of the exhibition determine the rhythm. Movements produce a critical experience of the ephemeral, affirming a critical counter-attitude to a world saturated with objects. A choreographed exhibition will only exist for the time needed for its overall realization.[5]

For Copeland, scored improvised movement as art content in a gallery space is a political and critical choice: a commentary on the culture of the art object and the behaviors that surround their exhibition, and this is made clear in his curatorial statements quoted here. In the tradition of Yves Klein's *The Void* exhibition (1958), and variations on the locked gallery from conceptual artists such as Graciela Carnevale (*Confinement*

Action [1968]), Copeland is critiquing visual arts culture, in this case through an intermedial experiment involving the transference of the discipline of dance into a new context.[6] In doing so he combines the conceptual gesture with a material practice through choreographic means; but what does such a project mean for dance culture? Issues he raises in this quote around the subject-object bind, a kinaesthetic empathy with the dancing subject, an experience of time as a product of movement, and the transitory nature of that movement, have been well worked over in dance studies, as we saw in Chapter 2. His emphasis on the ephemeral nature of dance is particularly regressive, recalling philosophy's essentializing of this characteristic, and manifests in his catalogue as a series of images of empty galleries displaying traces of bodies as marks upon walls, with no images of the dancers themselves.

The catalogue for *A Choreographed Exhibition*, edited by Copeland and Julie Pellegrin, features essays by and interviews with artists, commentators, and theorists such as Myriam Van Imschoot, André Lepecki, Barbara Formis, and Boris Charmatz. The inclusion of these dance-related theorists and makers indicates a concerted and rigorous engagement by Copeland with dance theory—particularly around scoring.[7] Movement scoring is a specifically choreographic practice developed alongside the visual arts during the mid-century period to become a transdisciplinary strategy, and this medial exchange has had a degree of critical attention.[8] Copeland's curation references this history, with movement scores commissioned from choreographers, poets, composers, and visual artists, some of whom, such as Michael Parsons, were involved in the mid-century intermedial milieu. However, Copeland's approach raises the specter of the traditional dancer-choreographer relationship, the hire-a-dancer mindset addressed in the associated literature by one of the choreographers involved, Lacey.[9] Lacey takes Copeland to task on his use of dancers from a repertory company from the Tanzkompanie Theater in the St. Gallen iteration of the exhibition "as the neutral material of the thing. This is such an old idea in dance, that of course still exists, but it is extraordinarily dated."[10] There is some account in her interview with Copeland of how she approached a score for the dancers based on duration, the transitions between the total of eight artists' scores, and the fact that they would be performing to no-one or each other for large chunks of time. Lacey brings a dance artist's perspective to bear on the performers' experience and the composition of the whole for both them and their audiences; she says, "for me the specifics of the group were important, their process, not mine."[11] Attention to

the real conditions for the artists and spectators in the time-space of the exhibition was perhaps secondary to the execution of the conceptual proposition for Copeland, and gestures toward issues of care and ethics that more recent dance-gallery projects are trying to address.[12]

In relation to the question of power at the heart of Lacey's critique, Copeland attempts to define "exhibition" as "choreography":

> A proposition for a definition: Exhibition . . . noun—a material, textual, textural, visceral, visual . . . choreographed polyphony.[13]

> . . . my entire curatorial approach is based on the idea of choreographing an exhibition. For example, I increasingly think of my exhibition catalogues as scores.[14]

In these definitions, choreography is equated with the exhibited result of curating and organizing materials, bodies, space, temporal frameworks, and potential for subjective feelings, perceptions, thoughts, and memories that constitute the phenomenon of the gallery exhibition. Copeland takes the role of choreographer here in the formula of an outdated mode of choreography as a process of control and constraint across a multiplicity of physical and intangible variables.

Copeland's experiment is clearly linked to the curator-author phenomenon that has an associated field of discourse within curatorial studies.[15] The curator becomes the artist and commissions experts to realize their concept, and the result is a decentering of the work of the artist to be replaced by the work of the curator. An extreme case might interfere with the commissioned artist's own desires about what they want to do and how their work is framed. Regarding *A Choreographed Exhibition* where the medium consists of dance artists translating scores by other artists in situ, the question of agency sits on a knife edge between subjection and empowerment; between layers of contextual limitations and control on the one hand, and the authority of presence and processual investment on the other.

Another group of dance artists, Toni Pape, Noémie Solomon, and Alanna Thain, who have written about performing in a Tino Sehgal piece, note the "somewhat pervasive phenomenon across the art field that draws performance within the museal space [which] often reiterates a distinction or hierarchy between theater and visual arts rather than enabling new, heterogeneous encounters between the forms."[16] The benefits for

the artists involved in Copeland's project—both score-makers and dance-makers—regarding new discoveries or encounters is hard to ascertain, but the response of the dancers in the French season, LeClubdes5 (Mickaël Phelippeau, Virginie Thomas, Carole Perdereau, Maeva Cunci), are recorded in the catalogue and elsewhere. Unlike the St. Gallen dancers, this group are artist-choreographers with a pre-existing collective practice. They describe the project as "a collective work" with "an artistic director and eight artists/authors," and within this imposed framework they found agency through a self-reflexive approach to co-habitation, interpretation, experimentation, and a shared imaginative:

> Three days a week for a month and a half, six hours a day, the collective Le Clubdes5 [sic] occupied the exhibition spaces in the Centre d'art to interpret these works. That's when things became interesting. The collective was called upon as a 'group of interpreters.' The question of the 'common' was therefore shifting towards a 'being together.' We represented both a work force and an artistic entity in its full right. We seemed to have achieved our challenge to exist at the same time as an 'interpreters' collective,' 'projects initiators,' 'places for experimentation,' 'permanent laboratory,' 'self-school,' [and] 'imagination to be shared.'[17]

While the project was a step in Copeland's journey as a curator, the dancers involved could find agency by adapting the conditions of the work to their own practice.[18] The gallery became, as Inés Moreno puts it, "a rehearsal room, a production site for new movements, an exhibition space, and a rest area," and the "time of the exhibition would be the time of practice."[19] In this case we can add *adaptation* to comparison and transference as key strategies for this exhibition to account for the dancers' perspective.

This was also Lacey's approach to her scoring task; she was interested "to use my tropes within the tropes of the 'exhibition'," so she focused on the moments of transition between each of the seven other scores to honor the durational nature of the work for the dancers and help them "stay engaged and really active in delivering the work." She goes on, regarding the challenges of gallery time:

> The question of duration was also glaringly obvious to me. It was a crazy thing for the dancers to go in, to work constantly with all these different notions of performance and with the possibility of being exposed to maybe nobody all day long . . . I felt strongly that the human level had to be considered: interest, fatigue, hunger, boredom, etc.[20]

It will become clear across the case studies in this book that dance artists and visual artist-collaborators commissioned directly by galleries or museums, or seeking out such contexts, have similarly dealt with adaptation, comparison, and transformation at the interface between disciplinary conventions. They have also moved, via transformation, toward what Agatha Gothe-Snape describes as an "a-disciplinary" condition opening onto "a field of action," unrestrained by binaries, within which they can match their ideas to the appropriate material.[21] Among all of this is always the question of care when working with a medium that brings all of the complications of the human condition, and artistic agency is key regarding modelling best ethical practices.

Case Study 4

Activating Dancer Agency in the Gallery—Adrian Heathfield's *Ghost Telephone* (2016)

Nine years after *A Choreographed Exhibition*, performance theorist, maker, and curator Adrian Heathfield put artists' practice front and center in a series of events at the Art Gallery of New South Wales (AGNSW) as part of Stephanie Rosenthal's 20th Biennale of Sydney. Three choreographers were part of Heathfield's *Ghost Telephone*—American Chrysa Parkinson (based in Europe), Canadian Benoît Lachambre, and Austrian Philipp Gehmacher—artists who have all been associated with conceptual dance and who were presenting their work in Sydney for the first time.[1] Described as "a one-month-long daily chain performance comprised of new interlinked works," which were all subsumed under Heathfield's title, *Ghost Telephone*, the solo artists were asked to respond to the gallery's exhibited works.[2] Heathfield's proposition was that each would spend time "in residence" with their chosen artwork/s, "attuning to its resonances and mutating its immaterial affects" through their performances.[3] He describes the work as a

> serial improvisation made in the vibrant space of relations between people, spirits and things. It mines the art institution as a site, using its environment and its works as the impetus for original performances that morph over time and make a new kind of unending performance work.[4]

In this sense, this performance work within the Biennale exhibition at AGNSW did seem to be an "amplification" of the museum, to use theorist Theron Schmidt's term in describing the work, having some affinity with Meg Stuart's response to Bart De Baere's provocation in *This Is the Show and the Show Is Many Things / Extra Muros* (1994), which I described as a corporeal commentary.[5]

While some of the solo artists' attention may have been elsewhere—imagined characters conjured collectively (Parkinson), other art work (Gehmacher who was dancing with Melbourne-based artist Daniel von Sturmer's installation *Material from Another Medium (Sequence 2)* [2001], and Lachambre who was dancing with installations by Colombian artist Doris Salcedo)—"the work of the work" manifested as dancing in the gallery.[6] While I spent time with all of these works, two sessions with Gehmacher provided some insight into his approach to investigating "where the material of an artwork ends and the context begins," and "what kind of material is his 41 year old body and how can it move in relation to other kinds of matter?"[7] Gehmacher engaged with von Sturmer's installation, which consisted of three digital videos projected onto screens (two clunky monitors and a free-standing screen), and a gap in the gallery wall that revealed the storage room behind. The videos showed objects in action (balloons filling with water, scrunched-up paper expanding, a ball of Blu Tack dropping and sticking), which appeared in the on-screen space like art objects in alternative sites, choreographed as a series. In Daniel Palmer's words, von Sturmer's work is "site-specific," deconstructing and multiplying the white cube in which the work appears.[8] Gehmacher responds to the title and intention of the work by adding the medium of his presence (awkward, hesitant, melancholy, direct), words, and choreographic choices to the existing collection of materials. He talks sporadically when I am present, translating crumpled plastic on the screen into fire blazing inside a "fireplace," and the shadow under a monitor into an "apron." He covers the projectors, blackening out the image, and stacks the empty chairs in the space (for viewers of the performance) into a tower, like Constantin Brancusi's *Endless Column* (1918) (there's "too much blank space" in the room he says). He also performs an homage to Bruce Nauman's *Walking in an Exaggerated Manner Around the Perimeter of a Square* (1968), putting his work into direct dialogue with the twentieth-century lineage of dance-gallery relations through his interventions.[9]

Von Sturmer's *Material from Another Medium (Sequence 2)* is part of philanthropist John Kaldor's family collection and during the exhibition it was located in the (then new) John Kaldor Family Gallery. Gehmacher muses on the Kaldor family—ex-partners, favorite children. He returns to the family theme often; he remembers me when I return to the work—he says that I remind him of an aunt in Vienna. He refers reflexively to dance and its place in the gallery as not being ephemeral or immaterial: "in the future museum dancers will be there to stroke and touch," and, "I'm

Philipp Gehmacher with *Material from Another Medium* (Daniel von Sturmer, 2001). Part of *Ghost Telephone*, a month-long chain performance curated by Adrian Heathfield for the 20th Biennale of Sydney, 15 March—15 April 2016. This project was made possible with generous assistance from The Keir Foundation. Courtesy of the artist. Photograph: Zan Wimberley

a Biennale artist now. But none of my people care." This critique of the institutional misstep between dance and visual art continues; he advises, tongue-in-cheek, that if we have sons, they should be dancers and "save the world, save the gallery." The artist telescopes us out of a work to consider its place in the museum as institution, in the chronology of intermedial developments therein, and art history more generally in a way that resonates with the post-conceptual tendencies I discuss in Chapter 8.

Gehmacher's dancing in the museum mobilizes the art form as a medium of adaptation, process, intervention, translation, accumulation, and connection. Dance elements become concepts in new work that speaks back to its context and viewers. Heathfield's and Gehmacher's choices demonstrate how far things had come, since Copeland in 2007 and Obrist and Biesenbach in 2011, to arrive at a curatorial model that supports the artist's active engagement with the art context, where their knowledges, virtuosity, and agency take center stage and open onto processual,

improvisational, and embedded responses. However, this is also a situation determined by Heathfield's curatorial proposition, which included the tag-team structure of *Ghost Telephone* with the artists overlapping into one another's residencies to establish some continuity across their work. Heathfield's framework was also in response to Rosenthal's naming of the gallery as "The Embassy of Spirits" within the broader context of the Biennale; she states, "the artists exhibited here investigate what religion and spirituality may mean for us today."[10] Gehmacher's contribution occurred within layers of curatorial concepts, and so his authorship and agency is shared with Rosenthal, Heathfield, and the other artists.

Gehmacher would return to Australia in 2017 to perform at Griffith University Art Museum his own critically acclaimed work, *my shapes, your words, their grey* (2013), a work in which "bodies, gestures, text, images and objects all dance together."[11] Critic Helmut Ploebst's review of this work when it premiered at Tanzquartier Wien with an associated exhibition at Grauraum describes how Gehmacher "dances enigmatically between exhibition and performance," having abandoned the traditional choreographic formats in his broader practice, working across video, installation, and lecture modes.[12] In this sense, Gehmacher embodies the a-disciplinary artist who brings dance elements such as improvisation, mind-body rigor, contextuality, and process into dialogue and collaboration with other art forms, arts workers, and art infrastructures. Dance as contemporary art manifests here as a negotiation with many moving parts, and my takeaway image of Gehmacher in the last minutes of his last three-hour performance, streaking wildly through the gallery rooms with abandon and agency, brought home the radical potential of the dancer-as-medium as a force of change and transformation within the art museum.

Case Study 5

Artist-Led Events—Shelley Lasica and Zoe Theodore, *To Do/To Make*

Choreographer and theorist Bojana Cvejić clearly articulates a political issue that many have noted regarding the appearance of dance and performance in galleries and museums since the turn of the twenty-first century:

> The current second performance turn in visual art consists of accommodating and adapting already existing works of dance and performance for the purpose of enhancing audience participation. This is part of a larger condition of total aestheticization of consumer-capitalist life, where art is a potent instrument.[1]

Like many of the debates in 1990s dance studies that engaged Michel Foucault's subjected body to discuss the impossibility of a self-determined dancer, such arguments run the risk of positing the dance artist as dupe, manipulated by the institution and powerless within its systems.[2] Rather than desperate artists clambering for the reputational heft that major museums and galleries can bestow, the artists discussed in this book have deliberately and knowingly chosen the particular frames, contexts, associations, and collaborators they work with, and within, as most relevant to their practice. Cvejić herself sees a possible exit point from the power dynamic she articulates in the form of the "transindividual":

> . . . it's interesting to think about the transindividual, how those relational, interactive, reciprocal moments might actually work against these dead ends as a different kind of resistance, to individualism and capitalism alike. Maybe that's wishful thinking.[3]

While Cvejić perhaps applied this to her experiments at Tate Modern in her program of events, *Spatial Confessions (On the question of instituting the public)* (2014), one could think about the transindividual paired with artist self-determination in other examples of artist-curated, dance-based events as a possible escape from the "dead ends" of inequitable power configurations linked to commodity culture.[4]

Adrian Heathfield's and Bart De Baere's collaborative processes as curators maintain the traditional distinction between roles: there are curators and there are artists. However, there are also opportunities in major museums where artists are engaged as curators and the results are often significant (even though they generally repeat the white, male domination observed in art history more broadly). Carte blanche programs, such as Tino Sehgal's exhibition at the Palais de Tokyo in 2016 is one example, as is Ralph Lemon's curatorial project at MoMA, *Some Sweet Day*.[5] Other examples include artist retrospectives such as Xavier Le Roy's *Retrospective by Xavier Le Roy* and Boris Charmatz's *Musée de la danse*, discussed in Part III. However, artist-led initiatives outside the major museums, and in the spirit of the Neo-Dada performance scene in New York circa 1960, offer a unique model where artist agency brings deep and nuanced knowledge of practice and creative process alongside its associated discursive field to actively shape and define the context within which the work occurs. In doing so, such work also defines a field of practice.

In the models rediscovered with the historiographic recuperation of the mid-twentieth-century engagement between dance and the gallery outlined in Chapter 3, we find dance immersed in artist-led events in New York beyond the major galleries, an historical phenomenon familiar within art history and closely tied to an associated performative turn exemplified in groups such as Fluxus. However, the Judson Dance Theater and Surplus Dance concerts pioneered an even newer kind of curatorial collaboration where *all of the artists involved self-curated collectively* in a model that was as challenging as any true democracy.[6] Sally Banes describes the professional context in which such an approach could flourish, with experimental dance acting as a "metacommunity of sorts where the different communities revolving around single arts disciplines coalesced."[7] This philosophy of inclusivity and equality is a reflection of the creative processes shaping the choreographic work of the host community. Banes notes how a Judson piece, such as Yvonne Rainer's *Shall We Run* (1963), involved a group of people behaving as a cohesive and non-heirarchical practice, "herding" or following the leader in running patterns, and producing an image of "a

serious, even heroic, egalitarian collective."[8] Later, the Grand Union collective, a continuation of Rainer's project *Continuous Project—Altered Daily* (1969-1970), would radically critique the role of authority inside a choreographic performance.[9] An improvisation group of stellar artists who each had their own individual body of work, Grand Union modelled a truly democratic structure for co-authored work. In Wendy Perron's excellent book on the group, she explains how "Rainer's ultimate decision to pull back from leading the group was not only a moral imperative but also a feminist moment . . . Rainer had demonstrated a kind of sisterly solidarity."[10] That the dance collectives had a strong female contingent, as opposed to the contemporaneous male-dominated artist-curators in the visual arts collectives described in Chapter 3, is worth underscoring in this discussion about power and agency.

Egalitarian approaches to presentation models for contemporary dance outside theater circuits persist in smaller collectives internationally.[11] Such activity would fit within Terry Smith's third current of contemporary art (after globalization and decolonization); an art of "modest" scale, "specific," and "lower and more lateral" in the international scheme of things.[12] Owing to their localized and unauthorized nature, artist-led spaces, showings, exhibitions, and events are open to the charge of vanity projects; there is no external authority such as state art funders (often peer-assessed) who bestow legitimacy on such phenomena. For this reason, they can also be the place where true innovation occurs beyond the reach of economic or politico-cultural remits that may restrict experimentation. Examples of artist-run dance initiatives internationally include Jacuzzi in Amsterdam and Chez Bushwick in New York (both supported by arts foundations); ReadyMade Works in Sydney (partly government-funded); and Insister Space in Stockholm.[13] The latter is resourced purely through memberships and is

> an artist driven organisation, platform and network for freelance artists within the field of dance and choreography. We work collectively and continuously to question the conditions and methods of artistic work . . . We wish to reshape the neoliberal structures in the dance-field—instead of promoting individual artists, we create supportive structures where our members can work with their own interests but in solidarity with each other . . . All our activities promote constant re-questioning of artistic production and methods; we replace competition with support, and individualism with solidarity.[14]

The key terms here—independence, collectivity, process/methods, practice-based, and artist solidarity—are characteristics that have been defining the dance avant-garde since the birth of contemporary dance at the turn of the twentieth century.

Another independent artist-run presentation program with a focus on choreography and its dialogue with visual arts is *To Do/To Make*, Shelley Lasica and Zoe Theodore's series of co-curated events.[15] Among Case Studies 2 to 5, the specificity of *To Do/To Make* is in its independent, cooperative practice established outside existing opportunities (including the ongoing program at the host venue Neon Parc), to support a simple, sustainable, and focused program that is grounded in a community of practice and discourse.[16] With two editions in 2018 and plans ongoing, this presentation platform was conceived by and for Melbourne artists working between dance and the visual arts, and provides an independent context where they can control the conditions within which their work is seen. Unsupported by government subsidies, with in-kind space from Geoff Newton of Neon Parc and artists being paid from ticket sales, this salon-type program of existing works attempts to de-hierarchialize the artist-organizer relationship. Lasica and Theodore manage this through what they describe as "hands off curation":

> The artists were encouraged to do what they want, present the work for as along as they want, engage as many performers as they want and address the audience as they want, however, we always asked them to present a work that we had seen in the past and that we felt would benefit from re-development or re-presentation.[17]

In this sense, the program is shaped by following the artists' existing practices and communities, identifying what they describe as "leakages" across and between works by artists who share mentors, teachers, cast members, and histories.

To Do/To Make is thus dependent upon an artistic community that recognizes shared practices, lineages, and preoccupations. Theodore describes a clear and consistent orientation in the presented works that reach beyond the logic of the proscenium theater and toward the gallery, but she also describes a challenge to the latter as the performances are "not suited to normal exhibition conditions." Lasica and Theodore also outline shared concerns across the works such as an acute awareness of context (space, history, community, performance), an interest in testing the subject/object

Shelley Lasica, *Behaviour Part 7* (2018), 215 Albion Street, Brunswick, Melbourne, 8 September 2018, *To Do / To Make*, curated by Shelley Lasica and Zoe Theodore in association with Neon Parc. Performers: Sarah Aiken, Ellen Davies, LJ Connolly-Hiatt, Luke Fryer, Timothy Harvey, Alice Heyward, Benjamin Hurley, Rebecca Jensen, Leah Landau, Shelley Lasica, Claire Leske, Jo Lloyd, Daniel Newell, Megan Payne, Bronwyn Ritchie, Harrison Ritchie-Jones, Ivey Wawn, Jo White. Photographer: Jacqui Shelton.

relation often through corporeal engagement with other materials, specific "modes of moving" that blur the distinction between the everyday and the virtuosic, and "stasis" and "exhaustion." The artists involved often work with propositions that can be repeated to produce variable outcomes, and this results in "a mode of address" that draws the audience into something "conceptual, specific, yet porous and open-ended." The performance tone is "perhaps casual," but "not cool," and certainly does not exclude the manic or emotional, "speculative or haphazard." But most importantly, as the name suggests, there is a focus on "the doing" of the work as key to its conditions: "making themselves at the moment," "making to remember," and "continually practising dancing and performing." This often involves collective decision-making, and the majority of the works are for more than one dancer, if not an ensemble. Here is the transindividual as a mode

of operation at the level of practice, choreographic composition, and curatorial philosophy, recalling Jennifer Lacey's description of the collective quality of dance cited in Chapter 2: "Dance is about people spending time together, thinking by behaving, and modify [*sic*] their thoughts by modifying their behavior: it is potentially a very powerful work."[18] And Jérôme Bel and Le Roy on the same:

> choreographies suppose a certain communion: of bodies, of movements, of their capacities, and their way of offering all of these a visibility.[19]

There is a proximity here to Terry Smith's *contemporaneity* as the primary feature of current contemporary arts, and connected to this is the event model of exhibitions.[20] In a conversation between Smith and art historian and theorist Boris Groys, the model of the "installation exhibition" as "event" is discussed as the new *Gesamtkunstwerk*—a total work of art that extends beyond the theater or opera model to potentially encompass anything necessary to the whole, and subsuming the parts to a totalizing vision.[21] Groys talks about this being "subjective" in comparison to more linear, narrative, or survey-type exhibitions, which, in a choreographic model where the elements are themselves subjects, begs the question of whose subjectivity is in play. This is where a community of practice makes particular sense, acknowledging the agency of the various parts of the whole rather than subjection to a singular, externally imposed vision.

Part of the impetus for Lasica and Theodore to curate *To Do/To Make* was a lack of adequate presentation opportunities in Australia for artists working in this way, primarily due to programming limitations at local major arts organizations and shrinking resources under conservative governments. Another factor was the emerging nature of new work that moves across and between the practices, strategies, and aesthetics of dance and those of other contemporary art media. Reciprocity and resistance operate as two sides of one coin as artists map pathways beyond cultural gatekeepers, a map that extends upon traditions that are foundational to contemporary dance, contemporary art, and dance as a contemporary art form. Lasica's solo exhibition, *WHEN I AM NOT THERE*, presented at Monash University Museum of Art in 2022 and the Art Gallery of New South Wales in 2023, continues Lasica's interest in alternative models of authorship. Curated by Hannah Mathews in its premiere MUMA iteration, and described as a "performance-exhibition," Lasica and her dancers occupied the gallery for the opening hours from 10 am to 5 pm and performed con-

sistently among materials from Lasica's decades of performances which included costumes, set design pieces, scripts, and video material. This work is the subject of research by Theodore who acted as Creative Producer for the exhibition, and the insights of her work will bring to light new models of best practice for choreographic-based exhibitions and exhibited works.

This circles us back to French artist Daniel Buren's critique of the rise of the art curator as artist, which he launched in 1972 and updated in 2003, and his important observation in the latter article that it is common practice for artists to take curatorial, editorial, or programming roles in music, opera, theater, publishing, and cinema but not visual art.[22] While performing arts programmers or producers are the equivalent of arts curators, which has resulted in the new moniker *performance curator* as mentioned in Chapter 3, there does seem to be very different histories, kudos, and cultures attached to the two roles. In the case of the emergent, transmedial field of dance as a contemporary art medium, leadership is fragile. Attention to the legacy of experimental dance as the traditional home of highly socialized art practices and collective authorship could bring more lateral models of leadership to presentation and programming in this new field.

PART III

Between the Twentieth and Twenty-First Centuries

This section of the book bridges two periods of experimentation in dance: *the second-wave dance avant-garde*, from the early 1960s to the mid-1970s, and *the third-wave dance avant-garde*, which began in Europe in the early 1990s and is still underway. Understanding the radical and influential nature of the choreographic work that was in dialogue with the broader field of contemporary art during the mid-century avant-garde established in the companion book to *The Persistence of Dance, Choreography, Visual Art and Experimental Composition 1950s-1970s* (2022), the most recent or third wave of experimental dance demonstrates an outward orientation that is even more pronounced, and has affiliations with the visual arts that have a new visibility. The focus of Chapter 4 is dance studies discourses since the 1990s regarding so-called *conceptual dance*. Conceptual dance (as well as non-dance, post-contemporary dance, and think-dance) has been used to describe a certain field of European contemporary dance, and as a term is as contentious as *contemporary dance*. This chapter considers the literature on this field of practice in so far as it throws light on the continuity of the dance-visual arts exchange; the field of conceptual dance has been closely (but certainly not exclusively) associated with the museal turn in dance. What do we mean by conceptual work in relation to dance? Which broadly influential strategies pioneered by dance artists in the mid-twentieth century apply to this more recent activity, and what are the new ways in which dance is in dialogue with contemporary arts practices? Following on from the case studies in Parts I and II, this section also seeks to challenge some assumptions about choreographic work at the interface between dance and visual art, and so, includes a discussion of Boris Charmatz (Case Study

6) as a paradigm of French conceptual dance. Charmatz has contributed substantially to the discourse on the dance-gallery field through his creative provocations as much as his manifestos and other writing projects. Chapter 5 looks at discourses and practices associated with *choreography as a concept*. This phrase has been used to describe the art form's increasingly extra-disciplinary adventures, and involves dance being split more emphatically into *dancing* as movement, technique, and singularity, and *choreography* unhinged from a specific dancing body and deployed by any number of possible elements (a collective of bodies, objects, score, etcetera). I discuss the intra-disciplinary provenance of the term, which produced binaries that cannot account for the diverse approaches appearing in the field, and I challenge associated narratives that have undermined the role of dancing and dancers. Such an approach contributes to other recent literature on dancer agency and labor, helps even up gender discrepancies in the current discourse, and addresses an over-investment of critical attention on narrow geo-cultural regions and cohorts.

Chapter 4

Between the Second- and Third-Wave Dance Avant-Garde

4.1 Introduction

Attention to specific choreographic projects that have been realized in galleries and museums, or are in dialogue with the visual arts but located elsewhere, requires a shift from curatorial and institutional contexts to the work of the work. The discourses surrounding artists working with dance as a contemporary art medium have primarily focused on the impact of new venues on the space-time programming of dance, cultural misunderstandings between arts institutions and dance artists, the condition of a choreographic work as a work of art (connected to the dance archive), and a consuming interest in the social function that has been associated with dance and choreography. Oddly, there has been little attention to distinguishing how the post-medium framework within which such work operates has changed creative practices, methodologies, and outcomes at a compositional level. In the following, I turn to developments in both dance studies and dance as creative practice over the past twenty years that were central to Chapter 2, where I put recent dance criticism into dialogue with the history of dance analysis to revise some key disciplinary principles. This involves the legacy of the North American second-wave dance avant-garde that has had such a significant impact on developments in contemporary dance internationally to place the more recent innovations within their historical-artistic context. Key theorists such as Bojana Cvejić, André Lepecki, Rudi Laermans, Jeroen Peeters, and Isabelle Ginot have contributed to mapping out a field that has survived a crisis in its foundational terms in the last three decades, offering renewed approaches to dance theory and compositional analysis. This allows us to consider which broadly influential strategies pioneered by dance artists in the mid-

twentieth century apply to the most recent dance avant-garde, and the new ways in which dance is informing arts practices and outcomes within the contemporary field at large.

Writing in 1944, John Cage summarizes the two remaining, unchallenged principles of the first wave of experimental dance stretching from Isadora Duncan to Martha Graham as, first, disciplinary dependence on the other arts, and second, an orthodoxy of the singular personality:

> The strength that comes from firmly established arts practices is not present in the modern dance today. Insecure, not having any clear direction, the modern dancer is willing to compromise and to accept influences from other more rooted art matters . . . the strength the modern dance once had was not impersonal but was intimately connected with and ultimately dependent on . . . the originators.[1]

The creative labor of the second wave of experimental dance through the 1960s and 1970s addressed this legacy via strategies of media-focused reduction and differentiation that established discipline specificities, and a programmatic critique of the cult of the author-artist through the employment of aleatory methods, performer neutrality, and collective authoring, among other things. However, the artists involved achieved these through an exchange with contemporaneous fields of creative practice, most intensively with the visual arts.[2]

Accepting the radical and influential nature of the choreographic work that was in dialogue with the broader field of contemporary art in North America during the mid-century avant-garde, the most recent or third wave of experimental dance reveals an even more pronounced orientation beyond its disciplinary borders, including expanded affiliations with the visual arts. French dance theorist Isabelle Ginot notes in 2003 that "a study of the history and aesthetics of the two periods and movements [second and third wave] in order to understand the effects of this proximity still remains to be undertaken."[3] This chapter examines some of the claims made for the recent wave of experimental dance in light of the revised accounts of the mid-century scene undertaken over the past 15 years in order to track continuities in the dialogue between dance and the broader contemporary arts. The following thus attempts to grasp the nuances of the new disciplinary-interdisciplinary field that both repeats, and is differentiated from, the American post-modernists and has been labelled *conceptual*. This work contributes to the task of clarifying what

is understood as conceptual work in contemporary dance since the 1960s, whether and how it is connected to the canonical category of conceptual art, and what, if anything, this has to do with the work I am describing as dance as a contemporary art medium. This requires close attention to key works. Having mapped some of the key concerns for the field in broad strokes through a discussion of recent curatorial work across dance and the gallery in Part II, here I pick up on specific compositional practices and choreographic choices in the work of Boris Charmatz, Xavier Le Roy, and others associated with the conceptual moniker. This shifts the focus in Part III more firmly to the work of artists in the field.

4.2 Conceptual Dance and the Third-Wave Dance Avant-Garde

Since the early 1990s, disciplinary discussions regarding progressive work in dance and choreography have been yoked to an intense focus on so-called *conceptual dance*. Conceptual dance (as well as non-dance, post-contemporary dance, and think-dance) has been used to describe a certain field of Western European contemporary dance, and as a term is as contentious as *contemporary dance*.[4] UK choreographer Jonathan Burrows writes:

> And we've invented the term 'post choreographic field,' and we're all camped out there under the stars while we work out what it means, which is tricky.[5]

Burrows describes the inadequacy of the "conceptual" of "conceptual dance," which was a "thinking mess and only afterwards became history."[6] While the term "conceptual" emerged in visual art, according to Peter Osborne, "as both a critical-curatorial category and a form of practical artistic self-understanding," it has never been taken up so broadly or confidently in dance studies, dance as creative practice, or programming.[7] This is in line with the awkward adoption of visual arts terms for other periods in dance such as post-modernism and Minimalism.[8]

European theorist and artist Bojana Cvejić has taken a leading role in discussions of conceptual dance. In her 2015 book, *Choreographing Problems: Expressive Concepts in European Contemporary Dance and Performance*, Cvejić associates "conceptual" with a derogatory attitude to the work of choreographer Xavier Le Roy and some of his colleagues in light of their resistance to "the foundational characteristics of dance as a his-

torical art discipline."[9] Nevertheless, Cvejić has done much to establish the term in current literature through her book's title, her use of the term in other articles, and her earlier comparison in 2005 of conceptual art and conceptual dance in dialogue with Le Roy.[10] Cvejić concludes that the term "conceptual dance" is symptomatic rather than descriptive, and "designates no movement, poetics, style or genre."[11] However, Cvejić and other writers (Ramsay Burt, Petra Sabisch, Lepecki, Peeters, and Laermans) have outlined in some detail the characteristics of the work of the artists associated with the term.[12] The primarily European artists are listed by Cvejić as Le Roy, Burrows and Jan Ritsema, Charmatz, Eszter Salamon, Mette Ingvartsen and Jefta van Dinther (Cvejić's case studies), as well as Jérôme Bel, Christine de Smedt, Alice Chauchat, Mette Edvardsen, Vera Mantero, Juan Dominguez, María La Ribot, Antonia Baehr, and Thomas Plischke.[13] Regardless of surrounding debates, the designation has stuck and is in circulation, and the fact that a specific group of artists have been consistently associated with the term suggests that there is common ground to be found among them.

Part III considers the literature on this field of practice in so far as it bears on the continuity of the dance-visual arts exchange and mobilizes this discourse in an analysis of French choreographer and dancer Boris Charmatz who has been creating work since the early 1990s. The field of conceptual dance has been closely (but certainly not exclusively) associated with the museal turn in dance. In fact, Lepecki argues that the critical work both within and surrounding such choreographies is behind the impact of the discipline on the "contemporary aesthetic imagination" resulting in "a choreographically renewed visual arts."[14] Jean-Marc Adolphe, a key commentator on this field of work writing in 2004, defines the tendency as "the emergence in recent years in Europe of 'new choreographic forms,' sometimes close to the visual arts or performance."[15] Many of the artists mentioned above cross over into gallery programming, appearing at The Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) (New York), Tate Modern (London), Hayward Gallery (London), Centre Pompidou (Paris), Museum der Moderne Salzburg, and Art Gallery of New South Wales (Sydney), among many others.

Debates around the conceptual as it relates to dance, and the associated art historical and pan-disciplinary binary that sets concepts against materials, throw light on a much broader field of experimental practices than that outlined above, from Meg Stuart in the early 1990s (Case Study 2), through to both Sarah Michelson (Case Study 1) and Adam Linder

(Case Study 7) working in the 2010s and beyond. Conceptual dance in a broader sense, encompassing its pre and post conditions, thus provides a critical framework for a discussion of the contemporaneous, intermedial situation which might better be described as *post-dance*, as I argue in Chapter 8. Such an approach loosens discussions of a third-wave dance avant-garde from a specific network of (mostly male, French) artists, and clarifies any links between choreographic works appearing in the gallery and the legacies of conceptual art and its precedents. So, in Part III, the literature on conceptual dance allows us to first identify links from the mid-century avant-garde to current experimental dance, tracing continuities from Neo-Dada across the two periods; second to track the persistence of strong links between dance and contemporary visual arts across the same; and third to consider the recent intensification of issues arising from the conceptual-material bind with the repeated movement across disciplinary borders between dance and the visual arts (in Chapter 5).

Historically, conceptual work belongs to philosophy, not art. In order to attend to this aspect of recent choreography, theorists have turned to philosophy in a shift that could be described as the most significant philosophical turn in dance studies since the 1990s.[16] This has involved an intense engagement with the work of Gilles Deleuze and Brian Massumi, in step with—and closely aligned to—the performance-philosophy work within performance studies.[17] As an example, Cvejić refers to "a commitment to philosophy" in her discussion of Le Roy, Charmatz et al. with a focus on "practices of thought" that contribute to the philosophical project more broadly, and declares her intention to "account for them conceptually by a philosophical method."[18] She focuses on their "analytic propositions" (which she sees as a continuity with conceptual art), and "problems" as an act of thought in such work.[19] This suggests an orientation toward ideas and away from the materiality of dance in her approach, but this, as we shall see in Chapter 6, is not the complete story regarding Cvejić and her peers.

The relationship with philosophy extends to the dance artists themselves who can certainly articulate their ideas and practices in sophisticated ways that continue the tradition of the artist-theorist emerging in the mid-century avant-garde.[20] Like composer Henry Flynt who studied philosophy and refers to the field in his seminal discussion of concept art in the early 1960s, certain of the dance artists associated with conceptual dance directly reference philosophers' work. A key commentator here is Swedish artist-theorist Mårten Spångberg who notes in 2002 that "the

interest for [sic] language and its conditions in relation to the moving body" in conceptual dance drew on philosophers such as Michel Foucault to undertake a "diagnosis" of the discourses shaping the dancing body.[21] Bel discusses reading Roland Barthes, Foucault, and Pierre Bourdieu, and works such as his first one, *Nom donné par l'auteur* (1994), directly address such philosophy.[22] Cvejić notes that Le Roy, in turn, "draws . . . on the thinking of philosophers such as (among others) Gilles Deleuze, Donna Haraway, Bruno Latour, and Jacques Rancière."[23]

Despite such relationships with philosophical work, Cvejić notes that, in practice, conceptual dance is less text-based than conceptual art. It is true that the use of text *in* the work of dance artists is limited in comparison to conceptual art in which, as Lucy Lippard states, it "offered a bridge between the verbal and the visual."[24] However, it is as pronounced as it was during the second wave, one historical exemplar being Trisha Brown's *Accumulation with Talking plus Watermotor* (1979) in which Brown interweaves two of her dances, *Accumulation* (1971) and *Watermotor* (1978), with two spoken narratives, one about the dance's origins and the other a personal anecdote. Le Roy and Bel have lecture-based performances, *Product of Circumstances* (1999) and *Pichet Klunchun and Myself* (2005), respectively, which use language as commentary on the action, and Bel also uses text on t-shirts and song lyrics as narrative components of his works (*Shirtologie* [1997] and *The Show Must Go On* [2001]). But this is different to the use of language in conceptual art as "iterative structure and representational medium," in Liz Kotz's words.[25] An example here would be Tony Conrad's tautological word score, *This Piece Is Its Name*, "in which the substance of the piece is 'This Piece Is Its Name'," so that the work is fully realized in its word form.[26]

Not all artists described as conceptual share a commitment to theory and philosophy, nor do they all turn to language as material within their work. American conceptual artist Sol LeWitt took a different tack (perhaps distancing himself from earlier concept artists such as Flynt) and his approach resonates with some of the dance work recognized here as approaching the conceptual. He is clear that "this kind of art is not theoretical or illustrative of theories . . . Conceptual art doesn't really have much to do with mathematics, philosophy, or any other mental disciplines . . . The philosophy of the work is implicit in the work and is not an illustration of any system of philosophy."[27] LeWitt's formula of a conceptual art that is bound to its material form, which is discussed in more detail in Chapter 6, epitomizes the poetic work described by Jeremy

Prynne and Laurence Louppe where experimental composition is found to engage deeply with "the resources that the practice itself has chosen," the medium, and its parameters (in Prynne's terms, its *language*).[28] As demonstrated in Michelson's art in Case Study 1, the recent work continues and deepens the dialogue with the visual arts begun in earnest in the 1960s, and leverages this "sociability" to extend its internal disciplinary critique, also begun in that period. In Part III, a poetic method engaging with the dance elements set out in Chapter 2 argues for *materials as ideas* or *dance elements as concepts* (paradigms suggested by LeWitt) in conceptual dance, establishing the recent avant-garde as working at, rather than beyond, its disciplinary limits.[29]

4.3 Continuity between Recent Experimental Dance and the Post-War Neo-Avant-Garde or Neo-Dada

Lepecki's much-cited 2004 article, "Concept and Presence: The Contemporary European Dance Scene," focuses on the group of dance artists considered conceptual (but to which he does not apply the moniker despite his article's title) in relation to the first- and second-wave avant-garde. He notes, "rather than rehearsing a modernist rupture with the past, contemporary European choreography sees the past as a common ground, as the surface it is inevitably destined to wander on."[30] Lepecki thus argues that the third wave consciously occupies the same critical terrain as its predecessors of the 1960s and 1970s, noting in particular their continued dialogue with minimal and conceptual tendencies. Two years later he makes a concession regarding the term "conceptual dance":

> I do think, however, that 'conceptual dance' at least allows for historically locating this movement within a genealogy of twentieth-century performance and visual arts, by referring to the conceptual art movement of the late 1960s and early 1970s . . . 'Conceptual dance' at least prevents claiming absolute historical originality to this movement, something I believe its participants would agree with, given their open dialogue with the history of performance art and postmodern dance.[31]

A year earlier, Ginot took a different position that, by her own account, has been ignored until recently, providing a critique of the discourse surrounding conceptual dance.[32] She systematically questions claims made

by, and on behalf of, artists such as Le Roy and Bel regarding their radical reworking of traditional notions of originality, authorship, and authenticity, suggesting that moderating such assertions would better acknowledge historical precedents.[33] Keeping Lepecki and Ginot's positions in mind, the following seeks to identify continuities between the second- and third-wave artists while acknowledging the important innovative ground struck by the latter.

Lepecki's outline of the characteristics associated with the conceptual dance artists has become authoritative and what follows underscores how conceptual dance first emerged as a critique of theater dance—that is, dance appearing in proscenium theater venues or their equivalent. He lists an anti-representational mode, anti-virtuosity, simplified performance scenarios, "a deep dialogue with visual arts and with performance art," a critique of visuality and movement, an explicit engagement with theory, and a preoccupation with presence.[34] Also in 2004, Adolphe and Gérard Mayen list slow temporalities and attention to "the less visible part of the movement" alongside non-predetermined corporealities "as a place of construction, experimentation, and inscription of being-in-the-world" as key characteristics of the work.[35] In 2007 Pouillaude adds anti-narration, anti-expression, and anti-compositionalism.[36] Self-reflexivity regarding the terms of production and process is also a recurring theme.[37] And almost ten years later, Cvejić adds some more nuanced points that emphasize the critique of theater: the dissolution of the dramatic apparatus that synthesizes making, performing, and attending under the domain of a unifying concept, with anchoring concepts instead being specific to each facet of a performance event; the foregrounding of time as the unifying element in performance; and "impurity" regarding mediality.[38] Other characteristics added by Cvejić include the very Cagean elements of undermining both recognition of the staged object along with a stable spectatorial position, and a critique of the identity of the author.[39] One element that is constant but rarely underlined (with the exception of Lepecki's extended consideration of stasis in this work), is a general tendency toward reduction that approaches a kind of minimalism often linked to the recurrence of solo work in this field.[40]

The radical testing of disciplinary parameters that is often claimed for this generation of experimental dance artists is clear when they are mapped back against the dance principles of Chapter 2. This work is clearly *post*-disciplinary, being dependent upon the form's defining characteristics to do its self-reflexive work, and thus we see *the persistence of*

a thing called dance at the point of its disappearance. However, in the work of the mid-twentieth-century dance avant-garde there are many of these same characteristics, including a strong engagement with the contemporaneous experimental arts and the widespread rejection of expression, narrative, and representation more generally.[41] The critique of virtuosity and visuality landed firmly in the work of Simone Forti, Steve Paxton, and Yvonne Rainer, with various uses of ambulatory movement, and an associated rejection of spectacle taken to an extreme in Forti's *Platforms* (1961) where the performers were hidden from view inside human-sized boxes. Brown spearheaded the interest in modes of presence within dance with works such as *Homemade* (1966) in which she wore a projector playing a film of her dancing the same dance *while dancing*, working the space between liveness and the recorded image. Her *Inside* (1966)—in which the audience sat on the four sides of the performance space while Brown "moved along the edge . . . on the kneecaps of the audience . . . looking at the audience"—reconsidered performer attitudes and proximity and their effect on presence and spectatorship. The same can be said of Rainer's *Trio A* (1966), which has been much written about regarding the effacement of the performer's gaze to deny their objectification by the viewer.[42] Experiments with extremes of pace and scale challenged the centrality of movement and visibility and highlighted the temporal dimensions of dance. Paxton explored stillness in his work well before his practice called *The Small Dance, The Stand* (1977) (e.g., *Transit* [1962] and *Flat* [1964]), so established an important precedent to the current interest in the same. And Brown's *Roof and Fire Piece* (1973), transmitted by single dancers across rooftops in New York, was impossible to perceive as one composition, exemplifying a critique of an ideal spectatorial position.

Forti, Brown, Rainer, and their colleagues such as Deborah Hay developed pared back staging that was easily transferable or adaptable to all kinds of venues, including the gallery, which in turn refocused attention on dancing as the material of the work. A challenge to anthropocentricism came in the form of the "non-human movement" of Forti's object-based works such as *See-Saw* (1960) and *Slant Board* (1961). Intermediality, established as a new standard in that New York milieu and chronicled in the writing of Jill Johnston et al., found a particular home within the parameters of dance, and this inclusive characteristic of the art form continues to appeal to the visual arts. To disagree with Pouillaude's mention of anti-compositionalism, the interest in composition turned then, as it has more recently, to an exposition of process, method, and means, so that cho-

reographic mechanisms were visible and indeed highlighted in the work of Brown, Rainer, and Paxton, and, more recently in that of Burrows, Bel, and Charmatz. In both avant-gardes, this involved a critique of the framing of the work (regarding technique, venue, institution, economy, etc.) and the term *dispositif* has been introduced to encompass all these aspects of composition.[43] This new approach to composition was yoked to questions of authorship and saw the development of movement scores that are now ubiquitous. To quote LeWitt, "to work with a plan that is preset is one way of avoiding subjectivity."[44]

4.4 Conclusion

Given the historical precedents for many of the stated features of the more recent avant-garde, what then are the unique innovations of this more recent group of artists? And how do these innovations cross over, once again, with the progressive work being done in the visual arts? As I note in *Choreography, Visual Art and Experimental Composition 1950s-1970s*, choreographic practices of the American mid-century were influencing developments in contemporary art such as the democratization of materials and authorship, the dematerialization of the art object, institutional critique, processual and distributive/iterative art, and intersubjectivity, all of which would contribute significantly to our current post-conceptual condition. Which of these tendencies apply to the most recent dance avant-garde, and what are the new ways in which dance is informing contemporary arts practices and outcomes? Some attention to the work of Charmatz will help answer some of these questions and clarify our understanding of genealogies related to the field.

In many of the cases that follow, as with those already described, the work of dance as a contemporary art medium does in fact manifest as dancers dancing in a gallery or art museum space. This "pointy end" of the broader intermedial situation brings some of the central issues—particularly those relating to the political and economic tensions that haunt the dance-gallery liaison—into high relief. Lepecki and Franko ask, "what are the conditions of labour of the dancer and choreographer in the framework of museum performance?" and refer to Bruce Nauman's score directive to "hire a dancer," which describes Mathieu Copeland's approach in Case Study 3.[45] Their line of questioning has been repeated recently by Catherine Damman in relation to *Judson Dance Theater: The Work is Never Done*:

> The issue was never whether dance belongs in the museum or gallery, but rather what we do with dance—and how we treat dancers—once it's there . . . Modest demands might look something like this: Pay attention to dancers, to dancing itself, and to the specificities of dance history and forms.[46]

Rather than artists performing another version of the dancer for hire, the following examples of Charmatz, Linder, Shelley Lasica, Maria Hassabi, and Latai Taumoepeau, like Michelson, show how certain choreographic work is in dialogue with both established art contexts and contemporary art practices. Such artists are participating in a new exchange that repeats the conditions of Neo-Dada where the dance artists were largely in control of their engagement with the visual arts. Each work brings specific choreographic elements to the foreground such as process, practice, participation, visibility, time, presence, and singularity. In doing so within the art gallery or museum, they re-imagine the contemporary arts with dance, dancing, and choreography working *and* unworking institutional codes. The other side of this tendency has seen contemporary visual artists employing dance-based approaches and strategies in much the same way as Rauschenberg and Nauman; the choreographic work of Agatha Gothe-Snape sits within this field and actively acknowledges this legacy.[47] Across all the case studies there are examples of adaptation, transference, comparison, incorporation, replacement, and integration, but the movement beyond binary models and toward a-disciplinarity is clear as dance knowledges become one material among many for the artists, whether they define themselves as choreographers, or not.

Case Study 6

Boris Charmatz—Institutional Critique and Contemporary Dance Histories[1]

Much has been written about French choreographer Boris Charmatz. The following focuses on his contribution to the formation of what has been called "conceptual dance," particularly the specific manifestation of the conceptual-material relation in his work presented in museums and galleries. Having trained in classical ballet and taken part in the European encounter with the American second-wave legacy in the 1980s and 1990s, Charmatz's commitment to the physical practice of dancing has been approached choreographically through highly conceptual structures unique to each work, including the dance-museum-as-concept.[2] Several aspects of his work are important for the critical thrust of this book. First is his desire to expand choreographic works into intermedial experiments exemplified in a project such as *Ouvrée (artistes en alpage)* (2000), which brought together multigenerational artists from various disciplines in an open-form workshop.[3] Second, his dance advocacy manifests in a desire to expose "the minor, the anonymous, the collective, and the intensive" aspects of the discipline, in Noémie Solomon's words, which aligns with the advocacy agenda of *The Persistence of Dance*.[4] Third, Charmatz was one of "Les Signataires du 20 Août," which will be discussed in Chapter 5, and the influential political position of that group propelled much of the European conceptual dance activity.[5] And last, his work for the gallery evidences some continuities with, and significant departures from, the second-wave dance avant-garde.

All of this appears to have led him and his producer and collaborator Angèle Le Grand to the notion of *Musée de la danse* (2009-2018), an overarching concept that oriented his entire practice toward a comparison between disciplines that such a speculation necessarily provokes. This involved curators, producers, choreographers, dancers, and the public in

an experimental re-orientation of the status quo vis-à-vis the arts, a project that his peer Jérôme Bel sums up as expanding the definition of dance "to its maximum so we can find it, identify it everywhere."[6] *Musée de la danse* is thus perhaps the ultimate concept of dance in relation to this book project: "a conceptual dream that has taken shape with everyone's gestures" (in Charmatz's words) to redress an historiographic exclusion.[7] But if redressive action is on the agenda, there are several strategies currently in play and we will see how Charmatz's institutional approach, which he describes as a Trojan-like invasion, differs from artists such as choreographer Adam Linder who choose the museum as site and context for their work at the outset.[8] Insisting on such differentiations and specificities helps clarify the nuanced approaches at the dance-visual arts interface.

In a discussion on "Conceptual Art and the Reception of Duchamp," Benjamin Buchloh identifies "the transition from self-reflexivity to tautology to contextuality as three stages of conceptual development," with the latter reflecting on "institutions, framework, distribution."[9] While one can see all three tendencies across second- and third-wave avant-garde dance, context played a special role in the second-wave, which was at the forefront of institutional critique, epitomized in Trisha Brown's rejection of the main dance stages in New York and occupation of urban spaces in the first decades of her practice. As Henry Sayre states, "it is important to recognize, in Brown's removal of her dance to a lake in Minneapolis or to a rooftop in Manhattan, a rejection of the system which would *contain* it in order to *sell* it."[10] The revision of disciplinary elements in the second wave was yoked to the spaces in which it was developed and presented, beginning perhaps with Anna Halprin's move outdoors to her dance deck in California and the streets of San Francisco, and continuing in New York with the diversification of performance sites mentioned earlier, which included parks, building exteriors, warehouse spaces, university gymnasiums, galleries, museums, and roller-skating rinks. This was the result of rejections from traditional festivals and venues and the presentation circuits they represented, but it meant that twentieth-century dance took the lead in a rigorous reinvention of art contexts, so that in this way it was more institutionally resistant than the rest of Neo-Dada, which maintained functional relationships with traditional institutional structures.[11]

Charmatz's work is interesting in dialogue with this aspect of the mid-century avant-garde. His *Museé de la danse* is a take-over:

> If one wishes the choreographic tradition to pursue the new technological trends and truly embrace the trans-media space of the contemporary world, then it seems to me that under the designation of Museum the artists will be able to have fun and create freely . . . We are at a time in history where a museum can be alive and inhabited as much as a theatre, can include a virtual space, and offer contact with dance that can be at the same time practical, esthetic and spectacular . . . where a museum in no way excludes precarious movements, nor nomadic, ephemeral, instantaneous ones . . . where a museum can modify BOTH preconceived ideas about museums AND one's ideas about dance.[12]

A broad dissatisfaction with the model of national choreographic centers in France became, for Charmatz, a critique of the institutional framework he inherited as the new director of Centre Chorégraphique National de Rennes et de Bretagne in 2009 and saw him look elsewhere for other models to claim.[13] His proposition was not a museum that we would recognize at the time; he describes a fun, liberated, open, technologically equipped haven for transmedial activity. But he hit upon what museums hoped to become (encompassing the processual, dematerialized, and intersubjective characteristics mentioned in Chapter 4), and Charmatz, rather than waiting for an invitation and weighing up his options à la Bel, proactively proposed what it was that he desired, and it (more or less) became so.[14] Charmatz understands that dance requires—or initiates—an entirely new model of the museum, and this is what he approaches in this project through a disciplinary stand-off at the threshold between the studio (rather than the theater) and the gallery.

Musée de la danse is a speculative framework that is not limited to the Centre Chorégraphique National de Rennes et de Bretagne but can find a home anywhere and can house any number of activities. In 2015, Charmatz and Catherine Wood presented *If Tate Modern was Musée de la danse?* at Tate Modern, London, a landmark exhibition in terms of scale and the use of streaming technologies to negotiate disciplinary differences.[15] The project was described as "a large-scale, two-day dance event . . . a variety of dance invitations, choreographies, exhibitions and free spaces," and included performances of Charmatz's early choreographic duet *À bras-le-corps* (1993), solos from *Levée des conflits* (2010), a community-led performance of *Roman Photo* (2009), and *manger* (2014), to which I will return.[16] Posing the question in its title, the project proposed a new hybrid entity, "the tatemuséemoderndeladanse."[17] UK choreographer Jonathan Burrows responded:

> I went to Boris Charmatz' Museé de la Danse at Tate Modern and I thought 'These are my people,' and I thought 'I don't care where they do this but a gallery is as good as any other place so long as they keep on doing it,' and it made me wonder what it was they were doing and whether it was old or new, and it seemed to defy exact placement and I thought maybe that is what we're doing, to somehow keep occupying these spaces that can't be easily identified but live in the body and can be activated anywhere, and as much as we worry that we should be more popular, nevertheless we enjoy this place of privileged deviancy that pulls people in, and has nothing to do with history but is about defiant and intelligent becoming.[18]

Burrows sums up the complicated ambiguities in Charmatz's project: the ever nimble, resourceful choreographer stumbling upon millions of new audience members; the relatively obscure (or minored) historical precedents in dance that dissolve in the novelty and marketability of Charmatz's vision; the mobility of the body archive at the center of his vision that can make a home anywhere and resists "exact placement"; and the flirtation with the possibility of losing the subversive, seditious elements of dance that have kept it relevant yet slightly apart from its disciplinary peers. Charmatz himself is aware of his concept as a provocation: "it's a proposition—not a reality."[19]

Alessandra Nicifero has flagged the importance of Charmatz's co-curatorial project in providing "more equality over the negotiations and aesthetic decisions involved in performing dance in museums . . . To have a dialogue without accommodating dance practices to the desires of the institutional discourse."[20] He is no unwitting tool of the museum, flattered by its attentions, but has rather located the museum within his own suite of research projects that began with *Association EDNA* and continues in his role at Tanztheater Wuppertal since 2022, which was established by German choreographer Pina Bausch. Mark Franko's essay, "Museum Artifact Act," celebrates Charmatz's idea that dance offers the museum what it itself does not have: dance creates its own museum in each instant in dancing bodies, thus constituting an "emancipatory procedure" when relocated to the museum. He writes, "the wealth of museum collections is productive of extreme poverty whereas the poverty of dance is productive of extreme wealth."[21] This echoes Burrows above on how dance can "keep occupying these spaces that can't be easily identified but live in the body and can be activated anywhere." This optimistic tone is a celebration of the qualities of dance that have been the envy of the visual arts since Rob-

ert Rauschenberg put on his skates, and points to an inherent resistance on the part of contemporary dance to the operations of capitalism.

One choreographic work that has been included in iterations of *Musée de la danse* at major museums of art, including Tate Modern, is *20 Dancers for the XX Century* (2013-2017) and this piece is perhaps emblematic of Charmatz's concept.[22] For this work, Charmatz commissioned 20 dancer-choreographers to perform, as solo artists, excerpts from their body archive; choreographies of their own or others, or dance techniques they were trained in. *The New York Times* critic Brian Seibert describes an encounter with Richard Move, a dance-impersonator, who performed as Martha Graham in the work at the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA), New York:

> For a while, he wandered like any other visitor, looking at the art. But Mr. Move also was the art. The Graham choreography he performed was an exhibit, yet so was he: a dancer as a living archive of dance . . . This was art that explained itself, or tried to . . . They gave minilectures, answered questions, suggested connections . . .[23]

Charmatz aims to raise the visibility of dance in its material form within gatekeeper institutions, arguing through practice and discourse for the historical significance of a medium that is so easily invisibilized.[24] By placing historical works embodied by current practitioners as "exhibits" beside other esteemed art works, Charmatz emphasizes (perhaps didactically) both the instability and persistence of the art object in dance in order to

> foster teaching and dissemination by way of a panorama of twentieth-century dance. Performers with diverse backgrounds and from different generations take over the hallways, rooms, and stairways of institutions of learning, appropriating and exhibiting some of the landmark solos of the twentieth century. As they stroll around, the audience may come across these strange visitors in motion dispersed around the building: they might discover a Merce Cunningham solo or a dance by Isadora Duncan, allowing everyone to build, each in his own way, a living, non-linear archive of dance in which they may forget themselves, pause, wander from echo to echo, from gesture to gesture . . .[25]

The work aims to demonstrate equivalence between paintings, sculptures, video works, and dances, while never forgetting "there's an 'imma-

François Chaignaud performing as part of *20 Dancers for the XX Century*. Direction by Boris Charmatz, Tate Modern, 15 May 2015. Artist Copyright: Tate©. Photo: Tate.

terial' part of the collection [of *Musée de la danse*]" that will always resist the museum's conditions, most obviously through the one-off status of the performances (organized for each iteration), and their exclusion from acquisitions and, thus, collections.[26]

Other points of resistance and differentiation between the dancers and their context in *20 Dancers for the XX Century* are in evidence in the qualities of the specific performances recorded at Tate Modern: the effects of gravity that engage the floor rather than the wall (Ko Murobushi performing Tatsumi Hijikata, Samuel Lefeuvre performing Alain Platel); an attention to the perception-action interface within the body (Chrysa Parkinson performing Anne Teresa De Keersmaeker); physical presence as both process and product (Julie Cunningham and Antonia Franceschi performing technique); and the effacement of a divide between art and life through the conflation of the artist-subject and the art-object (Frank Willens performing Charlie Chaplin in a performance-lecture). Curator Helen Molesworth would add the following dance characteristics in comparison with the other arts: "an acculturation with duration, a high regard

for non-narrativity, and sensations of bodily empathy."[27] These were also on display in Murobushi's crawl along the floor in a drawn out Butoh temporality, uncontextualized (un-narrativized) physical states such as Lefeuvre's disconcertingly tortured and awkward behaviors, and Parkinson's delicate feeling-forms emerging in, and transforming the energy of, her crowded gallery room. Placing choreographies side by side in this way also allows for the kind of networked spectatorial experiences produced by the museum but rarely available to dance audiences: non-linear, personalized maps that make sense of history through the detail of "gestures" and "echoes" (to use Charmatz's terms) across and between works in and through performance in real time-space.

Owing to the clarity of *Musée de la danse*'s aims, intentions, and methods, this speculative provocation became a touchstone in the discourse surrounding dance and the gallery. In a special issue of *Dance Research Journal*, *Dance in the Museum*, Charmatz is the subject of three articles, the author of one, and is also interviewed.[28] While Charmatz's politics are about decentering power and valorizing the role of the dancer (often over the choreographer), he has found himself auteur of what Ana Janevski describes as "an artist's project" in the most high-profile new venues for dance.[29] His many invitations from museums and galleries (e.g., Biennale of Sydney [2016], Tate Modern [2015], MoMA [2013]) to present his conceptually acute, but also singular take on the dance-visual arts relationship, have stimulated much critical debate.[30]

There is certainly some truth that his projects accommodate the new museum strategies such as the experience economy and participatory aesthetics that have been engaged in the service of its own reinvention, occupying a place of "slippage between dance as a fine art practice and the spectacle that it can become," to use choreographer Sara Wookey's phrase.[31] Linder notes:

> Boris's work was waged on this idea that dance's value is in its presence, in its community, with its public. It is this immaterial form, [however], all the personnel of the material is alive and kicking and therefore, if it engaged with the audience it would breach and overcome the kind of glib detachment that objects in the space can't offer.[32]

While it may be true that Charmatz, Le Roy, and Bel mobilize a participatory aesthetic in the gallery which may be open to the criticisms associated with the same, it is also true that Charmatz has demonstrated

a long-term commitment to participation as an aesthetic strategy and philosophy. His project *Terrain* (2019-after leaving the Bretagne choreographic centre) creates events such as *Dance Ground for Zurich* (2019) which brings this philosophy to a decisive point in an outdoor, inclusive, 18-day festival of dance.[33]

A more generative point of critique might be *Musée de la danse* as a stand-off; so what if dance claims the museum as its own? In terms of programming, the dance take-over model can be seen as a temporary, novel, and alien occupation that is focused on the museum as a venue for cultural experience and pedagogy, in comparison to, for example, the artist-led model of *To Do/To Make* curated by Zoe Theodore and Shelley Lasica (Case Study 5) that provides an alternative to both the theater *and* the museum. Charmatz's take-over, or "experimental invasion," is also different to the thread of practice we are following from the mid-twentieth century, downtown New York milieu to recent work that is equally at home in the gallery *and* the dance studio.[34] Like Le Roy's *Retrospective by Xavier Le Roy* (discussed in Chapter 5), Charmatz's *20 Dancers for the XX Century* and the concept of *Musée de la danse* are many things, but they do not fulfill the working definition of a field of *dance as contemporary art*. The latter work is distinct from contemporary dance presented on the stage that has its lineage in theater and ballet; however, this is exactly the kind of dance culture that Charmatz introduced to the gallery in *20 Dancers for the XX Century*, which featured the work of Merce Cunningham, Ted Shawn, Bausch, and Bel, performed as it would be on stage. In this sense, Charmatz's *Musée de la danse* does not emerge from a deep engagement with contemporary art practices and knowledges, despite Charmatz's studies in art history, or build on the legacy of dance-gallery pioneers such as Forti and Brown. It is distinct from the approach of artists such as Sarah Michelson, Lasica, Maria Hassabi, and other case studies in this book who have considered the contemporary art context as a part of their practice across their choreographic careers. Charmatz emerged from training in classical ballet and discovered contemporary dance through seeing works locally, studying at the Conservatoire National Supérieur de Lyon, working with Régine Chopinot and Odile Duboc, and meeting the important French dance researcher, Hubert Godard.[35] He became part of a wave of new choreographers in France and Europe who were focused on an alternative to a conservative model of dance that was local and has been ill-defined (as discussed in Chapter 5) but was potent for his generation. From a distance, intermediality in this context appears reactionary rather than emerging

from an organic community of practice, or indeed, from intermedial aesthetic lineages. Charmatz's position as advocate produces work stabilized by dance in its grammatical, cultural, and political conditions (no matter how critical it is of the same) and distinguishes it from an a-disciplinary or post-disciplinary position.

Charmatz's interest in the dancer (a role he has never abandoned himself, creating a solo—*Somnole*—for himself in 2021), and what Burrows interprets as his commitment to the "privileged deviancy" of dance as a discipline, became clearer to me when I encountered his contribution to the 2016 Biennale of Sydney. It also helps clarify where his choreographies, which have been mostly conceived for stage and are one part of his multifaceted outputs, fall within the dance-visual art field. Charmatz presented *manger* (2014) at Carriageworks in Sydney, an old railway yard with vast performance spaces and an industrial aesthetic. Originally devised for the stage, it was adapted here to "an embodied installation and a durational performance, a living exhibition and a dance," where the dancers, sound score, and paper-as-prop were the sole materials of the work.[36] His dancers were scattered on the concrete floor around the space but worked mostly in isolation, performing highly wrought solos in parallel, contained in space and full of a dark energy that reached extremes of pitch and tone. The themes of the work—the literal translation of the title is "to eat" but the broader theme is the mouth and orality—were manifested almost solely through the physical performance. Jeroen Peeters observes that Charmatz, Stuart, and Benoît Lachambre, who have all worked together (as noted in Part II), share an interest in "the body as filter," as noted in Case Study 2. For Peeters, this refers to the body as an active center for processing perceptions, sensations, and thoughts within a given context and converting these into meaning through action:

> These bodies, permeable as filters, are inextricably linked to the context in which they operate. In principle susceptible, these bodies are discursive sites where accepted meanings are outlawed, and where visual hierarchies and conventions are re-mediated.[37]

Peeters sees the discursive nature of such dance as a tension between the body as experienced, and the body as an object within a visual economy. Such economies or "heirarchies" are "remediated" through the agency, instability, and sensitivity (like a film plate or "filter") of the dancing body. Peeters describes these bodies as "heterogeneous," as empty of

Boris Charmatz *manger*, 2014. Choreography: Boris Charmatz. Performance, 60 mins (19 March 2016) presented at Carriageworks for the 20th Biennale of Sydney. Courtesy the artist. Photograph: Zan Wimberley

preconditioning as they can be, and "susceptible" to the influences that surround them, including predetermined movement scores.[38] The importance of context as it pertains to the condition of the dancer working at the perception-action nexus recurs in the case studies in this book and will be a focus in my discussion of the Lasica and Hassabi case studies.

The question of context also returns us to the heart of the material aspect of dance through which Charmatz realizes his (corporeally based) concepts in *manger*. This choreographic strategy is in line with his commitment to the body as medium across all of his works and his privileging of "dancing" over "choreography," something that sets him apart from some of his conceptual dance peers. His colleague Dimitri Chamblas describes how Charmatz works through the conceptual aspects of a new piece, "then he faces them off with the material nature of the dancing body."[39] An associated aim of *manger* was that the dance should "linger" in the bodies of the audience.[40] I observed the spectators negotiating their proximity to the physical states of the dancers and their relationship to the perceived action, their own behavior and responsibility,

and the affective force of it all. Observing as an audience member, and watching a primarily visual arts audience negotiate this work, the power of subjectivity-as-art-medium had never been so apparent to me. The technique, virtuosity, powerful scores engaging with imagination and physical states, temporal structures of duration that helped us all go deep, and self-conscious associations with trance dance and ritual, produced an overwhelmed and reverential state in so many around me. Charmatz was using the most powerful means of the discipline to expose the audience to his themes knowing that physical presence, proximity, force, labor, energy, and rhythm are both disarming and contagious.[41] A work about the functions of the body, expressed through the body in motion in an installation context, closed the space between content and media, meaning and form, object and subject, using all of the tools of theater-based dance rebirthed in a new context with new audiences in novel proximity to the action. The sophistication of this intention, which would have challenged visual arts audiences to reconsider what they think contemporary art can do and be, is in contrast to the rather didactic approach taken in Charmatz's larger *Musée de la danse* project.

manger is not a particularly radical work for contemporary dance, but when Charmatz places it in and among visual arts audiences, it is another "take-over." When Wood describes how Charmatz works with "the staging of attention" and "holding our gaze" to draw us toward something "potentially ungraspable and too particular to be repeated," she is describing the condition of contemporary dance as infamously "hard to see."[42] Charmatz has clearly mastered the choreographic structure of parallel solos that appear in his other works; in such work individuals are in full flight, improvising around scores and owning their material in a radical way that forcefully engages audience attention.[43] From his earliest work, *À bras-le-corps* (1993), which was performed with the audience in a tight frame around Charmatz in a very physical duet with Chamblas, Charmatz understood that the power of dance is in the dancers' bodies, and that *doing dancing* is the most powerful tool of the discipline.[44] This plays out even in his discursive workshop forms such as *expo zéro* (2009) where devices and tools are banned and "participants manifest their work solely through encounters with each other."[45] Concepts in his work are always arrived at via the body.

Charmatz's position in debates surrounding *dance as a contemporary art form* is interesting. He is committed to dance as a discipline and works with the medium in challenging formations, often involving

intermediality-as-experiment, and engages the institutional critique native to the art form, pehaps more aggressively than the second-wave artists. He also brings a conceptual approach to dance history, performance contexts, and disciplinary infrastructure in tune with others who are labelled "conceptual dance artists" and significantly departing from the second wave in his focus on these. All of this has made him a leading innovator in the third-wave dance avant-garde. He has studied visual art, collaborated with visual artists and major arts organizations, and represents the most public face of the choreographic turn in contemporary art.[46] Yet his choreographic works have a theater logic and make most sense in dialogue with the contemporary dance canons that he plunders, so reverentially, across his oeuvre, and this is a striking difference from the gallery works of Brown, Forti, and Deborah Hay that were operating far from a theater logic and deep in dialogue with their visual art peers. So, does Charmatz's entire body of work represent a Trojan Horse, a trick that knocks at the door of the art museum and blatantly overruns it, on its own terms, only to pack up and go home, continuing along its own journey? Is that dancer who rides the edge between experience and exposition, feeling and form, and who carries their own history with them wherever they go, always going to choose another home? Will dance always be alien to the art museum? A new generation of artists are taking a different tack, working the interstices within the institution in a less combative and spectacular way, and looking more comfortable among other works of contemporary art. The next case study, Adam Linder, is part of a new generation of artists who identify as choreographers yet move easily between the art museum or gallery, theater, and other contexts, creating work specifically for each.[47] Linder refers to peers such as Isabel Lewis, Yve Laris Cohen, Andros Zins-Browne, and Ligia Lewis. Others who could be added to this generation of dance artists in Australia include Angela Goh, Amrita Hepi, Jo Lloyd, Lizzie Thomson, Brian Fuata, Deanne Butterworth, Brooke Stamp, Matthew Day, and Alice Heyward, and I list their international peers in Chapter 1. But first I will turn my attention to the rise of conceptual and post-conceptual work across all fields of art to better understand a central (but not sole) aspect of the conditions within which such work is operating.

Chapter 5

Choreography as Concept and Post-disciplinarity

5.1 Introduction

Art theorist Hal Foster summarizes the importance of the work done by Robert Rauschenberg in the mid-1950s that anticipated the preoccupations of contemporary art over the second half of the twentieth century and into the twenty-first: "conceptual gesture, material process, and performative action."[1] A clustering of new and advanced art around *concepts*, *materials*, and *performance* emerged from the intermedial mid-century avant-garde that was engaging, as Rauschenberg did, with dance as a model and strategy. In some recent choreography the legacy of this period is clear in tendencies toward *choreography as a concept*, or choreographic ideas and objects that are independent of the dancing body. This has involved a renewed commitment to an expanded set of materials for dance that involves human participants in a non-hierarchical field of diverse elements. As a result of these recent extra-disciplinary adventures, dance has been split more emphatically into *dancing* as movement, technique, and singularity, and *choreography* as "a possible course of action" (to quote William Forsythe's influential "Choreographic Objects" essay), unhinged from a specific dancing body and deployed by any number of possible elements (a collective of bodies, objects, score, etcetera).[2] This prompted Forsythe to ask, "are we perhaps at the point in the evolution of choreography where a distinction between the establishment of its ideas and its traditional forms of enactment must be made?"[3]

This chapter considers the provenance and scope of the division between dancing and choreography in theory and practice over the past three decades, and the association of choreography as a concept with the movement of dance into galleries and museums. The aim is to build on the

work in Chapter 4 toward understanding the way that conceptual work in dance has been understood. This will demonstrate the specific and asynchronous use of the term in relation to the visual arts while acknowledging shared principles that reflect overlapping histories. This chapter thus continues the dialogue in *The Persistence of Dance* with the history of contemporary art despite some critique from dance theorists regarding the relevance of the same. In 2006, German dance and performance scholar Gerald Siegmund dismissed the usefulness of considering new developments in dance in relation to the history of (Western) art, as did others.[4] Such a position suggests that dance is irrelevant to developments in the arts more generally and denies its intermedial dimensions and exchanges historically. The choreography-dancing divide that emerged in the 1990s is contextualized in what follows as an iteration of the conceptual-material dialectic that has been so central to the arts post-World War II, as well as being a specifically *intra-disciplinary* process that dance as a discipline was undergoing. The following uncovers narratives that, on the one hand, promote choreography as a transdisciplinary model of composition or organization liberated from outdated paradigms of dance and with unique qualities and potential, but on the other hand, disempower the role of dancing and dancers and reinstate old binaries that are unhelpful in understanding the true scope of new practices emerging at the dance-gallery interface. The question of how relevant *choreography as a concept* is to the field of choreography as a contemporary art medium is also addressed. Finally, in attempting to unpack this recent history, a reconsideration of the scope of the third-wave dance avant-garde allows for new accounts that even up gender inequities in the existing discourse and help correct an overinvestment of critical attention in narrow geocultural regions and cohorts.

5.2 Dancing versus Choreography

In 2007, Performa Biennial in New York presented a series called *Dance After Choreography* which featured works by European choreographers Xavier Le Roy, Jérôme Bel, and Mårten Spångberg, key players in the conceptual dance debates. The distinction between *dance* and *choreography* made explicit in this title (and the implicit reference to a post-choreographic or post-discipline condition) appeared during a period when definitions and terminologies were dominating certain dance studies discourses and media commentary.[5] American dance theorists André Lepecki

and Mark Franko differentiate dancing and choreography in relation to Le Roy's gallery-based work, *Retrospective by Xavier Le Roy* (2012), as follows:

> *Retrospective* reworks an understanding of choreography in the sense that each and every one of its instantiations is deeply singular (its dancing) while the whole structure remains rigorously in place (its choreography).[6]

Le Roy was invited by curator and director Laurence Rassel to develop his *Retrospective* for the Fundació Antoni Tàpies in Barcelona. His aim was to use the archive of his solos (1994-2009) to produce an exhibition, and the result was a new take on the visual arts format of the retrospective—a performative archive that responded to both the intense interest in archiving dance that had emerged over the turn of the twenty-first century, and the choreographic turn in museums and galleries.[7] I saw this exhibition remounted in November 2014 at MoMA PS1, Queens, New York City, and understand the distinction Lepecki and Franko are making as, on the one hand, the procedural apparatus of the exhibition as *choreography*, and on the other, the individual and specific iterations by the dancers through their *dancing*. A major part of the exhibition (which also included an audio-visual archive and separate installation) was a rotating cast of six dance artists performing multiple tasks as soloists within a dramaturgy that was triggered by someone entering the space. One of those tasks was to recount how their biography entwined with the work of Le Roy and thus, their participation in the exhibition, and another, was to perform excerpts from his solos. Much has been written about *Retrospective*, including an anthology edited by Bojana Cvejić that discusses its significance regarding, for example, "the history and medium of the exhibition," and "the dramaturgy of the spectatorial position."[8] In terms of Lepecki and Franko's alignment of *Retrospective* with specific definitions of *choreography* and *dancing*, and in my experience of the work, the dramaturgical system could be equated with an expanded and stable choreography that was authored by Le Roy, while the cast members' performances constituted less stable, subjective, and idiosyncratic instances of dancing. *Retrospective by Xavier Le Roy* was accompanied by a conference, *Expanded Choreography. Situations, Movements, Objects . . .* , which was organized by Spångberg and marked a high point in the theoretical work associated with conceptual dance.[9] The description of the conference notes:

> Choreography is today emancipating itself from dance, engaging in a vibrant process of articulation . . . Simultaneously, we have seen a number of exhibitions in which choreography is often placed in a tension between movement, situation and objects. Choreography needs to redefine itself in order to include artists and others who use choreographic strategies without necessarily relating them to dance . . . Choreography is not a priori performative, nor is it bound to expression and reiteration of subjectivity; it is becoming an expanded practice, a practice that is political in and of itself.[10]

In Lepecki and Franko's observations, this conference description, and Le Roy's work, the division into dancing on the one hand as singular, present, and unstable, and choreography on the other as a repeatable, ahistorical, stable structure, can be linked to the historical division between dancer and choreographer that has been rejected by many contemporary practitioners. The historical model is associated with restrictions and prescriptions authored by a choreographer who remains external to the performance of the choreography by the dancers, the latter needing to be stabilized through a (Foucauldian) subjection to the choreography, technique, or body practice.[11] What has occurred since the mid-twentieth-century dance avant-garde has been, in fact, a breakdown of the distinction between dancing and choreography (commented on in Sarah Michelson's work, Case Study 1), with most dance practices involving degrees of choreographic work through an understanding of the spontaneous composition of improvisation, and choreographies often dependent upon dancer collaboration, agency, and authorship.[12]

Choreography, as opposed to *dance*, has become the preferred categorical term for experimental dance practitioners associated with the recent avant-garde that has been of such interest to the visual arts. Lepecki and Ric Allsopp link choreography to "conceptual and post-conceptual performance," stating that

> choreography is a field of contemporary arts practice that provides not only vectors for new forms of trans-disciplinary arts research but also a locus for questioning the orthodoxies of contemporary art work and practice. Through this work choreography can now be seen to invoke, recuperate and incorporate other forms of cultural practice.[13]

Here is choreography both in exchange with its peer art forms as a facilitator of intermediality and innovation, but also stewarding the arts

toward its beyond. Le Roy is emphatic about the subsidiary role of dancing in relation to choreography's broader applications:

> How do we extend our understanding of 'movement'? How do we produce movements? What structure or organization produces what movement? These questions are pertinent to different fields, but they also cover dance. This is why I prefer to talk about choreography rather than dance.[14]

Choreography allows Lepecki, Allsopp, and Le Roy to consider movement as non-dance-specific, as a strategy or process that can move across, and connect with, various disciplines and phenomena. Such definitions of choreography also have a provocative, almost antagonistic dimension that has resulted in some defensive responses. Katja Praznik, who perhaps coined the phrase "post-contemporary dance" in 2004, asks, "what do these authors [Bel, Le Roy, Tino Sehgal] offer as an alternative to dance and choreography, and why do they not want to dance anymore?"[15] Le Roy's colleague Bel certainly distanced himself from dancing, referring to how, in his early oeuvre-defining work, "there was no question of rehearsals, of dance classes or training sessions."[16] Later, Bel describes the conservatively trained dancer-subjects of his pieces, *Cédric Andrieux* and *Véronique Doisneau*, as "work horses" and how his job was "to introduce doubt, questioning, and subjectivity" into their position as dancers.[17] Bel's critique of a broad diversity of training regimes from ballet to Merce Cunningham represented by these artists (and to which he himself has submitted), is partnered with his abandonment of the studio, a move he aligns with Marcel Duchamp's rejection of the craft of painting: "in the same way that he claimed not to be 'hooked on turpentine,' there was no way I was going to be a 'lactic acid addict'."[18] This is an example of the generalized opposition set out in certain dance practice and theory between choreography aligned with the broader contemporary arts and their related discursive fields on the one hand, and a more hermetic understanding of dance that values the choreographer-dancer relationship and standardized forms of technique above all else on the other. However, as we will see, the latter are poorly defined in such literature.

5.3 Choreography as Concept

In 2013, Cvejić arrived at the conclusion that the "concept" of conceptual dance was "Dance as Choreography, which contradicted or showed that

choreography was used as a closed concept of Dance."[19] So the liberation of choreography at a conceptual level and a fierce opposition to mainstream practices were the central tenets of the tendency. This echoes conceptual artist Joseph Kosuth who stated in 1969: "the 'purest' definition of conceptual art would be that it is an inquiry into the foundations of the concept 'art'."[20] Possibly owing to its still emergent status in discourse, accounts of choreography as a concept lack both a clear vision of what it opposes and a succinct definition of the term. It is described as being "open" in opposition to more traditional understandings of choreography that Cvejić aligns with "the still Modernist established practices of the choreographers who emerged in the 80s and who are desperately clutching to the idea of Dance as the invention of body."[21] Dance critics committed to the older generation of artists are the target; Cvejić describes "essentialist resistances" in such criticism to the new work being due to the writers' commitment to a "prevailing regime of representation in theater dance, a regime characterized by an emphasis on bodily movement, identification of the human body, and the theater's act of communication determining the reception of the audience."[22] There is little concrete detail regarding who or what represents the "prevailing regime," but Cvejić here focuses on corporeal movement, anthropocentrism, and pre-determined affects as characteristics of mainstream practices. Broadly speaking, expression, subjectivity, and craft/virtuosity seem to be the key aspects of the conservative model to be addressed through strategies such as objectivity, a voiding of content including fundamental elements such as movement, and a de-skilling of the dancer.[23]

Cvejić locates an "open-ended" attitude to choreography associated with conceptual dance within the currency of an "indeterminacy of art" as defined by art theorist Stewart Martin.[24] This term is applied where all divisions between disciplines of art, and art and non-art, are broken down, thus going further than the contingent post-disciplinary label. This post-categorical condition of art is linked to the general commodification of the arts by Cvejić (via Martin), and can result in the colonizing power of the visual arts subsuming the creative practice and production of performance (and other ephemeral arts practices) into its economy.[25] As we saw in Chapter 1, other commentators such as Tate Modern Director of Programme Catherine Wood and art theorist Hal Foster warn of contemporary art's "rapacious consumption of other disciplinary specificities."[26] And as noted here by Cvejić, conceptual and post-conceptual models of choreography seem to offer paradigms readily subsumed into this logic. The narrative of dance as an unwitting tool of the visual arts set out in such

discourses needs to be re-written with an understanding of the complicity of dance in the conditions from which post-disciplinary art emerged, a complicity that has been argued for by myself and others elsewhere.[27] And the notion that the choreography in this field is completely unanchored from discipline is not sustainable when we look more closely at the work of artists such as Adam Linder, Shelley Lasica, Agatha Gothe-Snape, Latai Taumoepeau, and Maria Hassabi in the following chapters.

While sensitivity possibly prevents Cvejić from naming the artists or critics associated with the conservatism that her case studies oppose, the historical context of the emergence of conceptual dance artists helps us to read between the lines.[28] Suspicions regarding the value of traditional training techniques in dance and the emergence of choreography as a concept must be seen against the backdrop of the condition of contemporary dance in France in the 1990s. The history of the institutionalization of dance in France in the 1980s, and an important letter of protest in 1998, "Les Signataires du 20 Août," catalyzed a reactionary movement that went to the aesthetic extremes articulated here and elsewhere.[29] Ginot describes the conservatism at the heart of a legitimizing process that the art form went through in France in the 1980s which saw the establishment of national choreographic centers, prescriptive terms for evaluating new choreography, and opaque funding assessments. This resulted in what Ginot describes as a "stifling uniformity" in choreographic production in that decade.[30] The 1990s saw a widespread backlash "that started by a revaluing of the status of the dancer and developed into a global criticism of the system, through a return to values of performance, collective [sic], rejection of virtuosity, etc."[31] Alessandra Nicifero describes the ensuing dissolution of the company structure in France (and Frédéric Pouillaude the resulting freedom for dancers) which "seems to have had a domino effect in weakening other dance constitutive elements, such as authorship, composition, the essence of dance as medium and the nature of dance as spectacle, as previously understood in modern times."[32]

Added to this political situation is an aesthetic one noted by Cvejić: Europe's disconnection from the developments in American mid-century avant-garde dance during the 1970s and 1980s.[33] Céline Roux concurs that the shift in Europe in the 1990s was brought about by a delayed connection with American "post-modern" dance and the notion—associated with the work of Simone Forti, Brown, Yvonne Rainer et al.—"that the field of visual arts was a rich territory for art choreography."[34] American theorists acknowledge "the great migration . . . the dance diaspora" that saw the

European importation of American innovations, but the chronology and details of this are hard to discern.[35] Was the new European dance primarily breaking with European dance theater? Were they less familiar with the American second-wave avant-garde, hence the claiming of innovation described in Chapter 4? Or did the geographic distance allow for fresh innovations where the persistence of a monolithic sense of dance history stifled American artists? In any case, this specific geopolitical history of contemporary dance has been obscured within international dance studies and related fields by a generalized crisis of the discipline. In the process, links between mid-century American dance, European dance of the 1990s, and a clear-eyed account of connections to the recent and international dance-visual arts nexus have also been obscured. Choreography as concept, which thus emerged from a specific intra-disciplinary situation and history where dance was uncoupling itself from existing institutional paradigms and realities, has since been catalyzed by various aspirations regarding the social, political, and aesthetic potential of choreography in its most expanded applications.

Such aspirations played out in a 2022 event at the Institute of Contemporary Arts, London, *Choreographic Devices*.[36] The symposium appears to follow artist and theorist Edgar Schmitz's project with Mårten Spångberg *CHOREOGRAPHIC* (2016-) and its use of choreography as a concept, or rather "model," to frame discussions on "embodied and spatial practices in order to question social, political, legal and technological realities."[37] Participants included curators; theorists across art, philosophy, and history; and artists with diverse cultural backgrounds working in writing, dance, performance, sculpture, film, opera, and sound. Themes included ecologies, environments, and animals; queer creative practices; space and social relations; migration; feminism; post-colonialism; legal studies; indigenous studies; ethics; and activism. Like curator Mathieu Copeland's action as choreographer of *A Choreographed Exhibition* (2007, Case Study 3), commanding a structure to be performed by hired dancers, or even Le Roy's *Retrospective* (2012), such work is distinct from dance as a contemporary art medium if the latter is a model of choreography as an art form engaging with the central preoccupations and conditions driving the broader contemporary arts. In these three cases, choreography is either a theoretical apparatus for a suite of broader concerns, a model for curation, or a structure to reinvent the visual arts retrospective. These are all examples of conceptual work busy with extra-disciplinary concerns often related to the social or relational, and distanced (to varying degrees) from the material of

dance and dancing. This, then, is also different to *conceptual dance*, which is concerned with dance histories and materialities and which I will now revise before we move into Part IV of the book.

5.4 Conclusion

Le Roy, Bel, and Charmatz are male French dance artists who were the focus of theoretical discourses and institutional practices between dance and the visual arts in the first two decades of the 2000s. As Claire Bishop pointed out in 2014, "only *certain* lineages of dance are embraced by museums and the art world in general: a conceptually oriented practice that refuses narrative, character, and expression."[38] While this flattens the nuances in the work of these important artists (Catherine Wood notes how Charmatz works "between ideas and experiences," "between anarchy and control"), their broadly conceptual approach that has centered ideas and provocations and contained physical dancing in various ways has suited contemporary art museums.[39] Such suitability recalls, for me, Le Roy's and Scarlet Yu's durational exhibition *Temporary Title* (2015) performed at Carriageworks in Sydney in a grey space—not a gallery or a theater but a space approximating a studio—and involving more than a dozen naked dancers loaded with technical skill, crawling, lying prostrate, or on their backs with their legs in the air swaying together, and talking one-on-one to the spectators who lined the walls of the vast space of the old train workshop.[40] The dancers were objectified to a large extent in a simple and transparent compositional structure, approaching the sculptural in its overall affect, and largely voiding "narrative, character, and expression." The result was neutral to the extent that it could be re-set in other like spaces. One could conclude that the substantial investment in the work of Le Roy and his peers within dance studies is symptomatic of broader economic, aesthetic, cultural, and social circumstances. Between 2006 and 2017 eight books and numerous articles on contemporary dance focused on the work of this field of European artists, a large percentage of a small pool of dance studies literature.[41] The gender profiles of the most highly visible dance artists working in this field should also be noted. Alongside Le Roy, Bel, and Charmatz was another male-identifying artist, Sehgal, who was trained and worked as a dancer before becoming a visual artist.[42] Another continuity between the second- and third-wave dance avant-garde could then be the slow emergence of the work of female artists: Forti, Brown, and

Rainer in the mid-century generation and, more recently, La Ribot, Eszter Salamon, Mette Ingvartsen, Alice Chauchat, Mette Edvardsen, Jennifer Lacey, and Vera Mantero among others.[43]

One of the aims of *The Persistence of Dance* is to define dance as a contemporary art medium not in opposition to an undefined, conservative model of dance, but rather toward a holistic notion of experimental, intermedial contemporary dance that is not limited to a small pool of male artists. In this way one can liberate the notion of a third wave of dance experimentation from geographical, gendered, and aesthetic overdeterminations indicated in Ginot's question in 2002, "is there anything else happening?"[44] This will allow us to consider the broader reach of the dance-visual arts exchange in the early twenty-first century. In light of these aims, there are three things that we can take from the discourse surrounding the conceptual dance artists discussed in Chapters 4 and 5 that will help identify correspondences and exchanges with the visual arts. First, Cvejić sees recent experimental dance as completing the work begun by Judson Dance Theater, and through interrogating this claim, the conceptualists evidence the ongoing influence of the Neo-Dada or neo-avant-garde post-war period. Second, the conceptual focus of the work is revealed as being deeply material, as suggested by Foster's comments above on the direction progressive art would take after Neo-Dada. Finally, arguments for the radical testing of disciplinary parameters by this group (inadvertently) evidence the continuities that sustain disciplinary limits in the face of their extinction, that is, the persistence of a thing called dance at the point of its disappearance. These are three frameworks carried into Parts IV and V toward a model of *post-dance* that acknowledges the historical precedents, disciplinary contributions, and unprecedented condition of dance in the first decades of the twenty-first century.

PART IV

Concept and Material

Part IV begins with Case Study 7, Adam Linder, who exemplifies a return to the material business of dancing in his *Services* series (2013–2019), which is assertive of the discipline in many ways: of the labor of the dancer, of the right to place the work beside and as equal to other art forms, of the rights of the performer, of the financial value of dance as an art form, and of the ultimate resistance of the work to visual arts markets. What he and others have devised is a form of *dance as a contemporary art medium* and the materiality of dance in the figure of the dancer is crucial here. Chapter 6 seeks to unpack what *conceptual* meant when it emerged from the intermedial historical period in art between the early 1960s and early 1970s, and how this can be mapped against its use in both recent experimental dance described in Chapter 4 and in the contemporaneous second-wave dance avant-garde. It also examines the usefulness of these discourses in understanding current choreographic practices that interface with the visual arts. The literature on conceptual dance covered in Parts III and IV allows us to consider how the conceptual-material bind in the broader contemporary arts is playing out alongside the repeated movement across, and gradual dissolution of, disciplinary borders. Chapter 6 also contributes to an interest in the specifically choreographic approach to *conceptual-material* practices and debates that emerged in the mid-century period and continue today. This includes dance's contribution to the critique of the material objectivity of art, disciplinary purity, occularcentrism, and the transcendental status of art. In addressing such things, the work of dance and performance scholars Rudi Laermans and Bojana Cvejić are brought into dialogue with artist-theorists such as Sol LeWitt, Henry Flynt, and Joseph Kosuth, and also art theorists Hal Foster, Peter Osborne, Zöe Sutherland, Alexander Alberro, Lucy Lippard, and Claire Bishop. In

order to support a discursive balance between the two critical fields that can match developments in practice in this study of deeply intermedial practices, Chapter 7 underlines a tradition of disciplinary clarity in the field of dance. This chapter, continuing the work of Chapter 2, fleshes out a toolkit of methodological apparatuses, frameworks, and concepts drawn from dance analysis and theories of choreographic composition to arrive at specific terms for specific works that undertake singular compositional experiments. Putting these tools to work, in Case Studies 8 and 9, Shelley Lasica and Maria Hassabi reveal that in the most progressive choreographic work interfacing with the visual arts, the materiality of dance is most often bound to the conceptual as the mechanism through which it is realized. LeWitt has a formulation for this: the paradox of converting the material of the work into an idea—*material as idea*. The recent dance avant-garde thus works the space between attention to disciplinary fundamentals and a critique of institutionalized limits in subtle, unique, yet powerful ways that have helped reinstitute materiality, physicality, sensuality, and co-habitation into the very heart of our major art institutions at a time when such things were and are desired.

Case Study 7

Adam Linder—Dance as a Contemporary Art Medium

Adam Linder is an Australian choreographer based in Los Angeles and Berlin whose early works appeared in the 2010s.[1] He presented his first work in a gallery in 2012, *Ma ma ma materials* at Silberkuppe Gallery, Berlin, five years after Boris Charmatz instituted *Musée de la danse*. In his work, there is little sense of restrictions regarding established notions of what dance can and cannot be, and there is a new capacity to range beyond the Western contemporary dance skill base to include virtuosic popular culture styles and blatantly mimetic gestures. Linder has worked with Meg Stuart and Scottish choreographer Michael Clark among others and brings multiple technical skills to work with his highly trained dancers. In counterpoint to Charmatz's ambitious project, Linder's *Choreographic Services* series (2013–2019) insinuated its way into the museum and gallery in a more modest way, tinkering with the conditions of the institution from inside and recalling the approach of Stuart and Bart De Baere in *This Is the Show and the Show Is Many Things / Extra Muros* (1994) (Case Study 2) and Adrian Heathfield and collaborators in *Ghost Telephone* (2016) (Case Study 4). The works under discussion here do not present a spectacle that, in Linder's words, "wraps" the audience into its logic or energy to persuade, win over, or claim ground (which could perhaps all be applied to Charmatz's *manger* [2014] as it was described in Case Study 6).[2] A piece like *Choreographic Service No. 2: Some Proximity* (2014) functions alongside other works in the gallery as a cohabitant rather than a comparison, recalling Benjamin Buchloh on the importance of contextuality in the most recent conceptual work.[3] In comparison to Charmatz and the conceptual dance tradition of which he is a part, Linder shares some features such as compositional reduction and clarity and an aesthetic strategy to work the concept *through* the material, but apart from the difference in

scale and approach just noted, there are other departures: a new emphasis on virtuosity, skill, and dancing over choreography that can be distinguished from Charmatz's focus on the same; a folding of discourse more directly into the work; and politics that are less disciplinarily antagonistic and more culturally expansive. Linder states, "I'm much more interested in how performing bodies are institutionalized. If it is institutional critique, it's located in the transaction of bodies."[4]

Linder's *Choreographic Services* series is specifically made for museums and galleries and consists of *Choreographic: Service No. 1: Some Cleaning* (2013), *Choreographic Service No. 2: Some Proximity* (2014), *Choreographic Service No. 3: Some Riding* (2015), *Choreographic Service No. 4: Some Strands of Support* (2016), *Choreographic Service No. 5: Dare to Keep Kids Off Naturalism* (2017), and *Footnote Service: Some Trade* (2018).[5] These works, Linder acknowledges, "have a very clear conceptual framework," which he believes explains their popularity with galleries and museums, with invitations to present these works from the National Gallery of Victoria (Melbourne), Kunsthalle Basel (Basel), the Institute of Contemporary Arts (ICA) (London), the Museum of Contemporary Art (MOCA) (Los Angeles), and Serralves Museum (Porto).[6] They are easily reduced to their elements—a contractual text, freestyle solo dancing by an ensemble of two or more, a museum or gallery space—and the way in which they are put into dialogue which circles back, self-reflexively, to *the dancer dancing*, which is at the heart of the work.

Choreographic Service No. 2: Some Proximity features two dancers in matching uniforms (at the Museum of Contemporary Art [MCA] in Sydney in 2016 they were Linder and Justin Kennedy) who take turns reading excerpts from the critical responses to the festival/exhibition/collection (from Holly Childs in Sydney; in other editions UK art critic Jonathan P. Watts), which are posted on the walls around them. At the same time, they dance around the gallery space using a glide form of footwork that is a part of B-boy movement vocabulary.[7] Choreographic staging is peripheral, as in Charmatz's work, with a focus on the individual dancer's agency and investment; one of Linder's aims is to "keep the subjects the primary material."[8] There is nothing immaterial here; the working dancer is front and center. Linder describes how "the fulfillment of these very skilled actions . . . really detailed and virtuosic" are "the crux of my service position . . . and that is why it is being offered as a commodity on the market."[9] So, if Linder's work is conceptual, it is through both the legal work framing the performances and the foregrounding of movement vocabularies in each work, and how the two speak to each other.

Some Proximity, Adam Linder, 2014. *Choreographic Service,* 2 dancers and a critic. Pictured: Justin F. Kennedy, Adam Linder at MCA Sydney, 2016.

The *Services* do not present choreography as a concept that is busy with redefinitions of the discipline, but dancing that is in dialogue with its new context. If Linder's central theme is the value of dancing as a skill, he is responding to the new conditions the art form confronts as it moves into much tighter dialogue with visual art and its various apparatuses—venues, legalities, economics, working conditions, ethics.[10] Rather than an invasion that temporarily turns the institutional machinations toward the logic of the dancer and the dance studio, Linder confronts the economic conditions that exist in the museum and finds a way to work within the same. The most obvious condition is the "hire" transaction that applies to dance as opposed to the "purchase" logic of the visual arts:

> When choreography circulates in the visual art field, it needs an economic form that distances itself from that of objects, because it cannot be an object in a typical material sense . . . The idea for the services came from witnessing performance and particularly dance being wheeled out as supposedly 'immaterial' alternatives to an interest in objects—I found this quite patronising.[11]

Linder found equity in a transparent, contractual arrangement that became a part of the works, and which stresses the materiality of the dancer and their conditions, moving the performances "away from eventhood" and distinguishing them from objecthood.[12] As with Maria Hassabi's work (Case Study 9), the mechanism of the contract (between choreographer and institution, choreographer and dancer) is both implicitly and explicitly realized through materials that do not diverge from their purpose: "we're going to commit to what we're proposing to offer and that kind of agreement is more important than the whim of the moment [or to] serve the audience at any given time."[13] The contract details the terms of the engagement: how long they are engaged for, the hours they will perform, how much they are paid. But it also mentions less quantifiable things, such as this line in the original contract for *Some Proximity*: "Adam Linder, Justin F. Kennedy and Jonathan P. Watts—will invest subjectivity into fulfilling the service's function."[14] The displayed document thus plays with the logic of the genre of the contract.

> I like the contract being very interpretive: it's very playful. When a normal contract would maybe just stay fixed on technical details, I over-explain in a descriptive manner what the service will purvey. That is a tension in the work in that it starts off with this kind of rational logic, a carving out of parameters. But then—overtly in *No.5*, almost purposefully contradicting the previous services—it moves towards fiction and expressivity.[15]

The creative elements of the contract hint at the "delightfully pathetic" attempt of such legal documents to contain "a live experience of dance and of being with dancing bodies." However, he insists on the ethical bond of fulfilling the contract, "like the pride of a small business," as his interviewer artist Uri Aran suggests.[16] The document is binding, but Linder writes in some room to move.

Attention to the financial and legal aspects of the dance-gallery encounter introduces language into Linder's work in a very explicit way, and this is an important part of how the work connects with its audience. As room notes, the contract displayed on the gallery wall completes the work, contextualizing the performances and becoming a remainder when the dancers are absent.[17] Charmatz, as an example of the prior generation of conceptual dance artists, tends to discuss his work in plain language in a manifesto mode, sometimes veering toward the oblique or poetic, but he does not generally quote philosophy or other external disciplines.

The use of the spoken word in *20 Dancers for the XX Century*, like Le Roy's *Retrospective by Xavier Le Roy*, takes the form of explanatory mini-lectures by each artist as described in Case Study 6, and there are didactic performance-lectures in Le Roy's and Bel's choreographic oeuvres as mentioned earlier (*Product of Circumstances* [1999] and *Pichet Klunchun and Myself* [2005], respectively). Linder uses discourse differently in his work, folding the language of law, criticality, or creative writing into the materials of the composition so that text-based knowledges are in dialogue with, and always balanced against, dancing:

> I have been busy with language, I have been busy with idea/concept-based operations, but I've always met it with as much of a focus on what the body is doing in a very juicy, extra-linguistic kind of way.[18]

He sees this balance as an assertion of dance as a discipline, and distinguishes his approach from "some recent practices of dance that have been so focused on an extension toward the fields of philosophy, critical theory and science, perhaps rather than delving further into what the specifics of a virtuosic physical practice in dance might open up today."[19] Language is not a *substitute* for the home medium as it is in some conceptual art (both choreographic and visual), but a companion, annotation, or a compositional template for dancing.

Linder reflects that *Some Proximity* and *Some Riding* were "a lot about trying to grapple with how all the facets of information, knowledge, text production, were such big currency in cultural production."[20] In *Some Riding*, Linder gestured toward retaining control over the discursive ephemera around the work by putting commissioned writing by critics such as Catherine Damman *inside* the work and making it a function of the choreographic whole; grammar in its spoken form thus became a choreographic model. Linder used a movement vocabulary consisting of "a popping physicality stretched out, elongated with a kind of adagio-like temperament . . . there's this holding in the body that is being punctuated by these popping contractions," creating a "dynamic grammar in the body" that matches the rhythm of the memorized text being spoken by the dancers.[21] Linder explains how this "popping adagio" abstracts the semiotically loaded language of popping as it operates in Hip Hop scenarios, and "parses" it with the text so "they could like ride each other" in order to "make these languages look back at each other."[22] Jeppe Ugelvig, who saw the work at ICA in London, describes Linder chanting "I'm riding, I'm riding, I'm riding. . . .

Catherine Damman," as he moves around the space, and how dancer Frances Chiaverini, responding to a text by Sarah Lehrer-Graiwer, "hypnotically enacts a form of associative critical text in bullet-point form while synchronizing her utterances with a distinctive popping of her limbs."[23] Here Linder is interested in the cultural power of language in contrast with the language of the body and dancing, and parsing the two is a "way of softening those edges."[24] As Watts notes of his contributions as writer in *Some Proximity*, the dancing "animates my words, colliding the supposedly rational or the critical with the expressive, the undecipherable embodied."[25]

Aran's analogy of Linder's set-up in *Choreographic Services* as a small-business model is in line with the modest tone of the work, but Linder is careful to maintain that "I don't think this craft is submissive or subordinat[ed]" in this economy.[26] The *Choreographic Services* are designed to underscore the limited power of the art institution and the evasive and self-sufficient nature of dance within the transaction:

> What's interesting about choreography is that you can experience it as a viewer or keep company with it, but you're never able to possess it. So the 'Services' model allows for this choreography to be compensated, though it doesn't defy its true nature—its ephemerality.[27]

The *Services* series is assertive in many ways: of the labor of the dancer, of the right to place the work beside and as equal to other art, of the rights of the performer, of the financial value of dance as an art form, and of the ultimate resistance of the work to visual arts markets. The popular narrative mentioned earlier that describes dance as an unwitting tool of the visual arts is turned on its head as Linder takes control of the terms of his work's appearance in a new context. In this way he goes beyond Charmatz in setting the terms of engagement.[28]

One important aspect of Linder's work is a rejection of the generalized opposition described earlier between, on the one hand, dance practices aligned with the broader contemporary arts, and on the other, a more hermetic understanding of dance that values technical virtuosity and choreographic craft. The repression of technique became a point of differentiation for the French conceptualists regarding the European contemporary dance landscape in which they found themselves in the early 1990s, a scene Bojana Cvejić describes as "hermetic" and "conventional."[29] Linder notes the impact of such work:

> I do not believe that I have witnessed many positions thinking conceptually about critical formats in dance while remaining indebted to technical virtuosity, seductive theatricality, and colour.[30]

Linder manages a delicate balance of aesthetic strategies that sit easily within contemporary art contexts *and* feature recognizable technical virtuosity. There is no "closed concept of dance" here (to recall Cvejić's words), but an opening out toward the popular—an inclusion of *all* the dancing—as well as other physical modalities such as cleaning.[31] (Linder refers to his "wryly devotional relation to mimesis."[32]) Linder describes the division set out in the literature on conceptual dance:

> What is the nucleus of the value? Is that within the form speaking for itself or is it within the form deployed as a device for the concept? . . . [in conceptual dance] the form is there to support the argument versus 'oh, we're going to find the criticality in the nature of this specific form and delve into its qualities and what it's doing socially, politically, contextually.'[33]

Linder plumps for the latter, and the conceptual work that is carried in the title of the *Choreographic Services* and the associated legal texts are frames for attending to the dancers' skills and their ability to deliver the content and meaning of the work through its own "grammar" and "language," to use Linder's own terminology.[34] Linder thus centers his creative question within discipline-based priorities (what kind of dancer? what kind of movement? what can dance offer in this context? what are the conditions? what is the discourse?) and works back from there to the administrative and bureaucratic formulations that would speak for the discipline. So, Linder's work could never be categorized as non-dance, and neither is his work theatrical in the traditional sense. What he has devised is a form of *dance as a contemporary art medium* and the materiality of dance in the figure of the dancer is crucial here.

Like Charmatz, Linder honors the work of not only the dancer but specific dancers, in his case Brooke Stamp, Justin Kennedy, Stephen Thompson, Leah Katz, and Frances Chiaverini, which is something both Charmatz and Linder share with the American mid-century artists working around Judson.[35] Linder employs a consistent group of highly trained dance artists, offering them some job security and a large degree of autonomy within the work, and they contribute substantially to the choreographic whole. He notes that dance and dancing as a creative practice "is with people, com-

munity practice, it's transferring, it's really what I call orally-physical histories."[36] Charmatz's interest in the social and relational aspects of dance as they apply *to dancers and their audiences* (an interest shared with Le Roy and Bel) manifests in his specifically expressive, charged and "deskilled" movement, seemingly driven by imperative and instinct and engaging viewers through a contagious affective charge. Linder, on the other hand, consciously opposes an approach he describes as "stripping away virtuosity to tap this authentic experience of a social relation," and challenges the over-used notion of democracy that often accompanies this sentiment when it is applied to contemporary dance.[37] He chooses dancers who can follow his lead regarding "ornament" and "virtuosity" in their dancing.[38]

> The craft of dance has got to do with discipline, virtuosity has got to do with having discipline and then letting it fly and discipline has got to do with a practice of engaging with a thing, focusing on it, meditating on it, and throwing yourself into the fire of it.[39]

Choreographic staging and the control that this enforces in the traditional dancer-choreographer relation is replaced with a focus on movement vocabularies that Linder draws from multiple sources (but which do not constitute a stable, signature style), their relationship to movement scores, and the rationale for their use regarding a broader agenda to represent the contemporary situation through form. Each *Choreographic Service* had a different movement language: "in all the services there was a real specificity of what is being danced."[40] Taking *Some Proximity* as an example, Linder was "looking for a fluid marriage, a *proximity*, between the critical faculties of an art writer who is observing a context and performed movement."[41] As described earlier, two dancers took turns reading excerpts from critical responses displayed on the wall and danced around the gallery space using a "glide" form of footwork. As with *Some Riding*, Linder used this specific form as a way to put the dancers' physicality into dialogue with both the spoken word/text and the gallery visitors who surrounded them:

> if we look at a regular walk . . . there is a fluidity but you have a lot of the body that is held and rigid, facilitating the primary movement of the legs. But if you glide it's kind of a heightened walk . . . in terms of corporeal information, muscle memory, this is the reverse of walking. You have to plough your way over the knee into the toe cushion which gives you enough time to

> slide the back foot out on the heel to create that glide so . . . it's much more labour intensive. You cannot glide without activating every part of your body. Even though it's in the feet, it is managed by a fluidity in the pelvis which has to be managed by a very fluid spine. So, I was interested in this amplified walk . . . I called it a future walk.[42]

The dancers differentiate their movements from the ambulatory behaviors of the gallery visitors through gliding, a key method of freestyling that Linder links to his anchoring principle of "flow."[43] Freestyling is different to improvisation which might have a very open field of possibilities, being structured by specific movement styles and in this case, scores, and his dancers' command of their complex performance situation:

> Freestyling is about shaping the moment and how you bring in every aspect of the instant, whether that be in your history, your future desires, your technique . . . Wrap in where people are standing, how many people are in the room, how long they've been watching, what they've been doing, what is the atmosphere of the room, into the magic that they're creating in that freestyle composition and maybe the viewer becomes part of that equation [but] I don't have to address the viewer. I've been looking for more covert ways for the affect to come across.[44]

Linder links the flow of the glide to the very nature of the dancers' intervention in the gallery space that "rides" the various influences on their choices in the moment, but which also negotiates a dialogue with the new conditions through its own language that is presented as an alternative to the legalese of the written contract displayed in the space.

In contrast to Michelson and Hassabi, in Linder's work (like Lasica's), there is a socialized, collaborative authorship that both critiques the models of ownership in the art museum and actively mimics the conditions of the visitors who are choreographing their own pathways through the exhibitions, *covertly* wrapping them into the work. This more subtle inclusion of the spectators through movement vocabulary is networked among other aesthetic choices that build a world akin to the contemporary condition. Linder has described performing in Michael Clark's work and his holistic approach: "dancing in his performances felt like a formal translation of the wider social and aesthetic world he inhabits."[45] Returning to Linder's critique of the way democracy has figured in dance studies literature with its emphasis on the everyday and participation, Linder argues that

a truly democratic choreography for the early twenty-first century would be inclusive of social dance forms that are part of the African-American influence dominating popular culture internationally. This would include aesthetic consequences of the technologies that circulate such forms. In the use of a street style like gliding, Linder makes an analogy with the 1960s social dance form of the Twist and how both are physical reflections of their time.[46]

In summary, Linder's consciousness of the legacy of conceptual dance in its European formulation as he has moved into the gallery context has been considered here through a comparison with a particular artist: Boris Charmatz. In Charmatz's work I noted a departure from some of the conceptual art standards in his use of expression, subjectivity, and virtuosity, in addition to features such as an institutional critique that are in line with the conceptual field. Linder's work, on the other hand, can be explicitly representational in mimicking many everyday activities. It is virtuosic in its display of technical vocabularies and lacks the critique of visuality and movement so central to André Lepecki's formulation of conceptual dance described in Chapter 4, with Linder's work being low-key spectacle on both counts. In these ways it departs from the tropes of conceptual dance. However, in occupying the gallery as site it does adopt the following characteristics aligned with conceptual dance: simplified performance scenarios (the works mainly consist of dancers in uniforms/outfits that distinguish them from the crowd dancing among the art and visitors in gallery spaces); temporal manipulations of movement and the compositional whole (the popping adagio of *Some Riding* incorporates the rhythmic trace of orality and matching gallery opening hours makes the work durational); it is clearly in "a deep dialogue with visual arts"; it shares a preoccupation with presence; and it problematizes the figure of the author through both emphasis (the visible contracts) and obsfucation (appearing alongside and equal to his dancers who have agency and autonomy, again, like Charmatz). Linder's commitment to the materiality of dancing within his highly conceptual work leads us into a discussion of concept and material as they are understood across visual art and dance studies in Chapters 6 and 7, and further case studies that exemplify dance as a contemporary art medium.

Chapter 6

The Conceptual–Material Bind in Dance and Visual Art

6.1 Introduction

What many see as differentiating the broader field of the recent third-wave dance avant-garde from the mid-twentieth century second-wave is the prominence of the term *concept* and its use by both artists and commentators, even when they refuse the label *conceptual*.[1] Belgian dance theorist Rudi Laermans quotes Bojana Cvejić: "from the 1990s on, concepts are being thematized and discussed for every choreographic work of the new practices."[2] However, mid-century artists were not averse to using the term. British dance theorist Ramsay Burt recounts Simone Forti's use of "conceptual" to describe her 1961 works, and she managed to successfully combine dance elements with ideas, concepts, and propositions in works such as *Huddle* (1961), which resembles a rugby scrum involving five to seven people in which "one person on the outside of the huddle climbs up the mass and comes down."[3] Forti scholar Meredith Morse argues that in Forti's work, the physical aspects of embodiment are also treated as "atemporal abstraction, as a concept and proposition," perhaps in this case approaching the concept of the group body as sculpture.[4] In 1968, Jill Johnston talked about Yvonne Rainer in relation to the "expanding choreographic concept," pre-empting attention to choreography as concept in recent scholarship discussed in Chapter 5.[5] Rainer links her generation's interest in concepts directly to John Cage: "what is John Cage's gift to some of us who make art? This: the relaying of conceptual precedents for methods of nonhierarchical, indeterminate organization which can be used with a critical intelligence."[6] However, the conceptual work of that period was more focused on analysis and discourse around the work and the use of dance materials as concepts, rather than producing choreographies where

concepts were the primary content presented to audiences. Rainer's *Trio A* (1966) could be described as an exposition of tone as concept, and Trisha Brown's *Walking on the Wall* (1971) a similar presentation of gravity. In this way, the strong links with the material of the body resisted the extremes of conceptualism seen in the visual arts during the same period.

The increase in the number of artist-theorists in the mid-twentieth-century milieu, and their implicit and explicit critique of the distant and silent artist-genius, led to the exposure of the artists' creative means and methods to their public (which continues today) and fuelled a newly analytical approach to composition. Curator and theorist RoseLee Goldberg has described the emphasis on discourse within the Soho community in the 1960s and 1970s, and Brown is clear on the specifically analytic approach in Judith and Robert Dunn's famous composition workshops held in Merce Cunningham's studios that fuelled the mid-century dance revolution:[7]

> One of Bob's most important contributions was the method of analysis of the work shown. After presenting a dance, each choreographer was asked, 'How did you make that dance?' . . . and the discussion that followed applied non-evaluative criticism to the movement itself and the choreographic structure as well as investigating the disparity between the two simultaneous experiences, what the artist was making and what the artist saw.[8]

This kind of analysis of choreographic composition began with Anna Halprin. Forti describes the "show and tell" approach taken in Halprin's workshops where she would ask, "what was interesting about this?"[9] Dancers and choreographers were finding a language for their practice beyond the terms of forerunners such as Rudolf von Laban and Doris Humphrey through the collusion of ideas and concepts with compositional practice.[10] In this way, the parameters of the art form were redrawn.

Performance and sound artist Laurie Anderson links an analytic approach to composition during this period in North America to an increasing tendency to include the process stage alongside or even within the final work, sometimes even moving toward a de-emphasis of the final stage of production. This often involved the use of language. Quoting herself from 1974 discussing the exchange between post-conceptual artist Gordon Matta-Clark and Trisha Brown, Anderson says:

> Talking is a way to figure out what you are doing. It's not just that it was the work itself. I was very convinced that Gordon [Matta-Clark]'s thing

> was language . . . without the talk, the background, the thing that was left was really blank. It could be considered sculpture . . . but it wasn't really the thing that I thought it was about . . . I remember seeing Trisha's works and thinking, 'What I love about it is that she's talking and describing this thing that she's doing' . . . The stuff we actually made was not the point at all. The way Gordon talked about things was a hundred times better than how it looked.[11]

A good example of this is Brown's work *Yellowbelly* (1969), an improvised solo in which she "asked the audience to yell 'yellowbelly,' which means 'coward' in Aberdeen, Washington," and when they stopped yelling, she stopped dancing.[12] This set the audience up as both critic and raison d'être for the performance, exposing the awkward side of the audience-performer contract as well as the compositional machinery of the work to heighten the audience's complicity. The links between conceptually oriented dance work and a role for language in both development and performance continues, as was the case for Adam Linder in a piece like *Some Riding* (2015) in Case Study 7, and the imbedding of process itself (not documentation or commentary) in the product-oriented spaces of the gallery has been a major contribution of choreography to innovating the museum.

Marcella Lista, Chief Curator at the National Museum of Modern Art—Centre Pompidou, underlines continuities between the mid-century and current avant-garde in dance regarding conceptual work, referring to the earlier period as taking a "conceptual approach to dance, which critics described as 'non-dance' or 'anti-dance'."[13] She summarizes:

> Dancers metabolized the general orientation of the arts towards performance, while rearticulating performative materials through a conceptual elaboration in which the interest in structure takes priority over vocabulary. This choreographic research opened up a field of reflection that, by shifting dance towards the notion of activity, irrigated conceptual and process-based practices. The tension between subject and object, time and space, and image and language, which occupied the Judson laboratory, were the focus for many artists in the nineteen-sixties and nineteen-seventies.[14]

Lista thus indicates the important role dance took in the aesthetic advances of the earlier period that changed the course of the contemporary arts. These artists and curators are describing a conceptual turn in mid-century experimental dance. Laermans is emphatic: "The Judson Dance

movement shared the main concerns defining the historical moment of Conceptualism."[15] This attracted artists working in other fields who were learning lessons from the dancing they were both witnessing and "trying on" as choreographers themselves. Male artists such as Robert Morris, Dan Graham, Matta-Clark, Richard Serra, Hollis Frampton, and Bruce Nauman were drawn to such lessons, which would lead to comments such as this from Graham: "the body in formation is the medium; the body information is the message."[16] As noted previously, Robert Rauschenberg is an exemplar of a visual artist who sought out lessons from dancing.[17] This review of a Judson concert by dance critic Walter Terry, titled "The Avant-Garde Dance Becomes Non-Dance with Rauschenberg," is telling:

> It has been reported that Robert Rauschenberg, the well known avant-garde artist, has said he expects to give up painting for dancing. He shouldn't. Last evening he danced (?) with David Gordon, Yvonne Rainer, Steve Paxton and their associates in an evening of dance (or non-dance) at the Judson Memorial Church.[18]

Such examples chart the influence of the performative and experiential on the conceptual turn in the arts in the twentieth century, as described by dance scholar and dramaturg Kirsten Maar who argues that the "hierarchy of the conceptual and the merely executional" was challenged by the breakdown of the mind-body divide in dance through "kinaesthetic modes of experiencing" particular to the form at this time.[19] The following contributes to such interest in the specifically choreographic conceptual-material practices and debates emerging from this period.

In *Choreography, Visual Art and Experimental Composition 1950s-1970s* I outlined the limitations of a Minimalist framework regarding the mid-century dance avant-garde and established Neo-Dada as, at least, a very close companion to developments in dance.[20] As stated by Hal Foster, the work of the Neo-Dada artists (including Rauschenberg) paved the way for work involving the "conceptual gesture, material process, and performative action" that would follow.[21] Linking the terms *conceptual*, *gesture*, *material*, and *performance* in this way highlights the legacy of the Neo-Dada configuration that benefited so much from the inclusion of dance artists. What were the links between dance and conceptual art as it emerged out of Neo-Dada in the late 1960s? And what is the significance of this backstory for our account of recent dance work engaging with the visual arts and its institutions?[22] This chapter thus considers the corollary of the

division between dancing and choreography from Chapter 5 alongside the binary of *concepts* and *materials* that frames the whole of Part IV and provides the theoretical scaffold for this book, as indicated in its sub-title: *Choreography as Concept and Material in Contemporary Art*. This returns us to the debates surrounding the moniker of "conceptual" for dance and the application of the term in adjacent fields, just as, in the past, dance studies negotiated its own take on visual art terms such as modern, post-modern, minimal, and contemporary. This chapter seeks to unpack what conceptual meant when it emerged from the intermedial historical period in art between the early 1960s and early 1970s, any connections between this and its use to describe recent experimental dance as outlined in Chapters 4 and 5, and whether these discourses support an understanding of current choreographic practices that interface with the visual arts. For this reason, dance studies meets visual arts theory in what follows, and includes Laermans and Cvejić alongside artist-theorists such as Sol LeWitt, Henry Flynt, and Joseph Kosuth, but also art theorists Hal Foster, Peter Osborne, Lucy Lippard, Robert Pincus-Witten, Alexander Alberro, Zöe Sutherland, and Claire Bishop.

6.2 Conceptual Work in Dance and Visual Art

Philosopher, art theorist, and editor of *Conceptual Art*, Peter Osborne, states that "conceptual art remains a disputed idea," outlining the many critical positions it has generated.[23] The following list of its features is thus contingent and draws on the work of the theorists and artist-theorists just mentioned. I will go on to discuss the origins of the term in 1961 when composer and Fluxus artist Henry Flynt wrote "Concept Art," followed by Sol LeWitt's field-defining articles, "Paragraphs on Conceptual Art" (1967) and "Sentences on Conceptual Art" (1969). I am plumping for a definition based on these contemporaneous writings by two central artists (understood through both primary and secondary sources) thus limiting myself to those canonized within Western art history and theory and chronologically closest in proximity to the second-wave dance avant-garde. In doing so, I note Alberro's observation: "there are many histories and legacies of Conceptualism."[24] One is the history of female artists working within conceptual frameworks in the 1960s and 1970s by Susan Best, Jayne Wark, and others.[25] Another is a queer history of conceptual art, suggested by artist Henrik Olesen, which reviews the impact of Cage as a "gay pre-

conceptualist" and the work of artist Jack Smith, among others.[26] Histories that occurred outside the North American-Western European axis have been presented in exhibitions such as *Global Conceptualism: Points of Origin, 1950s-1980s* (Queens Museum of Art, New York, 1999), which contested origin stories that feature key players limited to narrow gender and cultural profiles. *Global Conceptualism* presented local forms on a global scale post-World War II that the curators aligned with a model of *conceptualism* that engaged with specific socio-political realities (rather than evacuating explicit politics as did most conceptual art).[27] A future project could trace links between this model of conceptualism and the new and culturally diverse generation of choreographers working in the field of dance as a contemporary art medium listed in Chapter 1 such as French Canadian artist Daina Ashbee who is of Cree, Métis, and Dutch ancestry; Aotearoa New Zealand artist Jahra Wasasala who is of Viti/Fiji and Pālagi descent; Tamara Cubas from Uruguay; and Taiwanese artist River Lin. Yet another might contribute to the feminist account of mid-century conceptual, corporeal work through a comparison between conceptual artists such as Ana Mendieta, Lygia Clark, Lynda Benglis, and Valie Export and their mostly female choreographer peers such as Brown, Rainer, and Forti. However, the complex, non-synchronous crossing of terms, strategies, and influences across disciplines as they have been framed within the Western art historical lens underlies the approach taken here while acknowledging work to be done.

As a key to the profile of Western conceptual art, Sutherland chooses Peter Bürger's identification of the avant-garde tendency to "throw into question the artwork as such, and thereby the status of art as social institution."[28] The following list expands on the conceptual art strategies that carried out such a program and confirms the strong links between Neo-Dada (late 1950s to mid-1960s) and conceptual art:[29]

- de-reification of the work-of-art through blurring the life/art distinction, often reducing art to "information," "instruction," or "imperative"[30]
- critique of art's autonomy through "a fusion of the work with its site and context of display," often involving degrees of institutional critique[31]
- anti-representation and even anti-visualization, replacing content with propositions[32]
- anti-expression or an erasure of the artist's hand taken to an extreme post Neo-Dada

- reduction of elements in line with "the growing tradition of reworking Cagean silence"[33]
- which lead to the "dematerialization" of art (coined by Lippard)[34]
- speedy reproduction and distribution (of ideas, catalogues, documentations) over materialized/visualized production and presentation[35]
- language as art and an interest in the speech act[36]
- blurring media specificity or a post-medium approach where all media and means are equal and available
- event over object and an associated redefinition of the spectatorial position—the birth of non-object-based art and experiential art

Sutherland links the last to "process and performance—a neo-Dada tendency," and as noted, the broader continuities with Neo-Dada are clear.[37]

At its most extreme, such work involved replacing the act of making art objects with another activity such as filling in a form (*Substitution 15* [1970] by Frederick Barthelme); exhibiting a breeze in *Air Currents* (Hans Haacke [1969]) by placing a small fan in a room; mounting exhibitions as two journal issues of *Aspen* (issues 5 and 6 [1967] curated by artist-critic Brian O'Doherty); contributing to an exhibition the telepathic communication of a work of art "the nature of which is a series of thoughts that are not applicable to language or image" (*Telepathic Piece* [1969] by Robert Barry); titling a work *A Piece That Is Essentially The Same As A Piece Made By Any Of The First Conceptual Artists, Dated Two Years Earlier Than The Original And Signed By Somebody Else* ([1970] by Eduardo Costa); or exhibiting the response of visitors to an exhibition opening by locking them into the space (*Confinement Action* [1968] by Graciela Carnevale).[38] As Lippard states, "we were imagining our heads off," and the sense of taking the parameters of art—and any given art form—to a point of absolute crisis is certainly a continuity with the third-wave experimental dance work that stretches the body, time, movement, space, place, and content to extremes. For example, in Paris-based choreographer Ivana Müller's *While We Were Holding It Together* (2006), the artists on stage remained static for a prolonged time, speaking in turn, suggesting narrative backstories for the scenario.[39] Or, in William Forsythe's *Nowhere and Everywhere at the Same Time No. 2* (2013), moving bodies were absent from the choreographic situation which existed as a material score for potential human interaction (hanging pendulums that participants had to dodge to avoid tangling with them).[40]

So, while the lineage connecting conceptual art to Neo-Dada is clear, and the importance of dance within the Neo-Dada configuration has been established, to quote Osborne, "what is the relation between conceptual art and the conceptual dimension of other kinds of art?"[41] Could a broader understanding of "conceptualism," which Osborne believes "is more or less coextensive with 'contemporary art'," be the accurate moniker for a more inclusive consideration of the third-wave dance avant-garde?[42] In summary, conceptualism has been defined as a change in attitude toward art by artists who no longer privilege the material, visual, spatial, or sensual aspects of their work. As not-dance, the language applied to some recent dance is clearly informed by the "'not-art,' 'non-art,' and 'anti-art'," of conceptual art.[43] The general critique of the status of art is also crystal clear in the interrogation of key dance principles and elements, detailed in Chapters 2 and 7, across the second and third waves. The critical approaches to authorship, spectatorship, commodification, representation, and disciplinary limits (including space and time) are shared between historical conceptual art and conceptual dance since the 1990s, and the interest in intermediality is where the two spheres of distinct training and distribution have historically met in practice.[44] However, the matter of the split between concept and materials/medium is a sticking point both within discussions of conceptual art and in this specific case of a comparison with relevant dance practices. The historical texts of Flynt and LeWitt help unravel the concept-material bind as it applies to dance.

In Flynt's 1961 discussion of "concept art" he describes "structure art" where, for example, musical forms such as "the fugue and total serial music" tried "to be [both] music . . . **and** knowledge represented by structure." Conversely, concept art "explore[s] the aesthetic possibilities structure can have when freed from trying to be music or whatever."[45] This can include "play with the concepts of the art such as, in music, *the score, performer vs. Listener, playing a work*," which must again focus on the structures as concepts rather than on how they manifest materially as music.[46] Flynt sets up an opposition where "one can be obtained only at the other's expense," that is, the conceptual at the expense of the material.[47] The inevitable corollary of this is what Lippard and John Chandler refer to as "the dematerialization of art" where "the studio is again becoming a study," and the art object moves toward obsolescence.[48] Lippard sums up: the conceptual work "was all over the place in style and content, but materially quite specific . . . the idea is paramount and the material form is secondary, lightweight, ephemeral, cheap, unpretentious and/or 'dematerialized'."[49]

In 2013, Cvejić refers to a similar tendency in the experimental dance she was witnessing, noting "choreographers' and performance-makers' current theoretical, self-reflective obsession with working methods, procedures, formats, and performance scores."[50] Cvejić's book goes on to establish that "concepts"—in the philosophical sense of the term (and she draws on Gilles Deleuze's later work and his philosophical sources)—are central to this field of work through her discussion of the choreographers' methods as working with "expressive problems."[51] So, while Cvejić and her artist-colleagues may be wary of comparisons with the conceptual movement in art, she finds concepts (as opposed to physical regimes, external references, corporeal sources, or intermedial experiments) at the heart of the work. For example, Cvejić writes of Jonathan Burrows and Jan Ritsema's work, *Weak Dance Strong Questions* (2001):

> As if it attempts at suspending the mind's control, each movement stops at the point where it gains the self-consciousness of the performers—which could be considered as the achievement of the modernist ideal of pure dance language. However, what is alien to this modernist quest in *WDSQ* [*Weak Dance Strong Questions* (2001)], is that this dance seems to be scaffolded by the logic of an external philosophical concept.[52]

For Cvejić, while the work may look like "pure" dancing in the scored-improvisation model, its significance is that it is driven by the philosophical provocation drawn from T.S. Eliot's poem *Burnt Norton*, which "lent the notion of movement 'neither from nor towards'," and allowed them to work with the impossibility of "movement outside time."[53]

A striking difference between the conceptual dance and conceptual art described above is the audience's access to the concept that drives the work. There is a note in Lippard and Chandler's discussion of conceptual art that tellingly compares the work of Rainer and Cage as examples that "conceptual art need not communicate its concepts."[54] While the language-based art of Joseph Kosuth, such as his four-word, colored neon sign *A Four Color Sentence* (1966), or even the extreme examples by Barthelme et al. given above, demonstrate their concepts explicitly, Lippard and Chandler's observation suggests another lineage of conceptual work that features non-reducible or more obscure driving concepts with links to Cage and the second-wave dance avant-garde, and which Lippard also links to LeWitt as I will go on to explain. Alberro ascribes to LeWitt's conceptualism a strategy of "irrationalism" rather than a controlled logic, which opens his work to "a multiplic-

ity of readings" from an "unlimited public."[55] There is similar resistance to the stability or reducibility of concepts in the recent dance avant-garde. The irreducibility of concepts in the dance work is clear in Cvejić's account of the central concept in Burrows and Ritsema's *Weak Dance Strong Questions*, "movement 'neither from nor towards'," which produced a specific quality of movement that has the characteristics of hesitancy, disruption, indecision, contrariness, and miscommunication, but which does not explicitly uncover their point of departure.[56] Alongside Burrows and Ritsema, another example might include Sarah Michelson's inclusion of the term "devotion" in her work's title, *Devotion Study #1—The American Dancer* (2012) (Case Study 1). There is some work to be done to extract the concept of the-devotion-of-the-dancer-to-the-dance from the durational, minimal performance in comparison to, say, Kosuth's *A Four Color Sentence* (1966), which you either *get* or you don't. The conceptual opacity that occurs during the transmission of the dance in performance, which is connected to the complexity of the body as a medium and the impossibility of neutralizing or containing its generative potential, leads us to the issue of a persistence of the material dimension in conceptual dance.

6.3 The Persistence of a Thing Called Dance

As noted, approaching dematerialization in recent experimental dance, or *the emphasis on the structural aspects of dance and choreography as concepts*, has involved some pointed experiments in prolonged stasis, near invisibility, or corporeal absence. However, rather than leading to an obsolescence of the art object/subject, the materiality of dance is most often bound to the conceptual as the mechanism through which it is realized. LeWitt has a formulation for this: the paradox of converting the material of the work into an idea—*material as idea*.[57] In Müller's piece, corporeal movement was transformed into an idea through physical stasis that extended to the point of discomfort noted in the trembling bodies of the performers. In *Nowhere and Everywhere at the Same Time No. 2*, Forsythe transformed physical presence into a score for action realized through engagement with the objects of the installation. In the Burrows and Ritsema example, the central problem or concept was not thinkable without pressing through improvised movement to approach "movement that has neither spatial nor temporal structure, a movement that internalizes 'the still point'."[58] Xavier Le Roy's piece, *Untitled* (2012), as seen in *13 Rooms* in Sydney in 2013, proposed

a choreographic situation in which nothing could be seen, but presence felt. The concept depended on the materiality of complete darkness and the intimate co-presence of performer and audience member, mobilizing plurisensoriality as a critique of occularcentricity.[59] Michelson's *Devotion Study #1* had a simple concept: "an exhibition of the dancer's devotion to dance."[60] A minimalist, durational dance, the choreographic structures of time, vocabulary, ground/floor, composition in space, spectatorship, and labor were presented as concepts through the materiality of "the dancer": the dancer as an "idea."

The division between concept and material touted by Flynt was realized in the very extreme examples of conceptual art mentioned above, which isolated structures of art and presented them void of content, such as the labor of making art (substituted with filling in a form), the presence of the audience in the gallery (alone and locked in with nothing to see), the materiality of art (invisible but perceptible air currents, imperceptible thought processes), the exhibition (as catalogue only), and tautological titles of works as works. While the substitution of ideas for art objects is clear in these examples, aligning with Lippard's statements on the dematerialization of art, in a contradictory note typical of the discourse surrounding conceptual art Lippard writes of "other artists [who] were more concerned with allowing materials rather than systems to determine the form of their work."[61] Lippard goes on to differentiate between conceptual art with an upper or lower case "c," with the latter including works like LeWitt's "in which the material forms were often conventional."[62] For example, LeWitt's *Structures* (1961-1962) is described by Buchloh as follows:

> The surfaces of these *Structures* from 1961 to 1962 . . . carried inscriptions in bland lettering identifying the hue and shape of those surfaces (e.g., 'RED SQUARE') and the inscription itself (e.g., 'WHITE LETTERS'). Since these inscriptions named either the support or the inscription (or, in the middle section of the painting, both support and inscription in a paradoxical inversion), they created a continuous conflict in the viewer/reader . . . was the inscription to be given primacy over the visual qualities identified by the linguistic entity, or was the perceptual experience of the visual, formal, and chromatic element anterior to its mere denomination by language? . . . Rather than privileging one over the other, LeWitt's work . . . insisted on forcing the inherent contradictions of the two spheres (that of the perceptual experience and that of the linguistic experience) into the highest possible relief.[63]

Here the material and the conceptual are put into tension as rivals that do not cancel each other out, and this rivalry becomes an important part of the work; *the conceptual work of the art happens through the material form*. LeWitt writes that if an idea makes it to the art-making stage, "the idea becomes a machine that makes the art," moving toward "realization" through the material processes, conditions, and qualities: "the artist cannot imagine his art, and cannot perceive it until it is complete."[64] This description of pressing the experimental thought or idea through the medium in an encounter that generates non-predetermined outcomes reveals a trust in the agency of materials and their collaborative capacity that was also a feature of the proto-conceptual work of Rauschenberg.[65] It opens onto a productive paradox that Osborne describes as "an exploration of the continuities and disjunctions between conceptual and perceptual logics," and this practice of maintaining a paradox, rivalry, or tension between the idea and the collaboration with materials also appears in the relationship between concepts and dancing in the case studies of dance as a contemporary art medium in this book.[66]

LeWitt's model of material as being in a dialectical relationship with the emergence of the idea is a useful alternative to Flynt's opposition between material and concept where "one can be obtained only at the other's expense."[67] Looking back in 1977, North American art critic Robert Pincus-Witten contrasts the "pure Conceptualists," who had depended on "systems from mathematics and philosophy," with another approach he links to both Richard Serra and the choreographies of Rainer and Brown in which he sees a return "to the conception that art is not necessarily made with notions, but with materials," and that this return "may have been spurred by the open-endedness of theatricality."[68] RoseLee Goldberg also follows LeWitt's logic (and possibly Graham's in *End Moments*) in her 1975 essay, "Space as Praxis," where she arrives at this conclusion: "there seems to have been a general consensus of sensibility which links that work which is now considered 'conceptual' to performance art."[69] LeWitt's model allows for (and was perhaps in dialogue with) the situation in dance and choreography across both avant-garde periods where the material of a conceptually driven work is most often tied directly to the idea/concept/proposition. The subject/object of the dancer was discussed as the material of dance in Chapter 2. The condition of the dancing body, described by Jeroen Peeters as a "discursive" site that "remediates" visual hierarchies and is "suspectible" to its context, explains why there is an instability,

obscurity, or irreducibility of the concepts within dance as a contemporary art medium resulting in the paradoxical condition mentioned above.[70]

Picking up on the discussions of Lippard, Pincus-Witten, and Goldberg on the role played by performance in the formulation of a particular strand of conceptual art, Osborne notes that "the first works of conceptual art emerged in the context of avant-garde performance culture" and the framework of Neo-Dada.[71] He lists the four central standards of visual art (via Greenberg) that were the target of conceptual art's critique: "*material objectivity, medium specificity, visuality and autonomy*." He then links the first—the critique of material objectivity—to a tendency in emergent conceptual art toward intermediality and the strong links with "performance in music and dance."[72] The critique of the material objectivity of art can be seen, in Osborne's formulation, as the catalyst for the other attacks on standards of art such as disciplinary purity, occularcentrism, and the transcendental status of art (leading to the critique of authorship, representation, and the other characteristics of conceptual art listed above). If a critique of the integrity of art-as-object is at the heart of conceptual art, dance offers a medium where the subject-object bind already always complicates any such construct as we saw in Peeters' model of the discursive body of conceptual dance, and the ontological status of the (traditionally) ephemeral art form has been the subject of historical and ongoing debates.[73]

Osborne singles out Robert Morris as having produced "more embodied conceptions of art as 'event'," and mentions Cage, Rauschenberg, Halprin, and Judson in passing, but there are no choreographer case studies included in his book, *Conceptual Art*.[74] In 1968, Lippard and Chandler find the dancing of Rainer and Alex Hay, alongside the art work of Rauschenberg and Robert Whitman, as points of "synaesthesia," where "art as idea and art as action" find some unity, but again, the dance artists are not framed as central to conceptual art.[75] It is perhaps the commitment to the materiality of the dancing body—its capacities and knowledges—that historically excludes the dance artists working beside Morris from the conceptual label despite their own use of the term mentioned above and has, rather, seen them aligned with the more blatantly materially occupied business of Minimalism. Or perhaps there is an historical influence and exchange between dance and the visual arts woven into the threads of the Neo-Dada to conceptualism narrative that have come to light only recently as a contemporary manifestation of conceptual dance emerged at

the end of the twentieth century at the cross-roads of visual art and dance. This asynchronous correspondence has perhaps obfuscated a complex network of practical exchanges, knowledge-sharing, distant influences and invisible genealogies, for example between Forti and Flynt, or Brown and Matta-Clark.

6.4 Conclusion

While one can perhaps say that all contemporary art has a conceptual aspect (if not going so far as to say that conceptualism equals contemporary art), the recent dance avant-garde tends *to evoke questions of the dematerialization of dance as just another way to reinstate disciplinary grammar*, a project that was left well behind by the above-mentioned more militant conceptualist artists such as Flynt. While Osborne and others link the shift away from visuality in conceptual art to a turn toward linguistically based content, the challenge to occularcentrism in conceptual dance occurs through the activation of the plurisensorial regime that was associated with the art form in Chapter 2, which is deeply connected to the mind-body material at the heart of the discipline. This is an important differentiation between historical conceptual art and the more recent conceptual dance given the rarity in the latter of what Cvejić describes as "the use of language substituting for movement" resulting in a "dogmatic prohibition of physicality" as a means of dematerializing the object of the art form.[76] The persistence of the materiality of dance and choreography through the body of the performer or agent (human or otherwise), and the general focus on choreographic events rather than text-based "information," "instruction," or "imperative" (from my list via Sutherland), sets the recent dance avant-garde apart from the earlier period of conceptual art.

If there has been a significant new expression of a conceptual model of choreography since the early 1990s, what are its specificities and relevance to the examples of dance as a contemporary art medium under discussion here beyond historical alliances between the disciplines? The case studies of Adam Linder, Shelley Lasica, and Maria Hassabi work the space between attention to disciplinary elements and a critique of institutionalized parameters in subtle, unique, yet powerful ways that have reinstituted materiality, physicality, sensuality, and co-habitation into the very heart of our major art institutions. Such work uncovers specifically *how* choreographic work embodies a model of contemporary art that foregrounds

material as idea, and potently realizes key features of conceptual art and conceptual dance such as self-reflexivity, plurisensoriality, reduction/minimalism, de-reification, process, and anti-illusionism. The uniquely disciplinary manifestation of conceptuality in the choreographic examples in this book feature a specific take on the role of its materials therein that can be described, following LeWitt, as material as idea. In such dance, there is a distinctive condition and function of its concepts; they remain covert, unstable, and multiplicitous. That condition is tied to the nature of its primary material, the dancing body, in all of its complexity, susceptibility, contingency, and obscurity. But these artists also demonstrate how dance as a contemporary art medium has opened up a space for new art practices operating beyond the conceptual paradigms, foregrounding dispersal, irreducibility, encounters, labor, meta-criticality, and co-presence.

Before delving into those case studies, I return to some disciplinary business: stage two of an account of some grammatical elements of dance that help me argue for the persistence of the materiality of dance within the field of dance as a contemporary art medium. I have argued that the work of key artists engaging in practices that move across the traditional paramaters of both dance and visual arts most often follows LeWitt's formula of *material as idea*, insisting that "the artist cannot imagine his art, and cannot perceive it until it is complete" in its material form and through the artist's collaboration with their materials.[77] In this case, some attention to the nature of those materials is required. As I noted in Chapter 1, this project follows a reclaiming of dance's own language within both practice and commentary following an historical moment within the discipline that saw certain tendencies shedding dance of the activity of dancing, described in Chapters 4 and 5. As this occurred at the same time that dance was re-entering the museum and gallery in modalities and numbers that exceeded the mid-century activity, it seems timely to revisit the material activity of dancing as it now returns to experimental practices in the 2020s, engaging with the equally material contexts of the contemporary arts.

Chapter 7

The Limit Features of Dance's Social Condition (Part 2)

7.1 Introduction

This chapter picks up on the discussion of foundational principles for dance in Chapter 2 before moving into case studies that exemplify the persistence of dance in this intermedial work. The following unpacks some disciplinary elements, highlighting a tradition within dance analysis that is analogous to formal analysis in the visual arts, and brings many of the concerns associated with the latter into play. *Breath*, *weight*, *tone, movement (qualities), force/energy/effort, rhythm*, and *space-time* are defined as discipline-specific in the same way that surface or ground, line, figure, color, and form are considered specific to painting. Formal analysis is as contentious within dance studies as it has been in art theory. Debates between field leaders in the former were couched in terms of *description* versus *ideas*, a version of the art theory debates around the function of art criticism after judgement.[1] British art theorist Peter Osborne notes that there remains "a kind of sensuous individuality that cannot, in principle, be grasped by conceptual forms," and the particular challenges of reducing dance to "constructed objects of theory."[2] This, alongside a pressing need to capture the ephemeral through description, has produced a persistent, creative, and innovative tradition of critical attention to the formal, material, and compositional dimensions of dance.

As noted in Chapter 2, the conservatism that haunts any project interested in disciplinary formations provides a challenge: to account for the limit-features of an art form that constitute its social condition and identity, while concurrently describing the radical testing of those limits within experimental practice. In the case studies in Parts IV and V, and those already encountered, attention to the material elements of dance

uncovers much about the distinctions to be made as we try to locate the specificities of the highly networked practice of dance as a contemporary art medium within its broader context. The conditions that have given rise to the still emerging form—the precedents in the work of mid-century artists such as Simone Forti and Trisha Brown; the particular aesthetic, cultural, and economic conditions that gave rise to conceptually oriented dance work in Europe; some asynchronous synergies with conceptual art as it appeared in the 1960s; the alignment of such work with a desire to reinvent the art museum; and a genuine return to intermedial interests on the part of contemporary artists—provide a context for its specificities. What follows parses traditional dance elements from the relatively shallow history of dance as a contemporary art form (since the turn of the twentieth century) with the new perspectives encountered through its intermedial adventures, leading to fresh aesthetic prospects for dance viewed from its outside.

7.2 Breath

In defining elements specific to dance, French dance theorist Laurence Louppe's discussion of breath is pivotal. She evokes breath as that which "connects outside and inside" of the body and marks it as a place of passage, but also as the foundation of phrasing (after Doris Humphrey), expression (after Martha Graham), as well as being the fuel for elevation and thrust.[3] More recently a research project titled *Breath Catalogue*, led by artist and academic Kate Elswit, starts from the premise that "breath is intrinsic to dance."[4] Breath, along with weight, constitutes for Louppe the main connections to "the body's memory [of] fundamental movements," one half of a two-way pull that orients contemporary dance always toward the unknown while maintaining an anchor in archaic or "fundamental" continuities.[5] Breath is also one of our most simple and least detectable movements. As a fundamental, it is both compulsory and a mystery; German Expressionist choreographer Mary Wigman describes it as the "secret" of dance, and also "the secret of life."[6] We breathe to keep ourselves alive, but breath is also what keeps us alive despite ourselves. Aristotle ponders, "how can we account for the maintenance of the function of breath?"[7]

Of course, breath is a gesture of repetition par excellence; its "maintenance" baffled Aristotle, and its disruption is traumatic. Its pattern of tension and release has been a source of choreographic structure, but it is

worth pausing and unpacking some assumptions about this model of the structure of breath. American choreographer Doris Humphrey's *The Art of Making Dances* presents a "theory of the phrase" that has been mobilized, overturned, and deconstructed across contemporary dance practices since it first appeared.[8] Humphrey says the phrase is built around "the powerful emotional shape of the breath phrase," involving tension, relaxation, and rest, and following "a rising and falling intensity and speed" which she also finds in the speech phrase.[9]

Breath, as a physical phenomenon in humans, is driven by expulsion; we have to get rid of carbon dioxide. The breathing process is facilitated by a large muscle under the lungs, the diaphragm, which, when relaxed, naturally domes upwards:

> When you breathe in, the diaphragm contracts downward, creating a vacuum that causes a rush of fresh air into the lungs. The opposite occurs with exhalation, where the diaphragm relaxes upwards, pushing on the lungs, allowing them to deflate.[10]

If one exhales and pauses before taking another breath then this is a rest phase where the diaphragm is relaxed in its domed form; but natural breathing is circular and thus has no still or relaxed point. Humphrey's modelling of dance phrases on the shape of a breath is based on a narrow definition of the same; the steady and predictable inhale-exhale pattern of restful breath described here, or the breath pattern associated with speech phrases. It aligns easily with dramatic phrasing which is conservative in nature—linear and logical, conforming to spectacle, language, narrative, with a climax or change in the middle. Humphrey's conservatism is clearly stated: "when the phrase-shape in this sense is disregarded, as it can be by artificial means in the arts, we are disconnected from this most fundamental of all shapes," and thus bad phrasing is produced.[11]

If the breath-shape of restful breathing is considered standard, modelling "good phrasing," this allows for the conscious and skilled manipulation of such phrasing through interruption, diversion, suspension, acceleration, exaggeration, etcetera, all of which will affect the breathing patterns of the dancer. Breath and phrasing exchange forms; as Louppe states, "the phrasing of movement is aerated in [breath's] unfolding, its quality, its 'grain'."[12] In opposition to Humphrey, Mary Wigman understands the range of breath qualities and how the dancer's movements can be "ruled by the law of his dynamically propelled power of breathing . . . he breathes . . .

with the same vibration that fills and shakes his whole being."[13] A conscious, skilled use of breath to fuel movement qualities links the use of breath in dance practices, as Louppe points out, to somatic practices owing much to Eastern body-mind disciplines.[14]

The breath is also central to the critique of subject-object distinctions in dance. As stated, for Louppe breath connects inside and outside, dancer and world, and here she is at her most poetic:

> Breath reveals only spaces; In breathing we touch and know our inner cavities. The body thus revealed is a net, not a mass. It is empty, not full. It refers us, beyond physical sensations, to the geographies of the body's landscapes, to the space that connects outside and inside . . . the body as a passage, a porous screen between two states of the world, and not an opaque, full, impenetrable mass.[15]

Our breathing, navigating the spaces inside, between, and across bodies as ephemeral substance and force, is charged with an imperceptible contagion. French dance theorist Hubert Godard describes "thoracic" or "respiratory empathy"—how we breathe with someone we encounter physically:

> The balance of the sensorial movements . . . this double trajectory towards the exterior and interior has a direct impact on inspiration and exhalation. It's as if respiration is, first of all, founded on the dynamic of our relation to the world. At any rate, respiratory imbalances or fixations are very often the reflection of disorders of perception.[16]

I have experienced this relational or contagious aspect of breath personally, and intimately, with my children when holding them while they sleep. How incoming affects—perceptions causing sensations—effect our breathing is deeply understood in our everyday lives, and is represented in terms such as *breathtaking*, *breathless*, *it took my breath away* . . . The relationship between sensation and breath—how sensations can catalyze variations in breathing—thus speaks to the connections between perception and breath. The dancer's engagement with breath moves this perceptual engagement with breath into action. As Louppe writes, "an informed practice of breath should be inextricable from the necessities and qualities of movement."[17] The work of French choreographer Benoît Lachambre, which "is focused on the study of internal sensations and flows," according to Jeroen Peeters, is an example of self-consciously breath-focused work. Peeters states that

"his starting point is, for example, the interoceptive perception of breathing and its resonance in the internal cavities of the body," and this is attended to within what Lachambre describes as the complex matrix of "internal sensations and patterns of the body," that together "approach the complexity of quantum physics."[18] At his performances in Sydney during *Ghost Telephone* (Case Study 4), this attention produced a quality of contained, calm, and focused attention; a command that encouraged deep engagement from myself as a viewer and produced a smooth logic across his movements, which ranged broadly in quality and tone.[19]

7.3 Weight

Louppe quotes Laban to indicate the universal experience of, and connection with, *weight* as a facet of dance: "All movement is defined by a transfer of *weight*."[20] Weight transference on every scale is associated with keeping us upright so, as Louppe notes, "all movement is a deferred fall, and it is from the manner in which this fall . . . is deferred that movement aesthetics are born."[21] The effect of gravity on the weight of the body is so foundational to dance, Godard states, that "any gesture is literally born from the gravitational function."[22] Choreography can thus reorient the gravitational matrix that traditionally places the vertical viewer in front of the vertically oriented object. So, for instance, the gallery floor supersedes the wall (choreographies filling the vast floor spaces of the Tanks at Tate Modern) or the walls become a floor (Trisha Brown's *Walking on the Wall* [1971]). Choreographic experiments can result in odd sightlines, peripheral views, suspensions, buoyancy . . .

As I have noted elsewhere, Godard writes very beautifully of a "plastic corporeal memory" in humans that is the "modelling of the tissues that generate the tensional organisation of our bodies."[23] This process involves the "tonic muscles which specialize in gravitational responses" and which contain our bodies' "most ancient memory":

> The essential task of the tonic muscles is to inhibit falling . . . in order to make a movement these muscles have to release. And it's in this release that the poetic quality of the movement is generated . . . . Why are we moved when someone dances, when they put so much at stake in terms of their stability . . . ? Because these activities refer to the history that is wholly inscribed in our bodies, in the very muscles that hold us upright.[24]

Involved here is what Godard calls the "gravitational line": "When one starts to move, the centre of gravity organizes itself in an open network in relation to supports or losses of support."[25] The dancer plays around the center of gravity, exploiting an intensely mobile system of support and release, and in doing so expresses, reworks, challenges our most fundamental physical relationship with the world around us, the spatio-dynamic orientations to the material world through which we move.

For Humphrey, fall and recovery became the basis of her idiom. Dance historians Nancy Reynolds and Malcolm McCormick describe her art as "a dance form that dramatized man's relationship to the ordering principle of the universe—gravity."[26] Humphrey recognized the poetics of the release of our tonic muscles described by Godard; the "drama" this presents through a virtuosic dance with instability and risk. On the other hand, to defy gravity is to leap—this is linked to breath in Louppe who quotes poet Paul Claudel on Vaslav Nijinsky: "he brought us the leap, that is, the victory of respiration over weight."[27] I will return to these extreme positions in a dancer's negotiations with gravity in relation to *tone*.

Following Laban, Godard, and Louppe, the ways in which a dancer mobilizes, manipulates, risks, or reinvents their relation with gravity through the distribution of body weight speaks directly to the bodies of spectators through shared corporeal experience and knowledge, and we will see how this plays out in the work of Maria Hassabi in Case Study 9. This may be "upstream" of consciousness, as Godard suggests.[28] Sally Gardner traces this interest in the aesthetic dimension of gravity and weight in dancing to Isadora Duncan's work early in the twentieth century. Gardner suggests that "revealing and communicating to her (largely middle-class) audiences the feeling of a relatively ordinary corporeal *shift of weight*," she thus brought an awareness of "being an embodied subject open to the world, to gravity and to falling."[29] It is clear then how a simple weight shift (a first principle of Duncan technique) opens up the collective corporeal memory of our foundational spatio-dynamic orientations to the material world through which we move.[30]

Weight is also "the least objectifiable and least figurable element," and thus is integral to the capacity for dance to circumvent mimesis and representation where it is not desired.[31] Louppe links the manifestation of weight in a moving dancer's body specifically to the torso and spine, as opposed to bodily extremities associated with the gestures of communication.[32] While the head, arms, and legs are the focus of most theories of gesture that seek to account for the expressive, communicative, and rep-

resentational functions of the body, the trunk of the body is not so easily "read," holding expression in deep functions that might slip through into posture and pose, as well as holding our center of gravity, which relates our body's core to the ground, that limit of gravitational pull.[33]

As Aristotle notes, "the spine, from which the ribs radiate to lock the body together, is the fixed part which originates movement. There must be something of this character; for all movement depends on something stationary."[34] Movement depends on stability, and stability depends upon the forces of gravity. Godard is clear on this:

> The usual meaning of the term proprioception is the knowledge we have of our own body's movements in a given context. I translate it as the feeling of self because without this particular sensitivity, the other senses wouldn't be able to function in reference to a constant self . . . . And we often forget that this sensitivity is related to the context, through the play of the internal ear which informs us of our relation to gravity, the only constant force in this world in perpetual movement around us.[35]

As Louppe points out, it is in contact improvisation that this stability is tested by a most complex challenge: the sharing of a center of gravity with another body with whom one is in constant physical contact and relation.[36] The constancy of our individual gravitational stability is put into play and dialogue with that of another in a profound act of trust, experiment, and an intersubjectivity that touches the very foundations of our material existence. In this way, the stability of everyday gravitational functions is challenged through the destabilizing processes of dance and choreography.

7.4 Tone

Tone, as it functions within dance, is connected to gravity and weight and relates to the intensity of muscle tone or tension.[37] The tension and release of muscles form the foundation of all movement and operate in reference to gravity and maintaining tonic stability. As I have written elsewhere with dance theorist and artist Nalina Wait, "it is in the transition from passive to active muscle tone that the initiation of each moment can be noticed: which muscles switch on for an action to happen, in what way do they switch on, with what force, tone, or quality?"[38] *Engaging* tonicity in

Steve Paxton and Nancy Stark Smith: Performing in an art gallery, Provincetown, MA. Photograph by Stephen Petegorsky. 1977.

certain muscles, a largely internal shift that marks the initiation of movement, infuses that movement with the qualities of that specific tone and indicates levels of energy and force. I believe this is behind Louppe's use of the term "engagement" as an equivalent for "movement" (via dancer Sylvie Giron's commentary).[39]

Godard connects muscular tonicity directly to the body's capacity to produce qualities and affects, but also meanings and emotions:

> The internal resistances to disequilibrium, which are organised by the system of gravitational muscles, will induce the quality and affective charge of the gesture. The psychic apparatus expresses itself through this gravitational system. It is through its investment that it charges movement with meaning, modulates and colours it with desire, inhibition and emotion . . . and this happens unknown to the subject, being upstream of her/his conscious awareness.[40]

As stated, this happens mostly "upstream" of consciousness, or subconsciously, in everyday life. So muscular tonicity, along with regulating our physical functionality, also contains the source of a qualitative charge that colors our gestural profile, informing what I have called our *idiogest*. However, in contemporary dance we may find a virtuosic engagement with tone at a muscular level, harnessed to produce a complexity of desired qualitative effects. This is clear in the very particular qualities of Jonathan Burrows in his duet with Jan Ritsema, *Weak Dance Strong Questions* (2001). In Chapter 6 I described the qualities of hesitancy, disruption, indecision, contrariness, and miscommunication in the dance, and watching Burrows it is easy to imagine the flows of tonic variation that are in dialogue with his central concepts of "movement 'neither from nor towards'," and "movement outside time."[41]

This tonic virtuosity has its provenance in the dance emerging at the turn of the twentieth century. As noted in relation to weight, the vertical orientation of dance was opposed in the early years of modern dance and would never recover the weightlessness that characterized the ballerinas of Nietzsche's era. As in music, *tonality* would be challenged, and give way to *atonality* which manifested in various forms of "release" in dance. Atonality is the muscular condition of release that abandons the tonic stability of what Godard calls "the system of gravitational muscles," making way for the exploration of a more comprehensive range of muscular engagement (which combinations of muscles? What degrees and qualities

of tonicity?), and thus *movement qualities*.[42] Methods of release were part of the movement revolution in the twentieth century that challenged the muscular behaviors of trained and habitual movement, including the patterns of classical ballet tonicity.[43] African-American dance scholar Brenda Dixon Gottschild gives an account of that system:

> The erect spine is the center—the hierarchical ruler—from which all movement is generated . . . This vertically aligned spine is the first principle of Europeanist dance, with arm and leg movements emanating from it and returning to it . . . this structural principle is a microcosm of the post-Renaissance, colonialist world-view.[44]

To challenge centralized tonicity was to challenge the dominant Western worldview in the early twentieth century. A new interest in weight, falling, floor-work, and groundedness (even stasis) would replace elevation, defiance of gravity, and muscular tension. Here is a body "content to flow into the world without occupying or dominating it," the non-assertive dancing body that has become the model for a way of figuring an art practice and art form.[45] Tonic (in)stability would become central to the aesthetics of contemporary dance; it is linked to the qualitative dimension of movement, the expressive charge, and perceptions of effort and (un)assertiveness.

This led to a "poetics of instability" that links us back to Burrows's observations regarding the unstable nature of dance in Chapter 2: "there is no sense to be made, and no steadiness to be borrowed, but we are overwhelmed by possibilities."[46] Louppe describes "a play of movement around the gravitational axis . . . asserting the idea of *a value which can only be one of wavering*."[47] She inverts the negative associations of "the fall" by contrasting this with "vertical death"—the atrophy of the tensor muscles in maintaining our corporeal verticality.[48] The promotion of a muscular tautness or extensional tension/tensility in some dance training, what Louppe refers to as a "tonic shield," can have an indoctrinating effect on muscular habits so that dancers may lose the capacity to access a "shifting of tensilities" by sensing and adapting their muscle tonality along a spectrum of gradients.[49] The body is already loaded with muscle memory related to "the tensional organization of the body" that is held in the "fascia, the muscle sheaths rich in collagen (and not innervated), and which produce memory," as Godard explains.[50] Again, as argued elsewhere, released muscle tonus gives access to "the soft end of the tonal spectrum . . . leading to greater freedom and choice in movement texture, quality and scope."[51]

Tonic virtuosity involves interrupting and loosening memory-habits that are both foundational *and* cultural, and I will discuss the powerful socio-cultural effects of re-coding muscular behaviors toward the horizontal in Hassabi's work in Case Study 9. Tone is also the key to the spectator's access to kinaesthetic empathy: "it converses musically with our own kinaesthesia and, playing on our own deep or light vibrations, carries us along into the most lyrical regions of our own corporeal awareness."[52] There is a strong link between the tonic sensations of the dancer and the movement affects presented to the viewer, building a bridge from one body to another through shared muscular memory. Along with breath and weight, what would seem to be the internal biomechanics of muscular work exists only in and through movement qualities, which in turn emerge from the ground of energy and rhythm, to circulate in a general exchange or flow.

7.5 Movement

Movement as a fundamental element of dance has been noted by some dance theorists (André Lepecki in particular) as the art form's historical commitment to "modernity's onto-political mobilization of movement."[53] This theoretical move in dance studies responded to a wave of choreographic works by the conceptual dance artists discussed in Chapters 4 and 5 that interrogated stasis as a critique of this dance element. However, the turn to stillness since Cunningham's deployment of it in the 1950s and 1960s can actually be seen as an expansion of the field of movement, just as John Cage's use of silence was an expansion of the field of music. Steve Paxton's assertion that there is no such thing as stillness, articulated through the practice of *The Small Dance, The Stand* (1977), was articulated some 20 years earlier by Merce Cunningham: "the nature of dancing is stillness in movement and movement in stillness . . . no stillness exists without movement, and no movement is fully expressed without stillness."[54]

Delving into a taxonomy, Louppe identifies the specific categories of fundamental, utilitarian, everyday, and "graphic" or "little" movements.[55] She also moves out, undertaking a survey of concepts of movement as it relates to dance from across the twentieth century, covering gesture, engagement, mobilization, posture, action, and motion.[56] Movement, in all these states, is both the expanded field of compositional choices and the whole context. Louppe notes, "Laban's genius, in the first instance,

lay in considering the body 'in movement' and not as a fantasmatically originary, immobile body upon which movement would come to make its mark."[57] The shift in Laban from an analysis of poses or positions to movement in its mediality was revolutionary. Sally Gardner expands on the universal role of movement in choreography: "'movement' is de-centred—it is the ongoing perceptual/organizational change or deformation that is taking place in the experiencing body before any movement is 'figured' or becomes visible."[58]

Part of movement as the pre-condition for dance and choreography is its role in *intention*. American media and cultural theorist Vivian Sobchack states, "intentionality (in life as in dance) is motility."[59] The link between movement and intention is profound and recalls Forsythe's definition of choreography as describing the choice of a "course of action."[60] Adam Linder's choice of the glide in *Choreographic Service No. 2: Some Proximity* (2014) in Case Study 7 as an "amplified" or "future" walk was intended to cut through the ambulatory movements of the gallery visitors with a charged tonality and virtuosic control of balance and speed, adjusting and "riding" the surrounding behaviors.[61] Louppe describes intentionality in dance as "the mobilization of being . . . the expression of a desire to be at work in the world."[62] In this sense, one could say *the labor of composition as movement itself*.

Inseparable from our consideration of the dancing body, movement also links us back to breath and weight, the foundational, everyday movements of the respiratory and circulatory systems, and the micro-movements of our tonic muscles that, unnoticed, keep us upright when standing still. So, when does movement become dance? Louppe, via American choreographer Alwin Nikolais, arrives at this definition:

> Movement is 'motion' in terms of undergoing one's own experience. There is 'dance' when this experience of being-in-movement, the qualities and modes of it surrendering to motion hold sway over all other parameters, be they action or artistic creation . . . dance as the poetics of movement is not so by its originality, nor by its spatio-temporal configuration but by the intensity of the experience which carries it (and which it can transmit).[63]

This recalls the self-reflexive function of poetics and Rhiannon Newton's "doing dancing" from Chapter 2. American poet Lyn Hejinian talks about poetics as recording "the experience of experience," and Louppe is suggesting that human movement becomes dance when there is a self-

reflexive encounter with the experience of moving.[64] It occurs where movement is the domain of a specific labor or practice, and the primary result is disassociated or distanced from functional actions or pre-determined aims. Influential dance pedagogue Margaret H'Doubler also understood that "creative activity combines what knowledge we have of a stimulating event with that of our relationship to it. It is this self-identification with experience that is the very core of creative effort."[65] A *movement practice* explores movement qualities in this self-reflexive way, and this is very apparent in Shelley Lasica's performance practice, which I have followed for over three decades. Watching Lasica dancing is watching Lasica in an active, dialogic relationship with herself moving and all the histories, physical idiosyncrasies, and creative interventions that she brings to that act, and as such, it is compelling in its ability to perform "the intensity of the experience which carries it."[66]

So where there is a movement practice, we might find dancing. But the movement of dance is not limited to the body. Wigman's assertion that dance is "exclusively bound to man and his ability to move" commits dance not only to the human body, but to closure through a relationship with physical virtuosity that is exclusive, that is, the more you can move the better you can dance.[67] This leads us to techniques, technologies, and skills, and issues related to (dis)ability. Dancerly movement flourishes in all sorts of contexts, and via all kinds of media. A video work by Australian Kuba Dorabialski features the artist dancing the answer to a question posed to him about faith/religion.[68] The performance slips between familiar gestures and facial expressions and more exploratory movements that are less stable in their form. I asked the artist how he had prepared for the performance and he said that he had not, but that he would describe what he performs as "intentional movement" working within certain restrictions.[69] His practice differs from that of many dancers, but the results are strikingly similar. This raises questions regarding what Louppe calls "'the work of dance' which interrogates the tenor of an action from its foundations."[70] If a movement practice and a lack thereof can produce similar results, what does this mean for both training and perceptibility/connoisseurship?

Use of pedestrian or everyday movement in dance post-Cunningham directly challenged standards of expertise, intention, and agency. In Case Study 8, I will discuss how Lasica constantly plays with this shift across the border of walking and dancing in gallery contexts where the distinction between the dancer and everyone else in the space is slim. As part

of a general softening of the art-life divide, the inclusion of any kind of movement as dance leads easily to anything moving as dance. Considering the grammatical limits for dance as an art form, movement is concurrently the most defining and least definable characteristic of dance, constituting the very conditions within which it occurs. To state that dance shares with film a claim to being *a moving art* is to underline its major preoccupation, its ground, and its limit.

7.6 Force/Energy/Effort

The force, energy, or effort involved in movement has been one of the hardest aspects of dancing to analyze and articulate, yet it is crucial. As Yvonne Rainer notes, "what makes one kind of movement different from another is not so much variations in arrangements of parts of the body as differences in energy investment."[71] Louppe explains how an understanding of effort came late in Laban's work and spoke to the overall "work of movement, or movement as work . . . as the mechanism of its emergence."[72] In this way, it is strongly linked to breath, weight, and tone where we find the provenance of movement, and refers to the intention or "attitude towards movement," chosen from a "palette of gears."[73]

Godard refers to this time-place of provenance as the "gestural anacrusis," and I have described this elsewhere as it plays out in the "gear shifts" in film musicals between, say, walking and dancing: "following [Godard's] definition, *gestural anacrusis* refers to the 'source' of movement, the 'pre-movement zone' where the quality and nature of the following gesture takes form."[74] I quote again his wonderful passage:

> One inevitably goes back to the mystery of what happens before the movement: what body image? what geography? what history? and above all, what intentionality? The pre-movement is an empty zone . . . and yet everything is already played out there, the entire poetic charge and tonal colouring of the action. A brief passage, a low pressure trough corresponding to this wholly founding moment: the gestural anacrusis.[75]

This is where the shift from perception to action occurs, and force and energy come into play as global terms for the intricate interplay of weight, breath, muscle tone, momentum, flexibility, and scale dialogue with intention, imagination, language, perception, and all of the expanded medium of dance.

Louppe connects the pre-movement zone with "visualization" and imagination in somatics, and this links us back to the mind-body.[76] Imagination plays an essential role in both energy and rhythm. Dee Reynold's book, *Rhythmic Subjects: Uses of Energy in the Dance of Mary Wigman, Martha Graham and Merce Cunningham*, argues that "the uses of energy in movement, and their transformation, are central to dance practice and analysis," and stresses the role of imagination in the process, linking energy and rhythm to "qualities of movement."[77] She also discusses dance and economics where the biological use "of kinetic energy while performing muscular contractions" is equated with "work."[78] Energy in dance, as opposed to the other arts, has explicit links to work and labor, and this is significant when dance moves into the commodity-based culture of the gallery. Dancer labor is expensive, especially when disconnected from the market value of a performance piece with a paying audience.[79] So, while the value of the energy of dance in the museum or gallery context is recognized, its conversion into the terms of that economy is troubled, and this has become an explicit theme in the work of artists such as Linder, and a covert one in other instances such as Matthieu Copeland's *A Choreographed Exhibition* (2007), Case Study 3.

7.7 Rhythm

In his research in the nineteenth century, Émile Jaques-Dalcroze arrived at eight theoretical conclusions, the first two of which are:

1. Rhythm is movement.
2. Rhythm is essentially physical.[80]

Contemplating rhythm without movement, movement without rhythm, or the production of rhythm that would lack a physical component, fortifies links between rhythm and dance. Defining rhythm as the essence of music leads Jaques-Dalcroze directly to the body and its movements:

> Muscles were made for movement, and rhythm is movement. It is impossible to conceive a rhythm without thinking of a body in motion. To move, a body requires a quantum of space and a quantum of time. The beginning and end of the movement determine the amount of time and space involved. Each depends on the gravity, that is to say (in relation to the limbs set in motion by the muscles), on the elasticity and muscular force of the body.[81]

Reynolds refers to Laban to connect rhythm to energy or effort, stating "movement rhythms are produced by modulations in energy expenditure."[82] As noted, Reynolds extends this to parse rhythm to energy expenditure or labor. She argues that innovations at the level of rhythm intervene into habitual kinaesthetic patterns, making rhythm a key to connecting movement composition and analysis to "wider cultural and theoretical contexts" and the work-related issues mentioned above.[83]

Rhythm, for Jaques-Dalcroze, is the "inner song" that we all carry with us and which informs our engagement with the world. Louppe describes this concept of rhythm as "a kind of 'transformer'" mediating between the world and our corporeal being, between perception and action:

> And these echoes are channelled in the first instance through changes in muscle texture, that drapery of fibrous intensity which makes our body into a resonating chamber and instrument and bow of an inner song . . . . There is thus an inner tonic song.[84]

Thus, Louppe links rhythm directly to tone via Jaques-Dalcroze. Here Louppe stays with this musical metaphor:

> This [muscular work] sets the 'tonic lyricism' for what follows and establishes the rhythmic character that mediates between inside and outside, action and perception, but also links rhythm to flow as that which comes in between changes in tone, quality, intention. In this way it colours the entire dance at its interface with the spectator, setting the terms of that encounter.[85]

Rhythm as a kind of ground that enables an action event or encounter recalls the understanding of perception in Immanuel Kant's sublime as understood by Gilles Deleuze. Between a unit of measure (based on the human form), the subject (the perceiver), and the object itself (the perceived), Deleuze finds an unstable rhythm that requires us to *experience* and *experiment* with being in space-time, the constitution of space-time being the common ground of all the arts.[86] As a corollary of the production and circulation of energy in a given situation, rhythm thus speaks to the whole context. In Adam Linder's *Choreographic Service No. 3: Some Riding* (2015) in Case Study 7, Linder's interest in rhythm was attached to both a paradox between the spoken word and movement, and an interest in energy contagion between performer and audience, riding the energy and connections within the whole situation of the performance in the gallery.

7.8 Space-Time

For French philosopher Gilles Deleuze, as noted above, space-time is the common characteristic of all artistic forms.[87] So what is specific about space-time in dance? Is it constituted through the body? Louppe's account of space and time are exhaustive regarding the manner in which this is the case. Time is, for Louppe, the means, the endgame, and the product of dance. She notes that "[the dance] encounter cannot be 'postponed' (différé). It involves, in itself, an experience/experiment of perceiving in space and time, an undergoing of this experience—on both sides."[88] It is the vector for an action, the condition that frames its possibilities. It can be the objective of a work by choreographers such as Cunningham, and others focused on duration or speed who would like to present a certain state of time through choreography. Time can be created through movement, as in the theories of Jaques-Dalcroze, emerging as a poetic force and produced through phrasing (from the breath) as the moment, the interval, and the present. But it is also something to be suspicious of—it is the immaterial element within a physical toolbox, but can run like a railroad across the sensibilities, "devour[ing] bodies."[89] For Louppe, space is a partner, a force, within the body and independent of it, something to move through and something that moves through us, is produced by us, and produces our dance. Louppe takes this from Wigman who, of all the modernists, took space as "her great, invisible partner."[90] But space is not place, and there is room for Louppe to elaborate on site-specific works and the tyranny of the proscenium architecture on "our own mental and imaginative spaces."[91]

Notions of space and time in dance are expansive and I cannot do justice to them here. What I aim to show in the eleven case studies in this book is how the body, space, and time—supporting the other key aspects of dance outlined here—have become a set of meeting points for dance and the visual arts in the recent dance avant-garde, picking up on precedents in mid-century North America and underscored in pared back approaches such as Hassabi's. In that earlier period, an emerging interest in art as an encounter between artists and audiences saw the visual artists turn to dance and choreography as a discipline that was staging such events explicitly, confronting questions of subjectivity, presence, duration, process, and spectatorship. The space-time of the art event, as it was developed in the work of artists such as Forti and Rauschenberg, reached beyond the painting, flat-bed, object, or action to become dimensionally complex choreographic events showcased in lofts, church halls, gymnasi-

ums, and roller-rinks. The field of choreography enabled visual artists to make moves in an expanded contemporary situation, and the conceptual work of the experimental art scene in New York fed back into dance in a unique dialogue with choreographic innovation that set the scene for current experiments.

7.9 Conclusion

In the case studies within *The Persistence of Dance* we see how the body, space, and time are the ground upon which a new mode of choreographic work has been built. Dance, as a contemporary art medium, deals directly with how these characteristics that are shared by all art forms set the terms for this particular intermedial encounter, and in Part IV I discuss how artists like Linder, Hassabi, and Lasica make these elements their core creative business. Questions of the corporeal, space, and time also framed the discussion of curatorial models in Part II that have provided contextual, conceptual, and physical conditions for the art-dance encounter. Understanding something of the disciplinary condition of dance, dancing, and choreography, it is possible to draw more from dance artists' specific encounters with visual arts contexts, practices, knowledges, and processes.

Case Study 8

Shelley Lasica—Context and Process

If the choreographic work under discussion in this book can be described as *dance as a contemporary art medium*, Shelley Lasica is an Australian artist who has straddled the visual arts and dance from the beginning of her career to the present.[1] The first Australian dance artist to be represented by a major gallery (Anna Schwartz Gallery, 1992-2012), Lasica has been occupying this creative territory for over thirty years, creating her first work for a gallery space in 1986, six years before Meg Stuart and Bart De Baere's pioneering collaboration discussed in Part II.[2] In 2022, Monash University Museum of Art presented her solo exhibition, *WHEN I AM NOT THERE*, a ground-breaking first for an Australian choreographer and an important example internationally alongside other surveys and retrospectives such as *"Retrospective" by Xavier Le Roy*, Boris Charmatz's, *If Tate Modern was Musée de la danse?*, and *Michael Clark: Cosmic Dancer* at the Barbican in London.[3] Her work is another instance of *dancing in the gallery*, but it is also an example of a practice that has rarely been anything else, coming close to Simone Forti's shifts across the border between dance and visual art during her long career.[4] Lasica has presented shows in theaters a handful of times in comparison to innumerable works in various types of spaces, including galleries; however, she has never abandoned her home discipline. In relation to the expanded use of the term *choreography* within contemporary art, Lasica states, "let's reverse this and get very specific about what we mean by choreography, both in terms of movement analysis and philosophy . . . It always comes out of a physical practice."[5] Lasica purposefully re-contextualizes choreography to draw the discipline into high relief with everything that it is not, for example, playing with the shift from everyday movement toward virtuosity, using all the tools of the discipline such as tone, energy, and weight described in Chapter 7, riding the moment between walking and dancing that has a particular impact in the relatively proximate performance spaces of gallery situations.

Lasica notes that "what you bring to [the performance]—the range of physical thought and expertise and training—it's not nothing, [but] it might not be recognizable."[6] The moment of recognition that someone is dancing is a place of acute attention for Lasica, and her choreography often smudges the distinction between what the dancers are doing and audience behavior in the shared space. In this self-reflexive approach to dancing as performance—as she "throw[s] into question the artwork as such," critiquing the central standards of dance as an art form—and in many other ways, Lasica embodies the conceptual legacy of dance that links the two avant-garde periods.[7] According to Peter Osborne, the standards for visual art that were the subject of conceptualism's critique were "*material objectivity, medium specificity, visuality and autonomy*," and these too can be mapped against Lasica's aesthetics.[8] Beyond her approach to the whole question of what and when dancing occurs ("medium specificity"), Lasica also confronts the singularity of the dancer ("material objectivity"), occularcentricity ("visuality"), and the context/situation/process of the emergence of the work of art that underscores the lack of "autonomy" and resulting contingency of her choreographies. All of these aspects of Lasica's work will be discussed in what follows, alongside the dance elements that persist and sustain this conceptual work.

How How Choreography Works for 2016 (2016) by Lasica and Deanne Butterworth and Jo Lloyd who performed in Lasica's work for many years, was performed in the large atrium space in the Art Gallery of New South Wales (AGNSW) in Sydney during the *Choreography and the Gallery One-Day Salon* in April 2016, recalling the use of the Donald B. and Catherine C. Marron Atrium space at MoMA in New York mentioned in Chapter 3.[9] This was a one-off performance that continued work began in *How Choreography Works*, which premiered at Melbourne's West Space in 2015 (9th October - 7th November) and exemplified the collegiality and community that Lasica engenders around her as discussed in Case Study 5.[10] The West Space exhibition was a collaboration that began with some archival videos of Lasica's work that Butterworth and Lloyd felt needed to be seen. The trio describe it as part of "an ongoing conversation" that encompasses the entirety of their professional exchanges over the years, for many of which Butterworth and Lloyd danced in Lasica's work.[11] There was a development period of 6 weeks, an exhibition of 4 weeks consisting of a permanent installation of video, costumes and a sculptural structure in the space, as well as occasional, scheduled performances by Lasica who was sometimes joined by Butterworth and Lloyd in an evolving choreographic

Shelley Lasica, Deanne Butterworth and Jo Lloyd, *How How Choreography Works* (2016), Art Gallery of New South Wales, Sydney, 27 April 2016. Choreography and the Gallery salon, curated by Erin Brannigan in association with the 20th Biennale of Sydney. Videographer: Samuel James (stills) *museum angle barriers from Helen Grogan (assisted by Geoff Robinson), *OBSTRUCTION DRIFT (AGNSW)* 2016.

exploration. They had both offered prompts to Lasica, choreographing her moves through suggestions.

In 2016 at AGNSW, when the three artists moved into the AGNSW atrium space at the conclusion of another work, the aim to "change the conditions of the space" had a palpable force.[12] As fellow artist Agatha Gothe-Snape has said, "just walking into a gallery is already a huge performance," and when dancers do this with all of their embodied knowledge in play, the tone of the space can shift as it did on this occasion.[13] The dancers cut through, herded, stopped near, created a tableau afar, stared people down, ran to the far end. This was not a performance to watch from a distance and remember to compare at a subsequent exact iteration. This was dancing in the here and now of a large white cube, surrounded by local and international art and layered with all the mashed-up contexts, audiences, and expectations of the situation. From the artists controlling the situation and the entire gallery at West Space, where, as Lloyd states, "we steered what it was . . . without certain things encroaching on how it functioned," six months later the dancers were bringing all of the work

from those weeks of development, daily performances, and conversations (which, in turn, was fed by the history of their professional relationships) into a new and very different context where "the space was asking different things of us."[14] Their presence appeared to me as both a good match for the general Biennale programming with an overt dance focus, and an "accidental protest."[15]

Lasica began typically: unannounced, just a slight shift in her attention, a movement beyond the pedestrian, something playful. She was running on the spot, little flicky runs that pitter-pattered. The audience dropped from a babble to silence as the exhibition space also became a performance space. Lasica's energy rippled across the onlookers who froze or moved out of the way, negotiating the transformed conditions. Butterworth and Lloyd emerge from the crowd, at first moving in a way that subtly distinguishes their actions from the pedestrian. They danced close to the audience but their gaze was soft as they attended to the situation with their other senses, unlike Lasica who made direct eye contact with the onlookers. The difference between the audience and the dancers remained slight—their dancing was not spectacular, but casual, relaxed, matter-of-fact. The tone was easy; they didn't seem to care whether we watched, giggled, chatted, or walked away. They were assured, but unassertive.

Another theme in *How How Choreography Works for 2016*, and evident across Lasica's body of work, is a critique of the dancing subject as singular, authentic, or unique through the circulation, re-use, and self-reflexive performance of material from across Lasica's work and, in this case, between the three dancers. In this sense, the dance unfolded like a serious game. The three artists moved in and out of contact, their hands gently resting on each other, taking off quickly down the room with twisting running steps, sitting with legs apart and thrusting their pelvises, frozen in standing shape-clusters. Sometimes Butterworth and Lloyd appeared like a chorus with Lasica, rocking in rhythm together away from her before the power dynamic shifted and she joined them regally on the floor at their feet. Mumbled comments passed between all three and they listened for more than words.[16] They were tuning their attention to other things: unseen forces, an expressive charge, potential pathways, familiar gestures, repeated phrases. We complete the work with our presence and attention to which the dancers are also attuned; as Lloyd says, "they are the choreography too."[17]

Butterworth, Lasica, and Lloyd were also engaging deeply and persistently with a context thick with all the resonances brought to their

work by four frameworks: the day-long Salon, the gallery's public program *Art After Hours*, a performance program of three works, and the gallery context—Sydney's major museum of art covering the entire gamut of Australian art, from its extensive Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander art collection to colonial and contemporary art.[18] Those resonances covered the political (dancing as public programming, not part of an exhibition), historical (one iteration in an ongoing project and "conversation," one dance in a history of dances in this gallery), economic (who is being paid? What is there to buy?), material (dancing on marble), social (what is between the dancers, and between them and us?), and aesthetic (what media? What kind of dancing?). Lasica thus describes the performance as "a lot of situations jammed together and so, extremely challenging."[19] *How How Choreography Works for 2016* thus dealt directly with context, and this is one of the most pronounced themes in Lasica's work. The dance was "in situ"; it was not transposable from site to site and became affected by the space-time in which it appeared.

In the gallery context, and among other works of art, dance and performance have the unique capacity to adapt to their environment. In the work of some artists such as Lasica who recognize and attend to this capacity, an evolving dialogue with context is part of the work's processual development and entwines the situation and the choreography. This was apparent in the works described in Part II; Philipp Gehmacher's approach to the same venue (AGNSW) in the same Biennale as *How How Choreography Works for 2016*; and Meg Stuart's response to Bart De Baere's commission for *This Is the Show and the Show Is Many Things / Extra Muros* at S.M.A.K., Brussels, in 1994. This interest of Lasica's is apparent in the names of her works, for example, *Behaviour* (1994-1995), *Situation* (1996), *As We Make It* (2016), and *Happening Simultaneously* (1991). This dialogic, adaptive, processual, and embedded quality of the art form is often the pressure point where institutional critique emerges, and Lasica's own critical reading of the AGNSW context guides my analysis here. Lasica supported my journey as a facilitator/curator by asking questions that uncovered the situation as it was for herself, Butterworth, and Lloyd as artists; the overlapping contexts, the politics of public programming/exhibitions categories in large institutions, health and safety issues, wages and terms of engagement. In having to scope a performance venue and its context, dance artists are learning to take nothing for granted. Moving forward, Lasica's involvement in the *Precarious Movements: Choreography and the Museum* research project is helping industry understand precarity as it is

experienced by artists when they interface with the museum and commence modifying their practices accordingly.[20]

In *The Shape of Things to Come* at Artspace 2017 as part of *Superposition of Three Types*, Lasica was committed to experiments with spectatorial perception, which included an invisibilizing process ironically approached through an expansive costume that made her at once visually compelling and object-like.[21] The exhibition's theme was color and the other works were primarily flat, abstract paintings, soft sculptures, and sculptures in other media, including light and plastic strips. Lasica had not performed in a context where visitors were so preoccupied with other attractions for some time; particularly in her early solo work, the audience behaved much like a theater audience, strictly attending to a performance of a certain duration in silence. At Artspace, the lack of attention opened up a new interest in how much she could withdraw her presence *while in plain sight*.[22] This was connected to some of her broader thinking around the real nature of the work of the work and perceptions of the dance artist's labor.

Doing dancing as and in performance is only one part of an ongoing process for Lasica that could be described as *doing dancing beyond the moment of spectatorial access*. As Lasica writes,

> What is the practice of the artist in this situation, or indeed the work of the artist as an ongoing practice. [sic] Is the doing, the performing—is that the only aspect that is identified with work? . . . Because although the doing is not always witnessed, it is always happening.[23]

Here, Lasica describes the way in which performance operates as one element in the ongoing process of her work. In tune with a poetic emphasis on process and continuity of practice, Lasica sees her performances as windows onto an expanded situation that encompasses past, present, and future, and a gamut of activities and degrees of visibility. Such telescoping out is associated with post-conceptual work—a kind of meta-critical position that is both immersed in, and looking in on, the contemporaneity of the performance iteration—and places the singular dance in relation to an ongoing practice, an institution, a discourse, a discipline, and a career. *How Choreography Works* (2015) is part of a series about Lasica's body of work created with Butterworth and Lloyd who are regular dancers with Lasica. In the original manifestation, the West Space gallery setup included live performances and "an existing installation of works—objects and screens showing my works from my archive."[24] In the catalogue for *How Choreogra-*

Shelley Lasica, *The Shape of Things to Come* (2016-17), Artspace, Sydney, 9 February—17 April 2017. Photos: Jessica Maurer

phy Works (2015), Butterworth, Lasica, and Lloyd write that the scheduled events in the gallery space were not so much performances as a "solution," "contract" or "proposition," "findings," "scenarios," "session," "a space of time," "it's like the other side of performing or the whole performing," a "situation," "there is no definitive and it's not that it's not finished."[25] The overarching notion is that choreography is not reducible to performance, and this underlines the material conditions of dance in comparison with, say, painting, which can be reduced to a commodified, singular object.

The processual nature of the work is in the language of the catalogue text that holds a sense of improvisation, interruption, and open-endedness in its form. The co-authored text that accompanied *How Choreography Works* (2015) is written in a challenging style full of circularities, ellipses, and ungrammatical writing. Lasica states:

> There's something about the method of knowing or the medium of knowing and its relationship to the actual, what it is that you need to know or find out. I guess in a way because I don't, I don't know. It's not about indecision. It's just about well, a lot of it's got to do . . . about language [sic]. If I can tell you the thing that I want you to know I'll just tell you.[26]

The *concepts* of Lasica's works—situation, work, choreography, behavior—register in and through the performance of dancing bodies but are also unanchored and unstable enough to gesture toward much that is not in the specific iteration at hand. The assertion of dance in the gallery context will always also point to the contingent nature of this art which can never be comprehended in its totality, even if one stays in the gallery for the duration. Osborne would describe this as "the ontological insufficiency of 'dance' to 'art' within the work."[27] Dance in the gallery thus emphasizes a condition of all art that is suppressed in other media—its place within a larger project involving the studio, other iterations, failures, repetitions, multiplicities—that will always escape the institution. In the work of Lasica's peer, Maria Hassabi, this provisional condition of choreography is expressed in a very different way: through reduction and a consistency across iterations that connects each dancer dancing in her work to a relatively stable, ongoing concept and vision.

Case Study 9

Maria Hassabi—Between Sensation and Its Display

Since the early 2000s, artist and choreographer Maria Hassabi has been working in a medium she refers to as "live installations," which appear in museum and exhibition contexts and adapt their duration to the opening hours of the hosting institution. (Hassabi also makes work for theatrical contexts which have a set duration.) The choice of this descriptor sits alongside various others employed in the field such as "living sculpture"; yet her term, like Shelley Lasica's "performance-exhibition," makes a clear statement about the intermedial position she takes through adopting visual art language that stresses the situated, durational aspect of her works.[1] In galleries and museums, Hassabi engages contemporary dance strategies to treat both the body and choreography as elements to be presented alongside, and in dialogue with, visual artworks. In this sense, she (like Lasica) mobilizes the processual and contextual capacities of choreographed works, adapting each iteration to a given venue's features. However, Hassabi's work sustains cues to a relationship with theater more explicitly than Lasica's and puts this into dialogue with a debt to the sculptural Minimalism of the mid-century, North American neo-avant-garde. In doing so, she proffers a unique example of "conceptual dance" that challenges some of its key tenets and can, rather, be aligned more closely with the concerns of historical conceptual artists such as Sol LeWitt. The conceptual-material configuration manifests in her choreographies as a performance of *being present*, one of the foundations of the art form in Chapter 2, which is realized through corporeal means and is part of her deep commitment to the discipline of dance. She describes the discipline of an embodied practice of engaging with or "catching" the present, noticing how the present always gets away from you as your attention is always already drawing you into the next second.[2]

Her live installation works *HERE* (2021), *STAGING: Solo #2* (2017), *STAGING: solo* (2017), *STAGING* (2017), *PLASTIC* (2016-15), and *INTER-MISSION* (2013) refer directly and reflexively to the exhibition context. Her theater-based works include *TOGETHER* (2019), *STAGED?* (2016), *PREMIERE* (2013), *SHOW* (2011), *Robert and Maria* (2010), *SoloShow* (2009), and *SOLO* (2009), the latter of which premiered at The Kitchen in New York before being programmed in visual arts contexts. The earlier *LIGHTS* (2001) was also theater-based and played self-reflexively with "the idea that what happens in the shadows of a performance space is as captivating and seductive as what happens in the spotlight."[3] Through such titles, she encourages an understanding of her signature reduced yet intense gallery-based choreographic work through its relationship with theatrical dance traditions. Hassabi differentiates how the theatrical elements—"the accumulation of bodies, colours, sound, light and architecture"—appear as processual in the gallery with no determined beginning, middle, or end, yet in contrast, find "completion" in theater-based versions such as *STAGED?* where there is a demand for a dramatic arc.[4] The economies of the theater inform Hassabi's choices for the gallery as she orients herself to "find a way towards an anti-spectacular, intimate exchange between the visitors and the work."[5] Her gallery-based work is, in this way, a response to contemporary theater-dance, which places her within the specific avant-garde lineage originating with Anna Halprin et al. and referred to throughout this book.[6]

Hassabi trained in dance at California Institute of the Arts (CalArts) with special studies in Cunningham and Alexander techniques, but describes an intermedial milieu in her formative years in New York when she established her career, with friends and colleagues in fashion and visual art.[7] Like Robert Rauschenberg's and Simone Forti's community in downtown Manhattan in the 1950s and 1960s, Hassabi and Lasica (and Agatha Gothe-Snape as we will see in the following Case Study 10) developed creative practices emerging from genuine sociality and exchange. In the case of Hassabi, this has produced a truly intermedial artist who stays with her disciplinary concerns while working at the limits of the art form in its social formation. Across her oeuvre, the various media in the work (set, score, and costume) are focused on the performing bodies, minimal yet striking enough to mark the difference between the work and everything else. Her sets and installations consist of subtle scores by Hassabi and composers such as Marina Rosenfeld and Stavros Gasparatos, lighting states by Hassabi and designers such as Zack Tin-

kelman that often are used as sculptural entities for exhibitions on their own, and installations such as the hot pink carpet of *STAGING* (2017). The artist collaborates with fashion designers such as New York-based threeASFOUR and Victoria Bartlett; subtly glitzy yet casual outfits are a constant across her works.

However, little gets in the way of a strong focus on the performance of herself and/or her dancers. Hassabi is clear about the dance-based methods and skills involved in her work:

> There are distinct choreographic differences between the works, which require efficient rehearsals and a considerable amount of labour from the dancers . . . A common thread in these two works [*STAGED?* and *STAGING*] and my previous live installations is the very strict script that the dancers follow, which is transcribed on paper, describing each movement and their counts—we call it the Bible.[8]

Hassabi goes on to describe how, with the *STAGING* series, she worked from her own body first to produce a two-hour solo version which was then transferred to the dancers, "finalizing with their bodies the counts, precise spacing and the gaze," and adapted for the various versions of the work.[9] This traditional relationship between choreographer and dancer means that a consistency in the movement material (which she says approaches a "technique") can be retained across the performing bodies through various iterations, and the performers can concentrate on the central premise of the work: *to be present in the moment through the movement*.[10]

INTERMISSION (2013) was a work for three dancers set on risers, and was premiered in a former gymnasium in Venice that housed the Cypriot and Lithuanian Pavilion of the 55th Venice Biennale. The dancers were mostly prostrate and moved from the top of the stairs to the bottom very slowly, so slowly that visitors passing through quickly may have only seen the figures as still.[11] Their poses were relaxed: propped up on an elbow or melting into the angle of the step. When I viewed this work at the Australian Centre for Contemporary Art in Melbourne in 2014, Hassabi's intentions to create art "supported solely by physicality while avoiding the use of theatrical tricks . . . to see whether physicality, in time and space, could, by itself, create images," was clear.[12] Unlike the version in Venice which shared the space with other artists so that many objects were scattered about the seating (chairs, brooms, stands of various types) and gymnastic mats, equipment and freestanding walls filled the playing

Maria Hassabi, *INTERMISSION* 2013, installation view, Framed Movements, Australian Centre for Contemporary Art, Melbourne, 2014. Courtesy the artist. Photograph: Emma Sullivan.

field, in Melbourne there were only bodies. Hassabi refers to the basics of choreography—"body, space, time, movement"—and notes "how much there is there to explore."[13] She describes choreographers' pursuit of audience "attention" in some contemporary dance by adding, say, a popular song and how adding such elements refers us beyond the work to the compositional concerns of another.[14] It can also distract the dancer: "choreographic steps can make me dance yesterday, and not stay in the moment."[15] The extreme vacating of external references in her work, and her quiet crafting of the very basics of the art form, is political in its assertion of the most profound point of differentiation between dance and other media in the gallery context—the present dancer.

In this way, the legacy of the minimalist or reductive strategies in the mid-century examples of dance as contemporary art (e.g., Forti's *Dance Constructions* or Trisha Brown's *Equipment Pieces*) is pronounced in Hassabi's work and raises all of the complexities associated with that turn.[16] The focus on the *materiality* of the artistic medium in Minimalism was connected to other characteristics: *egalitarianism* in the use of everyday

materials rather than those associated with "high" art; *suppression of authorship and meaning production* by showing materials as and of themselves with minimal authorial manipulation and/or external references; an emphasis on *physical presence* so that the material object in space-time is emphasized; and a *disciplinary* focus that distills the elements of an art form. It is clear how these things apply: Hassabi's use of everyday bodies; an occluding of authorship through the transferability of the technical instructions and Hassabi's role as an equal among many (although the choreographic "hand" is certainly present if somewhat invisiblized); and the emphasis on dance elements, especially physical presence. (I will return to the question of external references.)

Hassabi's work could also be read through some of the key characteristics of conceptual dance (according to André Lepecki) and conceptual art (according to Zöe Sutherland), although somewhat adapted in both cases. Regarding the former, there is a disavowal of busy, locomotive movement and a turn to anti-virtuosic content (or rather new virtuosities), anti-representational modes (perhaps despite references to fallen, broken or "lost" bodies), a model of choreography that is in opposition to its stage tradition (but rather here in deep critical dialogue with it), and a focus on presence (or "being present" as Hassabi prefers).[17] Regarding conceptual art in its historical formulation, Hassabi puts the status of art into question (is this dance? Sculpture? Installation? Art?); de-reifies the work of art (what skill? On-demand availability, looped material); employs anti-illusionism (pedestrian postures by casually dressed people); and promotes event over object (although Hassabi has some object-based remainders that can constitute versions of the work). But nowhere else do we see a clearer case of LeWitt's conceptual model of *material as idea* through the persistence of the human body in the person of a trained dancer in Hassabi's live installations.[18] The centrality of the dancing body, with its virtuosic performance of attention, being present in the moment, physical control, and command of audience engagement is an exemplar of the concept of the work—*to be present in the moment through the movement*—pressing through its material. Hassabi has quipped that some curators ask her what her concept is, but she only needs to know how much material (dancers) she can afford: "the materials don't change so the concept doesn't change."[19] This concept also extends to the dancer being able to adapt to the given conditions in the gallery or theater to keep the idea relevant:

> There's always a strict script, so we have to remain honest to the script. Because there are so many cues among the performers or among the sound or lights or whatever. But there are physical reactions that occur only when the works are performed with an audience and also reactions by the visitor of the museum that are beyond whatever we choreographed and scripted in advance. So we have to respond without letting go of the structure of the work.[20]

The tension between the dancers *being the material* that delivers the work/idea/concept and *being subjects* capable of/subject to the conditions of a given performance becomes an integral part of the work, and the audience enters into and shares this space of *happening*.

The mapping of Hassabi's work against paradigms within dance studies and visual arts theory might place the work within certain aesthetic, disciplinary, or critical genealogies as noted, but the specificities of the work bring us back to some choreographic elements. In Chapter 7, dance theorist Laurence Louppe quoted pioneer Rudolf von Laban on the foundational significance of weight in relation to dance: "All movement is defined by a transfer of *weight*."[21] When Hassabi reduces movement to its barest minimum, working with stillness, transitions, deceleration, and particularly the prostrate body that appears fallen or unconscious, she works the very specific effects of gravity on the weight of a body when it surrenders, effectively laying those effects bare through the subject's lack of resistance to its forces. In her various installations, her dancers melt over stairs, slide off gallery lounges, and sprawl across walkways, drawn to the surface of the earth and inching infinitesimally slowly across its surface, which receives its full and soft mass. The *transfer* of weight is made visible through the dancers' virtuosic reorienting of the body's center of gravity with every shift, balancing weight distribution to create corporeal forms that are maintained with ease and grace, but also often with visible effort. This mastery of the effects of gravity is what the dancer brings to the work, and Hassabi takes her place among the performers, modelling the highly choreographed demands of the work.

The transfer of weight at the heart of all movement is slowed down, refined, practiced, and displayed in her works. It is one of her central concepts derived from the discipline and colors the entire body of work, and she characterizes it in a way that catalyzes the political dimension of her art as it is embodied by her dancers: "this in-betweenness is what is at

stake."[22] Hassabi describes how she began with existing still images of the body in various visual media for a piece like *SoloShow* (2009), where she was working with "staging the movement between sensation and its display"; "the performer moves beyond rhythm, ideal postures, and coherence as hundreds of images are seamlessly, physically collaged."[23] However, she found that this limited her to a kind of mimicry that always referred to something else:

> So, I started paying attention to the transitions: to the ways in which the body transfers its weight from one pose to the next, from one image to the next, and what it requires to do so. I zoomed in on the details, choreographing even the smallest gestures—the breath and the slightest change of gaze became part of my material.[24]

Hassabi abandoned familiar postures and poses to make choreographies consisting entirely of transitions, filling the work with the minutiae of corporeal behavior set free from recognizable content (which began with "steps" as we have seen) and registrable forms, and focused on the utilitarian functions of how our body negotiates movement in time and space. The shift of focus from poses to transitions and their complex relationship with weight/gravity opened her work up to the special knowledges of contemporary dance with which she is so familiar, and she deploys the dance elements of breath, tone, weight, and gaze in delicately and specifically choreographed sequences that are freed from the restrictions of theater-time.

Some of Hassabi's descriptions of her work following *SoloShow* evoke some of the earliest experiments in non-classical (ballet) movement in the work of Genevieve Stebbins at the turn of the twentieth century:

> There was an attraction to image-based material in my work. And then I just went all the way there. And by *image*, I mean that it took me a while to understand how I was going to support image-based work that did not rely on easy theatrical tricks like change of light or change of costume. And that's when the stillness started coming more and more into my work—the effect of stillness and how you transfer from one pose of stillness to the next, without making it look like a tableau vivant but keeping it a consistent flow.[25]

Dance historian and theorist Nancy Chalfa Ruyter recounts how Stebbins stood at the cusp of modern dance at the end of the nineteenth century.

She joined the poses of the popular tableaux vivant activities explored in the loungerooms of middle-class American women with slow transitions, taking the practice to the public stage and beginning the shift to dance as a contemporary art form. A reviewer wrote of Stebbins at the time:

> [The poses] flow gracefully onwards from the simple to the complex. They are a natural evolution of beauty produced by the changing curve of the spiral line from head to toe, commencing with a simple attitude, and continuing with a slow, rhythmic motion of every portion of the body, until it stands before you as the perfect representation of art.[26]

As I've noted elsewhere, from the transition being of no interest in itself in classical ballet, Stebbins' Delsartism gave form to the "any-instant-whatever."[27] This had the radical effect in the late nineteenth century of resetting the very nature of what artistic dance could be, in much the same way that Hassabi has expanded our understanding of both choreography and art in the early twenty-first century.

Taking this attention to transitions down to the floor has multiple functions and affects: it reduces movement possibilities to increase attention toward where and how movement happens; it spreads the body and its relationship with the forces of gravity over a larger floor area offering variety of form; it better supports the dancer in slow and static work making it viable for the dancers to work for extended hours in relative comfort; and finally, it introduces concepts such as interruption, resistance, and the unorthodox into a gallery space dominated by a vertical orientation to art on walls or sculptures on plinths. The micro-portraits of the effects of gravity on bodily behaviors exemplified by Hassabi's dancers are thus juxtaposed, in situ, with the corporeal "obedience" and verticality of the gallery visitors who adhere to cultural protocols and move through the same space with heads stacked upon upright spines, legs, and feet. One impact of Hassabi's work is in this simple aberration of cultural behaviors that are highly contextual; dancers who take up too much floor space in places of transit with their sprawling limbs and seem to be resting and/or otherwise occupied in a place of focused leisure-labor. For Hassabi, the group nature of the works is essential to this affect: "the collective resistance is a collective commitment to the here and now."[28] While not out of place in the dance studio or on stage, in the museum or gallery such behaviors interrupt standard institutional experiences in ways that could be disturbing, exciting, inconvenient, or familiar depending upon individual orientations. One image in *Maria Hassabi (2015-2021)* shows a woman

in a wheelchair beside a dancer working on one of the gallery lounges in *PLASTIC*. She watches with interest, and the relationship between the alternative modes of moving through the space in the photo, which could be called locomotive-diverse, is compelling.

In many choreographic engagements in gallery and museum spaces, the floor becomes a place to contest the dominance of wall space, and by corollary, a surface upon which artists can reinvent and reclaim aesthetic possibilities through the medium of the dancing body. This was clear in Part I in the case of Sarah Michelson who used floor graphics to draw attention to its surface as the site of the dance. In Chapter 7, the shift from verticality to a multiplicity of orientations within space was described as one of the central occupations of contemporary dance throughout its emergence in the twentieth century. As Louppe notes, "all movement is a deferred fall, and it is from the manner in which this fall . . . is deferred that movement aesthetics are born."[29] Hassabi describes the way she works with this aspect of dance to create images that resonate in our particular contemporary situation:

> Some of the repeating images I use are of bodies falling apart—or what we call 'forgotten bodies'—such as those of homeless people, junkies, general outcasts: members of societies that seem to mean nothing as they don't produce capital, just take up space . . . I'm interested in what happens when viewers find themselves in a dialogue with this kind of material, which memories they stir up, even responsibilities.[30]

The subversive nature of the prostrate bodies in the gallery has extra-disciplinary links not only to the physically diverse but to the bodily behaviors of the socially dispossessed, destitute, and vilified: addicts, the homeless, the unwell. The sociocultural critique is implicit rather than explicit, and is evoked through the face-to-face encounter between bodies, another "between" that is allowed space for reflection and awareness through the performance and observation of physical "transition time."

Regarding spectatorial encounters with Hassabi's work, the pressure-point of the subject-object bind of the dancer/performer as medium (the dancer is both the subject making the work and the object of the work), an issue uncovered by Forti et al., is presented here like an exposed nerve that might irritate some gallery visitors due to the lack of distractions; these subject-objects are all there is to see. But Hassabi's mobilization of soft, publicly exposed, unassertive, or modest (Lizzie Thomson's term)

qualities in the bodies of her dancers makes the work non-threatening and open to the gaze of the spectator, inviting them to linger.[31] Hassabi has described elsewhere how she always wanted dance to slow down for her, so she has made her dances to fit her own spectatorial desires.[32] Yvonne Rainer has famously commented that "dance is hard to see," and critics have made similar comments about Hassabi's work:

> It's impossible to see everything; one way to grasp dance is not to grasp at it, to be willing to let it run its course. When dance is slowed down so that its forms and images linger, though, viewers can immerse themselves in the continuity of the movement; there is time to become part of the dance, to inhabit it.[33]

This is the in-between: inhabiting the dance between its postures and poses, between the bodies on display and the spectatorial body. But also between modes of viewing as body approaches object. Art critic and curator Harry Burke summarizes Hassabi's gentle critique of economies of visuality:

> Shepherding the languages and strategies of dance into the spaces of contemporary art, Hassabi decelerates movement until it folds upon definitions of sculpture and image, testing conventional rhythms of viewership in the process.[34]

The body as object meets the body as subject, and the objective distance we bring to viewing paintings and other art objects is compromised, not only by the mere presence of the dancer before us, but by the mode, quality, and intention of the work to evoke the powerless, disenfranchised, disregarded. Empathy is choreographed into the work.

However, Hassabi also acknowledges that, despite the "dictatorial" nature of her work, which creates a very controlled situation that runs machine-like, there is no possible control of the viewer's experience.[35] So Hassabi, like Lasica, builds into her work the many possible audience responses to the work as noted. Committed attention, vague curiosity, peripheral gazes, complete indifference, and even aggression (as was the case with *PLASTIC* [2016] at MoMA in New York where dancers blocked passageways) are all expected and accounted for in performance. Hassabi notes, "the biggest difference is that we don't ask for your attention in order to exist within our score. We will continue our task whether you are

present or absent, whether you love us or ignore us . . . Testing modes of viewership and behaviour."[36] Hassabi thus accepts the right of the spectator to attend or not to attend to the work in the way they desire, and this spectatorial freedom was in fact one impetus for her shift to the gallery. Hassabi's personal experience of what has been theorized as the liberation and democratization of the art experience with the institution of public galleries (in opposition to the private gallery), compelled her to choose this as her performance site.[37] Rather than seek attention as a busy spectacle, employing compositional means that she found "did not work" during her development as a choreographer at CalArts, her quiet mode engages audiences (or not) on other terms that align with her intention to perform "being present."[38]

Like Michelson, the demands Hassabi places on the spectator recall a mode of attention that is well-honed in seasoned dance audiences; as Michelson says, her own work is "really directed toward a certain kind of dance lover, someone who's watching—really watching, and watching in context, and watching completely."[39] In a work like *INTERMISSION*, viewers are confronted with highly crafted physical behaviors, carefully framed in the durational time, and minimally framed space, of the gallery. On the one hand, these behaviors, movements, postures, and techniques insist on the capacity of the dancing body to produce "images," and on the other hand, draw in witnesses to the effects of sensation. Hassabi notes how the performers' bodies resonate with the effects of adrenaline in the performance context, describing how a body that is slowed down in such a moment might quiver or shake uncontrollably.[40] Victoria Gray describes the "innervated processual states" of the dancers as she witnessed them in *PREMIERE* (2013) at Lakeside Arts, Nottingham, UK: the "'trembles' and 'micromovements'" of "largely invisible physiological territories."[41] The discursive potential of the dancing body identified by Jeroen Peeters—its capacity to address the tension between making images and being in sensation—is one of the primary things on offer here.[42] Hassabi states,

> The other thing that's interesting is what it is we're portraying. So there's an inner dialogue you have with yourself. You're not just holding a position and feeling it internally—you're also concerned with what you're projecting outside as a shape, a mold. So, as a performer, it's not only about how you're feeling inside.[43]

Hassabi's dancers, exuding a coolness associated with street fashion, disinterestedness, neutrality, and physical beauty, are in odd tension with

a virtuosity of care, attention, and effort that only emerges if you stay with the work over time, overcoming the much cited "photogenic" quality of the work. The work thus self-consciously maps the moving art of dance to the occularcentric economies of the gallery in a way that emphasizes how it exceeds traditional modes of gallery spectatorship; this work requires us to "stay with" to uncover its truth.

Hassabi's and Lasica's work reveals how the legacies of LeWitt and the conceptual artists of the twentieth century are woven into the story of this recent choreographic work for the gallery. Weaving this, in the case of Hassabi, with the early emergence of a movement-based art form that departed from classical ballet in the work of Stebbins, throws light on the complex linearities, knowledges, and practices that the new intermedial artists owe much to. The final section of the book, Part V, continues along the interwoven paths of dance and visual art forms, following the artists from the conceptual to post-conceptual, non-dance to post-dance, and from disciplinary to a-disciplinary, arriving at the work of Agatha Gothe-Snape and Latai Taumoepeau in the expanded field of contemporary art.

PART V

Beyond Dancing in the Gallery

The final case studies of the book continue along the interwoven paths of dance and visual art forms, following artists from non-dance to post-dance, and from disciplinarity to a-disciplinarity. Part V opens with Agatha Gothe-Snape, an artist committed to working with choreography in the expanded field of contemporary art, and closes with Latai Taumoepeau, whose expanded field reaches paradigms beyond the horizons of this project through its incorporation of First Nations knowledges and practices. These case studies frame Chapter 8 which addresses a reactionary turn back to the dancing body by some of the central protagonists in the Western theater dance debates surrounding non-dance. The work of Gothe-Snape emerges from a community of practice with dancer-peers, echoing the innovations of second-wave artists such as Robert Rauschenberg. Improvisation, collectivity, care, and mediality are combined with a post-conceptual position that is in critical dialogue with the male-dominated narratives of the twentieth century. In Chapter 8, the persistence of dance is argued for within the context of a *post-* model of contemporary art. Following a meeting ground for dance and visual art in (variations on) the conceptual (1960s and later in the 1990s), a very recent and widespread return to the materiality of art has turned the focus within contemporary dance toward the activity of dancing, which has involved honoring the work of the dancer through a greater understanding of their labor. This is shown to be at the heart of the visual arts' renewed interest in dance, alongside and in dialogue with the notion of choreographic objects. The emergent activity of dance as a contemporary art medium shares some characteristics with the post-conceptual (via Peter Osborne)—art which is transdisciplinary and telescopic, temporally expansive and unhinged from specific iterations, yet deeply self-aware of the contemporaneous

context, institutional frames, and its debts to the past. Taumoepeau, Case Study 11, closes the book with an art practice that exceeds the limitations of the methodology chosen for this book which rests on paradigms of contemporary art and contemporary dance as they have been theorized by mostly Australian, American, and European artists, curators, and theorists. This reveals layers of inclusion and exclusion that complicate the advocacy-driven thrust of this project and opens onto a future for dance as a contemporary art practice that is as intersectional as it is intermedial.

Case Study 10

Agatha Gothe-Snape—Art as Gesture

Agatha Gothe-Snape is a Sydney-based artist who has worked consistently with dance artists as collaborators, engaged with choreographic and performance strategies and practices, and included dancing in some of her works as one component among many (including light, vocalization, sound, PowerPoint, text, lectures, workshops, color, projection, found video . . .). She describes this as "dancing around the territory of choreography," and artworks such as those discussed here, *Rhetorical Chorus* (2017) and *Three Ways to Enter and Exit* (2011), demonstrate how dance can be a powerful medium for materialization within the post-conceptual, a condition that might frame Gothe-Snape's larger body of work.[1] Such works also model an alternative to dancing in the gallery as it has been discussed in the work of Sarah Michelson, Meg Stuart, Adam Linder, Maria Hassabi, Shelley Lasica, and others through their acute interdisciplinarity. They are also an exception among other Australian artists such as Justene Williams, Sally Smart, and David Rosetzky who also work with dancers in a mix of media. Like Robert Rauschenberg, Gothe-Snape is embedded in social and professional contexts with dance artists, and she also trained in performance early in her professional development.[2] She engages with improvisation in her method, describing how she makes "new discoveries in the act of doing" and, like Lasica, "the context and viewer experience is the generative principle."[3]

Dance as an art form offers Gothe-Snape a template for collaboration as it did for Rauschenberg; both artists seem to draw inspiration from its collective nature discussed in Chapter 2 where I quoted Jennifer Lacey: "dance is about people spending time together, thinking by behaving, and modify [sic] their thoughts by modifying their behavior."[4] In that chapter I also made the distinction made by Jérôme Bel and Xavier Le Roy between dance as involving a "communion" of some sort, while visual artists often

work alone.[5] The artist-collaborator is something that models of conceptual and post-conceptual art generally do not include, possibly assuming the traditional model of sole authorship. However, Australian art theorist Susan Best describes a tradition of critical approaches to authorship within highly conceptual work post 1960s through its depersonalization, not so much through the treatment of a given material, but through a practice of art-making that is socialized and collective.[6] Closer to Lasica's creative community and quite different to Hassabi's sole authorial hand, Gothe-Snape's process in these explicitly choreographic case studies allows her to work both conceptually and technically, taking risks within the safety of an extended artist community which includes her long-term collaborator, Brian Fuata. Where issues of visibility, scales of economy, and remuneration finally tore through the Rauschenberg-Cage-Cunningham community, Gothe-Snape invests in balancing issues of agency and ownership through an attention to the conditions for her collaborators and the ways in which they are acknowledged. She notes that in her process, collaboration is "interpersonal and emotional"; she is "not just giving the dancer the task"—there are "social, emotional, and then workplace relations."[7] Gothe-Snape is acutely aware of the complexities of the dancer's position in this field of work and pursues an ethical approach with her dancer peers, speaking candidly about the working conditions and challenges around "authorship, power, intention, and care."[8]

In Gothe-Snape's work we see a direct engagement with—even direct address to—the legacy of conceptual art, suggesting a "post"-conceptual condition for her work. Erik Jensen cites some very early works that sharply declare Gothe-Snape's debt to conceptual art:

> At art school, in third year, Agatha wrote 'For lease' in huge letters on the wall of the student gallery. It was the last show there. Later she paid an air freight service to deliver eleven plywood letters to an opening, to spell out the words 'Time poor art.' She gave the man his fee in front of everyone, after the speeches. 'I love that work. Still.'[9]

Scaffolding her approach appears to be an extended study or meditation on the concept-material bind that is the legacy of conceptual art. Sol LeWitt's words echo through her work: as noted in Chapter 6, LeWitt describes how "the idea becomes a machine that makes the art," drawing the materials toward its purpose which it manifests; "the artist cannot imagine his art, and cannot perceive it until it is complete."[10] She describes

her dual focus as, on the one hand, "truth to materials," and on the other, to "plan a parameter" which leads to the "playing out of a proposition and what happens in that act."[11] Her collectivized strategies decentralize the work's *means*, which ranges over bodies, texts, materials, histories, while asserting an authorial vision/proposition that holds the many moving parts to account. The *concepts* traverse discursive fields on micro and macro scales; the artist drills down into the details of the specific context and iteration of each work, but also telescopes out to nation, art history, gender politics, authorship, and sociality. Gothe-Snape mobilizes her telescopic vision to attend to the flow and transmission of forces, concepts, movements, and materials as they range across galleries, studios, public spaces, domestic spaces, and political discourse; "not art as an object, but as a series of activities, events, sounds, smells, emotions . . .".[12] She describes the "ephemeral nature" of much of her work and is vigilant in how it is transposed into the gallery context; she asks, "how does something relational, non-material, emotional, or even energetic manifest within the conditions of the gallery?"[13] In a panel discussion she described how she approached "the temporal duration" of her survey exhibition, *The Outcome is Certain* (2020) at MUMA: "all the elements of choreography are central to what I am doing; entrances, exits, sequencing, staging, energy transfer, syncopation, repetition and difference, delegation, collaboration, instruction, trust, love, tempo, shape, form."[14] LeWitt's formulation of *material as idea* is here, but across her practice dancers, dancing, and choreography introduce the corporeal, interpersonal, and emotional via a medium that cannot be easily contained.

Her critical approach to media forms and their materiality is determined by thick research tasks that may lead to the transposition of gesture to vocal score (*Rhetorical Chorus* [2017]), psychology text to verbs transcribed onto a basketball court (*The Scheme Was a Blueprint for Future Development Programs* [2015]), or Robert Hughes's art theory to an emotional directive (*The Fatal Sure/The National Doubt* [2017]). Here is freedom of materials combined with a process marked by a "trans" method that emphasizes the journey over the product. Gothe-Snape has been emphatic on this point and in line with LeWitt: "this technology or machine that I'm trying to work through . . . I'm more interested in those processes being put into play and . . . something tonal and acute emerging that is unpredictable."[15] Critic Julie Ewington refers to the artist's use of transposition as "displacement," but it seems more like accumulation despite a certain minimalism in her works as they are presented.[16] Hannah

Mathews, co-curator of her 2020 survey, *The Outcome is Certain*, describes Gothe-Snape's work as "conceptually rigorous and materially ambitious," and this neatly summarizes the tenor of her verbal cues/notations for works like *Here, an Echo* (2015-2017), which work through materials toward speculations: "verbal sorcery," "ambience takes on the order of the medium," "a word is a score for acting."[17]

Her post-conceptuality involves a virtuosic transdisciplinarity (or "a-disciplinarity" to use a term coined by Gothe-Snape and Fuata), which presents multiple media in complex relations.[18] The artist describes her work as "scrambled eggs," but it actually poses a serious challenge to the whole notion of discipline as it relates to art: "I can't decide to be more disciplined . . . I think that's the thing, it's so much about discipline and I just don't see any disciplines. I see a field of action and I just want to move in it."[19] This recalls Robert Morris's statement in 1971 that emphasizes the artist's liberty to explore all of their capacities for production in a post-medium mode, and connects Gothe-Snape to the Neo-Dada lineage running this project:

> What the hand and arm motion can do in relation to flat surfaces is different from what hand, arm and body can do in relation to objects in three dimensions. Such differences of engagement (and their extensions beyond technological means) amount to different forms of behaviour. In this light the artificiality of media-based distinctions falls away (painting, sculpture, dance, etc.). There are instead some activities that interact with surfaces, some with objects, some with objects and a temporal dimension, etc. To focus on the production end of art and to lift up the entire continuum of the process of making.[20]

Gothe-Snape's work can appear as site-based installations (*Three Physical Doorways, One Conceptual Wedge and A Gentle Breeze* [2017], PowerPoint files (*POWERPOINT CATALOGUE* [2008-], walking tours (*Here, an Echo* [2015-2017]), performances (*Cruising in the MCA* [2010]), multiscreen works (*Five Columns* [2019]), live inscriptions (*Every Artist Remembered* series [2009-2018]), or sculpture (*Living Sculpture [White]* [2013]). One example of this transdisciplinary approach is a Biennale of Sydney Legacy Artwork Project commission to develop a public work, *Here, an Echo*. This took the form of a *project* in the sense of a total work of art made up of multiple events and encounters, including walking the streets guided by her collaborator, choreographer Brooke Stamp, who modelled a

certain mode of attention and physical responses to the spaces, and a text-based installation in Wemyss Lane, Surry Hills using phrases discovered throughout the research and stencilled onto the side of buildings and the surface of the road. Her interest in public art, placing works incognito by mimicking the rhetorical devices that surround us (hard courts for sport, signage, bill posters, PowerPoint presentations), puts art into the flow of the everyday and blurs the line between art and life. Choreography is a central device in crafting the movement this requires, but I now turn to two more explicitly choreographic works: *Rhetorical Chorus* (2017) and the earlier *Three Ways to Enter and Exit* (2011).

Rhetorical Chorus (2017) is a work that includes spoken text performed by The Prologue (Brian Fuata) and The Transmitter (Joan La Barbara), a score sung by a chorus of six, gestural cues/conducting, two choreographer-dancers as The Right Hand and The Left Hand (Lizzie Thomson and Brooke Stamp), found footage, and light-color-text projection, all combined in a proscenium presentation.[21] The work involves transcribing the hand gestures accompanying conceptual artist Lawrence Weiner's speech in a video (which is projected during the work as a tight close-up on his hands) to choral vocalizations and choreographed movement. The result is a performance that approaches the condition of painting, or an opera that looks like a slideshow. Watching from halfway up the vast Bay 17 theater in Carriageworks in Sydney, the stage space, back projection, and performers are flattened by blocks of color, written text, and relatively static behaviors by the chorus (walking, crawling, making shapes, standing, crouching) forming compositions that the dancers occasionally cut through quite wildly with their scored improvisations. All of the various elements are following the score, derived from Weiner's hand gestures, which is pressed through the specific media: dance, song, spoken word, written text, color, and light.[22]

Gothe-Snape's projection of footage of Weiner's hand gestures, apparently accompanying his (inaudible) description of his art of "pure ideas" that appears elsewhere in the work in spoken and written form, mashes together the legacy of conceptual art with a choreographic attention to the movements of his hands. In Gothe-Snape's account, it is a visual commentary on Weiner's confident assertion of the conceptual over the material: "I wanted to take the words out of his practice and understand what was left."[23] In this sense, it presents a contradiction at the heart of conceptual art—the corporeal within the conceptual—through an extended portrait of the hands of a sculptor who ultimately chooses text as his medium.

Agatha Gothe-Snape, *Rhetorical Chorus*, 2017, performance, choral and choreographic performance score and PowerPoint projection; 70 minutes. Performed at Carriageworks, LIVEWORKS 2017, Sydney, 19–29 October 2017. Originally commissioned by Performa, Performance Space and the Keir Foundation for Performa 15, 1–22 November 2015. Co-presented by Performance Space, MAAS and Carriageworks, Sydney. Photo: Document Photography. Photo courtesy of the artist and The Commercial, Sydney. Performance documentation, dress rehearsal, 19 October 2017.

Gothe-Snape shows how Weiner inadvertently expresses himself corporeally, beyond his own language-based definitions of his language-based conceptual art. Gothe-Snape is also drawing our attention to the historical figure of an artist who is able to make such definitions and assertions:

> . . . trying to untangle the gravitas of the twentieth century and therefore the male icon of the twentieth century. I was so accustomed to listening to men talk . . . what are they saying and why do they have so much gravity and how they're using specific tools to quieten you and . . . unravel your own power . . . I took 'rhetorical' as how to lodge an argument that's believable and that is the argument of the twentieth century . . . we believed it with such hope . . . to undo this legacy for me it's important to drill into it . . . until it dissolves this rhetorical force of his argument into something else.[24]

Weiner's authoritative position and clear concepts are suspended, against his will. His voice is silenced and his gestures transform and pro-

liferate in multiple iterations across various media that have a life of their own, disassembling the notion of an originary and authoritative gesture. As Amelia Wallen notes, Gothe-Snape "collapsed the protagonist of conceptual art into the ensemble."[25] His background as a sculptor is clear to Gothe-Snape who describes how "his hands seemed to be sculpting the space itself—sheering an edge here, moulding a peak there."[26] The division between the disciplinary and transdisciplinary, and the material and conceptual in Weiner's approach to his art, is thus challenged by pinpointing the performative, corporeal dimension in the artist's discourse. The prologue text at the opening of the work, spoken by Fuata, is made up of "found fragments of Weiner's utterances ordered alphabetically." Weiner is thus "deviated, detoured and embodied" in the work as a whole, a work that has had various iterations (one of the dancers was severely injured on opening night and the performances went on without her, and there has been an earlier version at *Performa 15*) and multiple authors (Gothe-Snape describes giving some decisions and agency over to the composer, Megan Alice Clune, and the choreographer-dancers, and there was also a dramaturg on the project, Sarah Rodigari).[27]

Gesture and its links to rhetoric, which Gothe-Snape notes "must work in the silence between and around words," form a persistent theme and framing imperative in her work.[28] In *Rhetorical Chorus*, the physical gestures of Weiner open a space that his words—and his official artistic gestures that manifest primarily as written text—do not touch upon. The gestural as the medial or processual aspect of action, characterized by philosopher Giorgio Agamben as "a means without end," is a touchstone for Gothe-Snape who arrives at a diversity of materials through research and studio practice to then lift out tokens as the remainder and persisting work of art.[29] The work-as-process is never far from these tokens, or what Lasica et al. would call "solutions" or "findings" that remind us that dance as contemporary art is not reducible to performances but expands beyond such singular and contingent iterations.[30] Associations between gesture, mediality, and the "trans" of transmedial are connected to the artist's interest in flow as an ideal state; she describes watching the dancers she works with when they are "in flow" during improvisation as being "completely captivating."[31] Gothe-Snape tries to keep this sense of flow in her works as a whole by, as noted, emphasizing the procedural but also engaging with improvisational methods. In *Rhetorical Chorus*, where she brought so many media together, Gothe-Snape employed both improvisation and predetermined elements so we could describe an overall use of *gesture as a*

modality/mediality that cuts through the overall composition, infuses the whole, and informs each element.[32] Here is "means without end" produced through a combination of what LeWitt would call "a machine that makes the art"; as she states, "I don't really care what it looks like or what it was because I was more interested in the process that had led to it."[33]

In an even more explicitly choreographic work, *Three Ways to Enter and Exit* (2011), three solo dances (by Brooke Stamp, Lizzie Thomson, and Tim Darbyshire) are improvised from three personalized scores by Gothe-Snape in gouache and pencil. These are offered "as totems" and "acts of love" to the three artists with whom she has personal relationships.[34] A response to "generations of conceptual art and instructional dance" (the scores are a cross between 1980s Brophy-style graphics and ballroom dance-style footwork guides), the work asks the dancers to become "complicit with the construction of events and images that make up my work" by translating the scores into movement, dispersing authorship to the point where they "made uncanny or strange my score."[35] In this way, the self-contained action scores of Bruce Nauman or Dan Graham, which often resulted in solo-authored performances for camera, are less relevant than the socialized scoring of La Monte Young or Simone Forti, which has an outward-facing agenda and orientation, is often dedicated to other artists, calls other artists into the performance, and is able to be re-performed by many.

Beyond the generation of new solo dances from Gothe-Snape's scores, a documentation of *Three Ways to Enter and Exit* reveals another outcome of the work that emerges from the act of translation. It shows Gothe-Snape watching Stamp attending to her score, observing her working with the instruction, watching "the dancer's virtuosity as material."[36] Dance seems to model a form of *attention* to the art event as a climate or condition (the medial aspects of art), a mode of viewing that Gothe-Snape's work demands of its audiences; the dancer becomes a guide for their fellow attendees on how to look and respond to Gothe-Snape's visual art. Reintroducing the body into her art as interlocutor or one medium among many is a key strategy for tackling "the thickness and richness of the intermeshing world" as she experiences it corporeally:

> I'm always in a crisis of incorporation with the world, and language cannot always account for that . . . the body [is] at the nexus of the hugely impossible feat of relating to the world . . . I find it incredibly overwhelming and that overwhelming happens in the body [where the] social and interper-

> sonal is formed . . . it is the kind of thing that's been obliterated from 20th century art (not in all cases and not in a lot of female artist cases).[37]

The interest in the body extends from Gothe-Snape's own body, through her performers, and on to her audience. *Three Ways to Enter and Exit* seems connected to the artist's project the year before with Brian Fuata, *Cruising in the MCA* (2010), which modelled the kind of attention required for viewing art on the way that members of the gay community attend to public spaces when cruising for sex. This participatory work drew visitors at the 2010 Primavera art show at the Museum of Contemporary Art (MCA) in Sydney into a simple body practice to prepare them for their experience in the gallery; a prescient project that pre-dates (and in many ways exceeds) the broader embrace of participatory strategies in galleries internationally. For Gothe-Snape and Fuata, repeated three times a week for three months, it constituted a physical practice.

Gothe-Snape was trained in performance, body techniques, and painting and thus epitomizes the transmedial artist. In Peter Osborne's work on Xavier Le Roy, he points out a problem that could well apply to the critical reception of some of Gothe-Snape's work. In the critical writing on Le Roy's gallery-based work, Osborne warns of a presumption of

> a substantial or 'ontological' category of dance (at the core of a wider concept of performance) as the medium of the enactment of its own questioning, deconstruction, unravelling, expansion, and transformation . . . a sign of the still-enduring power of the discourse and practices of medium-specific modernism.[38]

Instead of taking such an approach to Le Roy's work, Osborne sees the need for a broader critical context: the entire field of contemporary art. Gothe-Snape's work across several art categories, including graphic art, theater, sculpture, painting, as well as dance, assumes an equity among such media that is adequately represented in her term "a-disciplinary," and allows the choreographic to break free of the kind of post-disciplinary frameworks that Osborne detects in some current critical approaches to dance and the gallery. In order to adequately frame Gothe-Snape's work, an understanding of dance knowledges by the critic or theorist should be a part of their critical toolkit and calls for a new kind of commentator. This book project, alongside many others listed in Chapter 1, attempts such a critical position, following the progression of dance and choreography as it

emerges as a more central facet of contemporary arts practices. And this progression is nowhere more convincing than in collaborative practices such as Gothe-Snape's which care for dancer agency and expert knowledges, modelling best practice as part of their realization.[39] Gothe-Snape's interest in the vagaries of art history, which drives a project such as the series *Every Artist Remembered*, may also guide her recalibration of disciplinary hierarchies.[40] And her sly feminism exposed in her reframing of canonized male art figures such as Weiner and Hughes, the modesty of her multidisciplinarity, or her explicit address to gender inequity in works such as *Trying to Find Comfort in an Uncomfortable Chair* (2019), chimes with the uniquely female profile of contemporary dance lineages.[41]

Gothe-Snape is inventing new ways of working, approaching each project with a set of concepts (rhetoric, proximity, ambience), materials (a yellow line, Robert Hughes's closing remarks in his *Shock of the New* series, Weiner's hand gestures, action scores, cartography), and strategies that owe much to dance and performance (transposition, improvisation, repetition, witnessing, instruction, attunement alongside her comprehensive list above). She states, "I don't really care what it looks like or what it is, as long as there is a truth to the materials, a deep valuing of the instruction, which might be in struggle, the playing out of a proposition."[42] She demonstrates a transdisciplinary virtuosity that multiplies possibilities, frameworks, positions, and perspectives, inventing unique spectatorial propositions where a performance looks like a painting, or a basketball court is a mood-reader. Fellow Sydney-based artist Latai Taumoepeau (Case Study 11) is similarly charting new ways of working across media but with a more overtly body-centered practice that moves beyond the corporeal to a consistent set of props (water, sand, tarpaulin, glass) that contextualize her body as one material among an ecology of co-extensive elements. As scholar Talei Luscia Mangioni notes, "Taumoepeau thinks with elements."[43] Her commitment to instruction or task sings with Gothe-Snape's more explicit citation of conceptual lineages, and Taumoepeau is no less post-conceptual in her conscious engagement of a critical and telescopic position. Both female artists thus operate within and beyond the bounds of current aesthetic frameworks.

While in Part IV Adam Linder, Shelley Lasica, and Maria Hassabi helped establish what we could call dance as a contemporary art medium, Part V launches with Gothe-Snape and concludes with Taumoepeau, framing a chapter that complicates both the notion of choreographic authorship and the contours of the field regarding dance and art history. If

conceptual dance and art are still taking shape within historiography, the post-conceptual situation is still emergent, multiplicitous and compelling in its promise of new paradigms and possibilities. One striking feature of recent activity within global contemporary dance that is in dialogue with the broader field of contemporary art is an even more pronounced turn to the materiality of dancers and dancing, building on the resistance within conceptual dance to the dematerializing extremes of conceptual art. So, before turning to Taumoepeau, Chapter 8 starts with a reactionary turn back to the dancing body in recent dance practices and associated theory by some of the central protagonists in the debates surrounding non-dance, recalling mid-century painter and theorist Robert Motherwell's comment that "perhaps the effort to destroy one medium makes one as sensitive to its qualities as love of it."[44]

Chapter 8

The Persistence of Dance at the Point of Its Disappearance

8.1 Introduction

Following an apparent meeting ground for dance and visual art in (variations on) the conceptual (in the 1960 and 1970s, and later in the 1990s), a very recent and widespread return to the activity of dancing, which has involved honoring the work of the dancer through a greater understanding of their labor, is understood to be at the heart of the visual arts' renewed interest in dance. The characteristics of Peter Osborne's model of the post-conceptual—art that is transdisciplinary and telescopic, temporally expansive and unhinged from specific iterations, yet deeply self-aware of the contemporaneous context, institutional frames, and its debts to the past—chime with the emergent activity of *dance as a contemporary art medium*, and it is clear how an artist like Agatha Gothe-Snape can be aligned with such art historical work.[1] Other art historical understandings of the contemporary condition of art by Robert Pincus-Witten, Hal Foster, Terry Smith, and Alexander Alberro are inclusive of characteristics shared with contemporary dance as it has been defined, via its elements and principles, in this book.

This brings us to *post-dance* as a moniker for certain creative practices engaged in the ongoing re-invention of dance and choreography in the twenty-first century both in terms of re-location (within the contemporary arts broadly rather than theater) and re-turn (to practices to which it contributed uncredited knowledges), and which can be discussed in relation to the wholesale revision of the contemporary arts as a project that is also ongoing. I will argue that dance as a contemporary art medium is one strand of activity within a post-dance situation and demonstrates continuity with the mid-twentieth-century dance avant-garde (estab-

lished in Chapter 4) as a corollary of being a part of the historical dance-contemporary art exchange. This involves recognizing alternative histories, genealogies, progressive tendencies, and future directions beyond the work under discussion that help fill out the larger profile of dance in its *post* condition.

In 2015, a conference called *POST-DANCE: Beyond the Kinesthetic Experience and Back* took place at MDT (previously Moderna Dansteatern) in Stockholm. Co-convened by Danjel Andersson of MDT, dance and performance theorist André Lepecki, and Gabriel Smeets (then artistic director of Cullberg Ballet), the event treated post-dance as "an open source concept" to be defined by the participants.[2] Andersson coined the term and suggests that it is the latest development in a genealogy connected to the second-wave New York-based activity.[3] If it describes our current condition and has some alignment with "post-conceptual," then this genealogy sounds right. While the conference was Andersson's response to new dance work in Stockholm, the key speakers who included Jonathan Burrows, Mette Ingvartsen, Adrian Heathfield, Samlingen collective, Bojana Kunst, and Mårten Spångberg, ensured the conference was internationally relevant and "the place to be."[4] There was something in the term "post-dance" that hit on the contemporary situation.

Spångberg's and Bojana Cvejić's contributions to the conference publication voice a change in attitude to "dancey-dance."[5] In this sense, the term may reflect a post-*conceptual*-dance position. Cvejić confesses to a secret "relish" in the work of the "few surviving companies" that present choreographies displaying "casual excellence and feel for form," produced by "a particular regime of work enabled by the money that can pay for repetitions."[6] Spångberg still argues for a distinction between dance and choreography, the latter now described as a network of technologies that can be liberated from the medium of the dancing body; dance, in his scheme, is "pure expression" in need of structure.[7] He argues for the "liberated," post-disciplinary condition of many dance artists: "what we know is that dance is no longer enough."[8] Yet he also defends disciplinary definitions as a way of "figuring out what those liberties really can do for us."[9] Finally, he states, "post-dance signals a return of dance and dancing," linking this position directly to "advocacy."[10] Such a turnaround seems to reflect the problematic division between "conceptual dance on the one side and the dancey dance, real dance or just dance on the other," noted by Kunst, which recalls the mind-body division that had been overcome so successfully in contemporary dance and theory.[11]

Despite this apparent persistence of the legacy of the mind-body binary during the heyday of conceptual dance referred to here by Kunst, attention to the work of dance composition and dramaturgy did not actually abate in the broader field during the 1990s and early 2000s. In the work of collectives like Sarma in Europe, and publications such as *Movement Research* journal in New York, as well as publications by dance artists on their own processes, writing in material and discipline-specific terms persisted and, in fact, accelerated. Artists such as Mette Ingvartsen and Chrysa Parkinson have taken the lead in a renewed attention to the work of the dancer and dancing through their practice, research, and publications.[12] As noted in Chapter 2, collaborations between theorists and artists have also played an important role in both developing and accounting for the current field, and Cvejić is a part of this activity, too, as we will see. So, in fact, discourses on both conceptual and material approaches to dance not only developed in parallel, but also overlapped.

So why post-dance? And what is the significance regarding the current dance-gallery activity? Jumping back in time, some writing by North American art critic and historian Robert Pincus-Witten in his 1977 book on *post-minimalism* resonates with *post-conceptual*. The final sections of his book address the "conceptual performance" of Vito Acconci, Lynda Benglis, and Scott Burton, among others, but arrives at dance via Marcel Duchamp in the very final section.[13] Pincus-Witten distinguishes the work of artists such as Bruce Nauman and Robert Morris from performance work dealing with "myth" and "autobiography," being grounded in what he calls "behaviour" (coincidently the name of a series of works by Shelley Lasica).[14] This focus on movement in and of itself is then linked to dance, which is described as one option among many in this early post-milieu (naming Yvonne Rainer and Trisha Brown, and also Rauschenberg "as a dancer and stage designer"):

> walking as dance, amateur as dancer, another way of painting and sculpting—an alternative. Painting without painting. Sculpture without sculpture. That today we happen to see many dancers performing in ways suggestive of modes of painting or sculpture does not necessarily mean that the dancer is a painter or sculptor . . . Does recent dance come out of painting or sculpture or does sculpture and painting come out of dance?[15]

This description could be of the current work that, I am arguing, maintains its reference to a home discipline with its own knowledges and

practices, while ranging among the other arts in its post-medium life. Risking the danger of overstating the impact of radical dance and performance practices on the state of the arts post-conceptually, yet following Pincus-Witten's conjectures regarding the two-way flow of interdisciplinary influence, this chapter involves speculations regarding the significant contributions of dance to the seismic shifts in the ontological condition of art at the turn of the twenty-first century. (This, in turn, is dependent on arguments I have built regarding the historical exchange between the two art forms.) The role of dance and choreography within this "post" situation can be discerned in many facets of the contemporary arts such as new treatments of space and time through the role of the moving body and its explorations with dance elements such as weight, tone, presence, absence, stillness, duration, and collectivity.

This chapter thus draws visual art theory and dance studies into close dialogue. Part III focused on debates and developments in dance studies regarding the emergence of "conceptual dance" in the 1990s and its links to a renewed proximity between dance and the visual arts. This resulted in the return of a particular field of practice that had first appeared in the mid-twentieth century, *dance as a contemporary art medium*, as one of its modalities. Chapter 6 looked at the emergence of the conceptual in art history in the 1960s and the role of dance therein as both a contributor to and a distinct instance of the conceptual-material bind that has been understood as separate from the primary historical narrative of conceptual art. I argued for distinct and asynchronous manifestations of conceptualism in dance and visual art that do, however, interweave as influences on the current "post" situation in the arts more broadly. In this chapter, dance and visual art come together as we turn toward a discussion of that current condition of art in the early twenty-first century, which is understood variously as post-disciplinary or post-conceptual. As noted, definitions of these terms by Osborne and others are particularly helpful in pinpointing the choreographic alignments with new paradigms of contemporary art that are opening a space for dance; both a physical place for practice and presentation, and a theoretical space that is inclusive of its knowledges and traditions. This chapter ends with some notes on a bespoke model of *post-dance* (and I take Andersson on his word that this is an open-source term to be adapted for use), which sits close to notions of *expanded dance* but perhaps also touches on something like *para-dance*. It has appeared in the last decade as a distinct field of research, practice, presentation, and emerging theory that cannot be directly matched to visual

arts monikers but which is part of a broad field of *experimental intermedial arts* with which it shares certain features.[16] As noted in Chapter 1, the dance and choreography appearing in this field is generally distinct from theater-based dance repertoire, performance art, and experimental theater or contemporary performance, but there are some instances where specific artists move between such categories as is the case for Meg Stuart, Adam Linder, Maria Hassabi, and Latai Taumoepeau. This chapter ends on a speculative note in keeping with the still emerging shape of the dance-gallery exchange in these early decades of the twenty-first century.

8.2 The Material Genealogy of Dance

The role of dancing, as it appears in recent compelling discussions, promotes the subjective and contingent position of the dancer as a strong counterpoint to *choreography as concept*. Australian dance artist and commentator Rebecca Hilton recently published an article, "DANCERNESS," in which she observes "how unremarked upon, even unrecognized, dancer knowledge—DANCERNESS, is."[17] Kunst focuses on the dancer and dancing in her contribution to *POST-DANCE*, describing "the material nature and quality of dancing labour, where dance opens itself as a poetic and sensual force of movement."[18] She notes how the critique of virtuosity in conceptual dance led to a countering exposure of the role of the dancer and the expansion of the kinds of work they do. This revealed how various aspects not normally considered part of the dancer's work or labor, from "hanging around" to sharing "process and method," could be more valuable to their overall practice than, for instance, technical accomplishments.[19] Uncovering the true scope of the work of the dancer has deepened the general understanding of the activity of dancing and the corollary of this is renewed insight into dance as an art form.

This refers us back to the mid-century dance avant-garde where the conceptual work of the North Americans developed in dialogue with the material business of dancing. Sally Gardner quotes dancer Paula Clemens on this:

> At the heart of Judson were dancers, people with a deep empathy for the human body . . . all the formal and emotional reasons why and where a dance takes place, were ultimately rudimentary to the less easily described developments and breakthroughs of the physical movement of dance.[20]

Such accounts make it apparent that the mid-century dance artists, cited by the recent avant-garde in inconsistent ways, were as invested in researching and deploying disciplinary elements as they were in rejecting what had come before, working with concepts and ideas, and trying on the methods of other art forms. Artists like Yvonne Rainer and Simone Forti embraced the tool kit of dance craft, working with gravity, weight, tone, memory, and stillness in explicit ways to unpack concepts such as minimalism, the pedestrian, singularity, democratization, and radical juxtaposition in ways that challenged the discipline's very foundations.[21] So, while *composition* has been replaced by *dispositif* in the writings surrounding the third-wave conceptual dance artists, the critique of composition both recently and in the 1960s never reached the extremes of conceptual art described here by Branden Joseph: "investigations into composition as a form of self-referentiality that ends by negating and ultimately annihilating itself."[22]

The literature on conceptual dance across the turn of the twenty-first century was, in fact, authored by some of those most committed to maintaining a disciplinary profile for dance through the act of testing its very limits. Cvejić's philosophical project in her 2015 monograph, *Choreographing Problems: Expressive Concepts in European Contemporary Dance and Performance*, includes close attention to the materiality of dance. Alongside her "commitment to philosophy" discussed in Chapter 4 is her position as an insider, her "dramaturgical experience in making dance and theater," as well as having accompanied some of her case studies "as a distant observer in the studio or as a passionate attender in the audience."[23] This might involve access to creative developments, interviewing artists, participating in process, or taking the choreographers' writings (including scores) into full account.[24] Cvejić acknowledges a turn to composition in her case studies and attention to dance elements such as pure presence, a decentralization of vision, along with "weight, colour, motion, rest and attention."[25] The first case study in Cvejić's book—*Untitled* (2005) by Xavier Le Roy—is described as a disciplinary, almost modernist, reduction of choreography to its barest minimum.[26] In Cvejić's discussion of Eszter Salamon's *Nvsbl* (2006) there is another return to compositional preoccupations—the work is concerned with visibility, stillness, movement, time, speed, and change.[27] And *It's in the Air* (2007) by Mette Ingvartsen and Jefta van Dinther, is discussed by Cvejić in terms of its treatment of "weight, shape, gravity, direction, rhythm, and flow of the dancing body," along with questions of dancer agency.[28]

From this perspective, as French dance commentators Jean-Marc Adolphe and Gérard Mayen note, the moniker "non-dance" for this work can be seen as a misnomer:

> Certainly, this attitude calls into question the definition of the commonly held idea of what dance would be. But rather than qualify this attitude in the negative, it is better to question what is now the source and the inscription of the dance, and thus continues to operate stubbornly in its field, while overflowing it.[29]

Choreographer William Forsythe echoes this sentiment when he notes that his interest in "choreographic objects" as "autonomous expressions of its principles . . . without the body" should serve "to make the organizing principles visibly persist."[30] In the case of *Nowhere and Everywhere at the Same Time No. 2* (2013), described in Chapter 6, hanging pendulums in an installation setting that participants can engage with invite the audience to experience physically for themselves "organizing principles" close to the heart of the discipline: weight, momentum, agility, proprioception, and responsiveness.[31] Forsythe swaps out the dancer for the participant, the occularcentric for the embodied. *So dance persists, even at its limit, in such work.*

The gallery or museum has had a hand in the current state of affairs vis-à-vis disciplinary assertions of dance. Mark Franko connects the materiality of dance, and the recent associated concept of *choreographic objects* exemplified in *Nowhere and Everywhere at the Same Time No. 2* by Forsythe, to debates surrounding dance and the gallery or museum, specifically regarding re-enactment and museal practices:

> If the objectality of choreography still remains to some degree elusive, it is nonetheless true that there is a movement afoot to uncover its materiality rather than its ephemerality. And in respect to this project, which is barely beginning, the concept of the museum, if not its physical and cultural reality, is crucial.[32]

This recalls a statement by Robert Rauschenberg: "I learned that a work of art—say, a painting or a piece of sculpture, is an elusive quantity—that is, the fact that it's concrete makes it elusive. The dance, on the other hand—is really concrete, not elusive at all."[33] From the perspective of an artist working within the museum or gallery paradigm Franko is describing (that is, exhibitions and collections), the (im)materiality of dance can

be seen as relative when compared with the mediated encounter between viewer and artist via an art object. In this comparison, the unmediated, physical presence of the dance artist in the close encounter often provided by gallery-based instantiations of choreography makes it very "concrete" for those experiencing the work.

The material aspect of labor for the dancer is something curator Catherine Wood believes is also part of the art form's appeal for the gallery or museum. She argues that "visual artists don't have any disciplinary training now," referring to the much discussed "deskilling" of artists due to an emphasis on concepts and critical thinking, resulting in a fascination with "the material discipline" of dance.[34] This seems dangerously close to reviving a mind-body split, however, as with Sarah Michelson, Adam Linder, and Maria Hassabi, the display of dancers' labor can indeed be a compositional focus in such work. So, through its transposition from the stage to the gallery, the material aspects of dance—its physical source, skill, expression, inscription, labor, and discipline—gain a new kind of value that is independent of commodity-based economics and directly result from a post- or a-disciplinary condition. This is dance seeing itself from its outside—from the position of the visual arts. It demonstrates how, as Adolphe and Mayen state, dance continues to "operate stubbornly in its field, while overflowing it," and that this expanded state is bound to new perspectives born of new positions in relation to the visual arts and its institutions.

In Case Studies 1 to 11, distinct dance elements and principles from Chapters 2 and 7 such as process, mind-body work, presence, collectivity, weight, rhythm, and singularity appear as the template, idea, or concept that is then mobilized across various materials. In line with such an approach, in the work of Gothe-Snape, we saw how the linguistically bound methods of conceptual art are adjusted to accommodate the corporeally bound orders of knowledge at play. As choreographer Jennifer Lacey states, "I believe that the body has access to a way of conceptualizing that differs from the parts of ourselves that construct and process verbal language." Lacey goes on to poetically articulate this physical-conceptual work:

> This modality of thought is concerned not only with instinct and emotion, but also with ontological queries, with theorizing. Through the body there are opportunities to consider and present ideas with a respect to their complexity and seeming contradictions or transgressions . . . their integral knottiness, to show the gloss of the tangle.[35]

It is this decentering of language-based systems of knowledge and structure in order to remain true to the "gloss of the tangle" at a practical level that underpins the resistant status of dance within the contemporary arts milieu and maintains its status as "deviant" and "unclaimable," in the words of Jonathan Burrows and David Velasco, respectively.[36] The impetus to rein in and control the concept as it is expressed through a work would lead conceptualists such as Kosuth away from working with materials and toward working with pure language to transmit art information. Others such as Richard Serra and Lawrence Weiner (who Gothe-Snape cites) produced lists of verbs, in and of themselves, as art.[37] Degrees of slipperiness where the body-as-art-object is concerned lead to degrees of instability and openness, "complexity," and "contradiction," in Lacey's description of the conceptual work of dance. In Chapter 2 where I discussed the importance of *process* in all stages of choreographic work, dance was defined as evasive, unstable, contingent, and changeable. This condition of dance has generally conspired against a reduction to linguistics noted in Chapter 6. As noted in the work of Shelley Lasica, with no language-based equivalent for the work, the choreographies open onto multiple relations with extra-disciplinary material that is expansive and inclusive of other media, contextual parameters, conditions of operation, political resonances, philosophical work, and social imperatives. The work of Latai Taumoepeau demonstrates how the capacity of dance to create open, complex, networked, and telescopic work can be taken in directions that challenge the tools for analysis at hand and point to the future of the dance-visual arts relationship.

8.3 Post-Dance

Regarding the persistence of materiality in the second- and third-wave dance avant-garde, Peter Osborne's definition of the post-conceptual suggests a proximity to emerging understandings of post-dance, although his early writing on the topic excludes choreographic works from his field. One criticism of Osborne's work by Leland de la Durantaye is that it lacked current (not historical) post-conceptual examples to support his thesis, and de la Durantaye offers Tino Sehgal as a possible example to match Osborne's model of contemporaneity-as-medium.[38] This may have prompted a text by Osborne on Xavier Le Roy published a year after in 2014.[39] Connections between very recent experimental dance and "the

eclipse of conceptualism" have also been made by Belgian dance scholar Rudi Laermans, but dance studies has perhaps balked at engaging with the apparent impenetrability of this most recent and esoteric phase in visual arts history.[40] I mentioned earlier Robert Pincus-Witten's description of a strand of post-Minimalism that was prophetic of the role of dance within the current post-medium situation.

The Persistence of Dance has demonstrated both the challenges and insights made apparent when mapping the development of contemporary dance against equivalent phases in contemporary art.[41] Confronting the influences, confluences, and departures between visual art and contemporary dance is essential for any project attempting to analyze current practices working across these historically determined fields. Throughout this process, it has been demonstrated that dance has played a role in the emergence of various facets of contemporary art, at least since the mid-twentieth century. Osborne's understanding of the post-conceptual condition as the current state of the arts as he sees it emerging since the turn of the twenty-first century reveals affinities with Andersson's notion of post-dance with which I opened this chapter. Ideas from other theorists such as Alberro, Smith and Pincus-Witten discussed in previous chapters also contribute to what follows.

Osborne states emphatically: "today, 'contemporary art,' critically understood, is a postconceptual art."[42] Osborne's model exists at the site of the ontological trauma of extreme conceptualism that pressed the limit-features of various art disciplines to their asocial, ungrammatical conclusions. Recent dance bears witness to the subsequent destabilization of disciplinary distinctions and the rise of transdisciplinary activity that telescopes out as a result of intense critical self-reflexivity. It is within this context that we have seen the extra-disciplinary adventures of choreography, including the privileging of philosophy within dance discourse, the interventions into the art form's self-determinations by various institutions' aspirations, and the trickle-down effect to a crisis in pedagogical models.[43] *The autonomy of dance as a desired state of the art will not be recovered from this condition.* However, disciplinary specificities are not excluded from Osborne's model of thinking about art's development either; after all, there can be no transdisciplinarity without disciplinarity.[44] The post-conceptual marks a return to the material dimension of art that seems in step with sentiments in the *Post-Dance* reader and the most recent innovations in contemporary dance. In line with this understanding, the *Post-Dance* publication maps out critical terrain where artists and the-

orists blink and shake off the adversarial attitudes of the conceptual period with its opposition to a generic, conservative model of dance, and admit to a rich diversity of dance practices committed to its material conditions.

Osborne summarizes "the critical legacy of conceptual art" as the terms that set the conditions for post-conceptual art which I translate as follows.[45] First, there is an acknowledgement of the co-dependence of the conceptual and material aspects of any work of art, but with a critical ("anti-aesthetic") stance informing that relationship. Second, within that criticality, there is absolute freedom regarding the choice of materials for a given project (and this is linked by Osborne directly to the "Duchamp-Cage-Cunningham-Fluxus" genealogy).[46] Third, he describes an awareness in such work "that the unity of an individual work is comprised not on the basis of its identity with itself in an idealized present," in aesthetics scholar Lisa Trahair's words, but is the totality of multiple events and encounters that might constitute a "project."[47] And, finally, the result of this multiplicity is an unfolding process across time, "a dynamic interplay between the work's actual and virtual dimensions that derive from its contextual and historical relations."[48]

So, the alignment of certain qualities, knowledges, and practices of dance with these conditions becomes clear, hence the interest coming from visual artists in exploring dance and choreography as materials or concepts, or from dance artists re-framing their practice within the spaces, institutions, and discourses of the contemporary arts. The insistence in recent dance on the medium of the moving body even at its conceptual limit, its intermedial adventures with the entire gamut of artistic disciplines and their constitutive elements, its processual capacities, and virtual suspensions as score or embodied memory all articulate to the characteristics of post-contemporary art as described by Osborne. The affinity is particularly clear if we consider Osborne's point 5: that the post-conceptual artwork is "no longer identifiable with either a physically unique instantiation or a simple set of reproducible tokens (readymades)," so that "the unity of the work becomes both distributive and malleable."[49] Dance has a disciplinary advantage regarding an understanding of the persistence of a work of art across multiple instantiations or moments of material occurrence (the actual and the virtual dimensions of choreography). Choreographic repertoire, by nature, consists of multiple "spatio-temporal sites of instantiation" that constitute the "work"; however, this is traditionally limited to performance outputs. Dance in its contemporary formulation was early to take up an expansion of the work of art to include

text-based scores, iterations of the work in-development, and compositional commentary/exposition.[50]

So to return to our question: why post-dance? And what is the significance here regarding the current dance-gallery activity? In addition to the processual nature of choreographic works of art and the challenges this presents to the notion of discrete, archivable, and commodifiable art objects, dance's inherent openness, unassertiveness, and inclusivity has made it an exemplary transmedial form as noted in the case studies in this book that think across the means, strategies, and affects of multiple art forms within choreographic frameworks (as opposed to multi-arts collaborations). This has occurred in dialogue with a political imperative to promote a disciplinary profile for dance in the face of the powerful and potentially colonizing field of the visual arts. For dance, a disciplinary-interdisciplinary tension ultimately foregrounds the persistence of a material (or aesthetic) dimension in the form of the "ineliminable" dancing body. *The persistence of dance is the persistence of the body of the dancer.* The fact that the dancing body as medium opens onto a plethora of interesting complications as we saw in Chapter 2 (subject-object, agency-authorship, autonomy-relationality, etc.) has meant a critical stance between the art form and its primary material in the post-conceptual context, and this has become a major feature of recent examples in the field.

In Michelson's *Devotion Study #1—The American Dancer* (2012), the artist is clearly in dialogue with the ontological crisis in dance but chooses to press through the materiality of the form (dancing) and highlight its disciplinary formulations in what could be described as a post-critical mode (the choreographer, the dancer, labor, the floor, modern dance). The embarrassment about dancing that fuelled the extreme experiments in non-dance in Europe is reversed here as Michelson brings it all back: the choreographer as author, the rigor of choreographic and technical precision (despite using dancers with varying degrees of traditional training), a respect for the modern dance heritage, the invention of new movement vocabularies, complex scenography and staging, and leotards. Alongside these material, disciplinary aspects of the work, Michelson explains that she begins from a place "of not knowing," as if inventing dance anew with each work by making it "a problem"; that is, she maintains a critical disposition in relation to her medium/materials.[51] Michelson engages in an expanded field of material including music, spoken text, and visual art, and recognizes the specific instantiation of a choreographic work that, for her, has a limited life of iterations, and the processual nature

of each work within the oeuvre. Overall, there is a keen—perhaps even primary—awareness of context (the discipline, the venue, the programmer, the dancer).

Post-dance can be seen as an elaboration of the consequences of the project of contemporary dance as it played out in the twentieth century, the period in which it was also born. As I have argued elsewhere, there is a temptation to see dance as an artistic discipline belonging to the twentieth century, with its appearance at the birth of the century marking a break with classical ballet and the twenty-first century witnessing the transformation of dance into something quite unprecedented.[52] In 2008, Australian dance theorist Sally Gardner wrote, "modern and post-modern dancers' defining of an autonomous art . . . remains an incomplete project," suggesting that dance's aesthetic autonomy was never fully realized.[53] In this case, defining dance outside ballet as distinct from other disciplines becomes a failed project of one century—the twentieth.

Or rather, if the limit-features of the discipline were the focus of the second- and third-wave dance avant-garde, the consequences of this are playing out in many and varied ways in the twenty-first century with a new and incontrovertible attitude to those fundamentals that could be called post-critical.[54] Post-dance is the practical and philosophical condition of dance *post*-modern, -contemporary, -theater, perhaps even -choreography. As a point of no return for the form, it shares with Osborne's post-conceptual the "function of exceeding a limit in its established form (the aesthetic) in such a way as to render it visible and thereby reinstitute it on new grounds."[55] Although contemporary dance has never reached the dematerialized limits of "pure" conceptual art, the rigorous testing (if not absolute superseding) of disciplinary limits in conceptual European dance of the late twentieth- and early twenty-first centuries has brought about a similar visibility and reinstitution of dance and choreography in their material forms. The works under discussion in this book that test dance within this post-dance condition would thus be, for Osborne, art "that can sustain the signifers [sic] 'art' and 'contemporary' in their deepest theoretical senses" due to this very persistence.[56]

The shape of this activity has much in common with the "configuration" described by Alain Badiou and applied to Neo-Dada in *Choreography, Visual Art and Experimental Composition 1950s-1970s*: "an identifiable sequence, initiated by an event, comprising a virtually infinite complex of works . . . minor, ignored, redundant, and so on—that are no less a part of the immanent truth whose being is provided by the artistic configura-

tion."[57] The work under discussion in this book operates within a post-dance milieu, perhaps initiated by the disciplinary crisis in France that migrated internationally. Dance as a contemporary art medium could be described as a return of the art form to a non-theatrical, intermedial condition that allows it to reach through and beyond its material forms to draw out a sequence or "truth." That truth also involves networks of discourse, practice, politics, programming, and pedagogy that are global and, at the same time, nowhere in particular, and are only constituted through a recognition of the sequence (which is still emerging). This telescopic approach lines up very neatly with an endemic *post-* situation.

This book project has attempted to locate within such a situation a specific field of practice, and this particular configuration of art works has been grasped through shared pre-occupations and certain characteristics, presented as a global phenomenon as part of the international field of contemporary art. However, Ecuadorian choreographer-theorist Fabián Barba's coining of "the prejudice of local dance" mentioned in Chapter 1 has the counter-effect of suggesting tighter specificities; communities of practice, corporeal cultures, physical lineages, and geographic habitats.[58] The global characteristic of contemporary art argued by Terry Smith and others "seems less obvious in the contemporary performing arts where centre and margin still remain much more defined," as academic Frederik Le Roy notes.[59] Our final case study locates the work of Latai Taumoepeau in very specific geographic, cultural, and political contexts and is part of a global shift that is jettisoning the generic in favor of the specific.

8.4 Conclusion

In summary, the choreographic examples in this book engaging with the contexts, strategies, institutions, and disciplines of visual art are one field within a wider web of overlapping tendencies that together constitute the condition of contemporary art. How can we adequately account for such work in ways that acknowledge both the broader contours of that condition and the distinct profile of work located between contemporary dance and contemporary art? Such work demonstrates various iterations of intermediality, from the gallery take-over of Boris Charmatz's *Musée de la danse* (2009-2018) to Gothe-Snape's theater presentation, *Rhetorical Chorus* (2017), which includes dance as one element in a kind of *Gesamtkunstwerk* or total work of art. In this sense, perhaps naming and claiming are not as

helpful here as being specific and precise about what artists are actually doing in this space. However, as I have argued throughout this book, the case studies share a foregrounding of *the materiality of dance*, of *context* and *process*, demonstrating a practical-critical approach to the dance-gallery relationship. If we could describe a condition of dance that might be specifically *dance as a contemporary art medium*, and which might also be a part of *post-dance* as that coming after the intra-disciplinary business of conceptual dance, we could add the following characteristics to those just mentioned: (1) a focus on materials (both corporeal and expanded) as (largely unstable) concepts; (2) a layering of processual means at all stages of the work; and (3) a foregrounding of context or contingency (as opposed to the primary status of *the show* in theater dance economies). We could add (4) a recognition/reconsideration of the legacies of the twentieth century avant-garde; (5) a new profile for the dancer and dancing as holding specific knowledges and corporeal archives and embodying subject-object agency; (6) an intensified commitment to plurisensoriality and sensation over occularcentricity and language-based experiences, shared through co-presence; and (7) communities of practice beyond the dance studio that exemplify a-disciplinary exchange. As a group, artists working within the configuration of dance as a contemporary art medium also lack any coherence regarding form and style but share a knowing and rigorous orientation to the legacy of extreme disciplinary questioning that has come before them with a new scepticism regarding disciplinary limits. The field is also inclusive in its public profile in comparison to the historical delineations of conceptual dance, representing the true gender, cultural, physical, and neurological diversity of its constituents. All of this is framed by a *para*-position: seeing itself from outside, from the side of contemporary art in its capacious—and colonizing—configuration. However, rather than being absorbed into this larger project's contours, being neither helpless nor desperately pro-active in its own annexation, dance takes the opportunity to sharpen, finesse, and update its disciplinary profile to better characterize its condition in the twenty-first century as part of the most progressive activities in the arts in its broadest sense. In this way, the realization of the new condition of *experimental, intermedial contemporary dance* would have been impossible without its deep and historical exchange with the visual arts.

Gothe-Snape pulls together choreographic and visual arts genealogies and theoretical touchstones in her complex work. A post-conceptual artist in so many ways, Gothe-Snape's immersion in an intermedial community,

and her cross-training in visual art and performance, exemplifies what she refers to as an *a-disciplinary* approach. In this chapter I have uncovered some threads between art theoretical approaches to the *post-* condition of art and the examples of dance as a contemporary art medium in this book. My final case study, Latai Taumoepeau, introduces a critique of such a methodology and the theoretical apparatus upon which it leans, and gestures toward a newly decentered field of dance as contemporary art that reconfigures artistic and theoretical paradigms that have favoured English-speaking Americans and Europeans.

Case Study 11

Latai Taumoepeau—
Dancing Moana, Working with Urgency

Tongan-Australian artist Latai Taumoepeau's work *The Last Resort* (2020) is a live performance and installation co-devised with her relative, Taliu Aloua.[1] Presented on Cockatoo Island in Sydney Harbour, the disused and vast industrial building that housed the work echoed with the sound of the two performers smashing glass bottles with an *ike* (Tongan wooden mallet). As reported by fellow artist Taloi Havini, "visitors could hear the sharp tap of glass breaking from the other side of the gigantic Turbine Hall. The sound of smashing glass alongside an accompanying droning soundtrack created a live, human-induced cacophony."[2] During the vernissage week of the Biennale of Sydney, Taumoepeau and Aloua slowly and carefully emptied glass bottles out of plastic hessian bags that were stacked around them like a dam and worked them into a sea of sharp shards with their mallets as well as bricks strapped to their feet like Japanese *geta*. In the thirty-minute synchronized dual-screen video that formed part of the installation version, we see the action from long and mid-shot simultaneously.[3] Taumoepeau and Aloua don worn, hotel bathrobes branded with logos for "The Last Resort," as well as goggles, a mouth-and-nose mask, and the unwieldy footwear before they get to work on the materials. Their pace is unrushed as they stamp on the sea of broken glass and twist their feet to grind it down. Aloua looks down, but Taumoepeau occasionally gazes up and around her as if she is observing weather or the surrounding landscape. Aloua strikes at closed bags on the floor or the wall with the mallet, tipping out the broken contents. Taumoepeau rips one of the empty bags and drapes it around her neck like the traditional *lei* of the region. The two workers move close to each other at one point, stamping and grinding

Latai Taumoepeau, *The Last Resort*, 2020. Performance view for the 22nd Biennale of Sydney (2020), Cockatoo Island. Commissioned by the Biennale of Sydney with generous assistance from the Oranges & Sardines Foundation. Courtesy the artist. Performer / Co-devisor: Taliu Aloua; Lighting Designer: Amber Silk; Soundtrack: James Brown; Costume: Anthony Aitch. Photograph: Zan Wimberley.

in duet. The enormity of the task is signalled by the piles of bags, the broad sea of glass, and their resigned and exhausted postures.

The overall scene recalls low-paid, manual laborers working on site and dealing with refuse or recycling. Some associations include the link between glass and its primary material, sand, physical risk and precarity, and futile/incommensurable labor. The poetic manifestation of the work's message is realized through the sandbags that are often used to mitigate against rising water, the shabby hotel robes that evoke a dilapidated island resort, and a landscape converted into a dangerous field of material that cannot be "defused" but which also shimmers like a sea. Papua New Guinean-Australian artist Havini tells Taumoepeau,

> when I stood in your work and watched this whole bed of glass glistening with light, it looked to me in many ways like how the light hits the surface and reflects on and through the ocean.[4]

Taumoepeau's Tongan heritage determines the concepts that drive her work, and to this I shall return.[5] Her *faivā* (performance/temporal practice), like Maria Hassabi's, sits close to performance art but is dependent upon a physical discipline that comes from dance and physical training in many styles and techniques. Taumoepeau is a self-appointed *punake*, which is a Tongan term that refers to "a composer of movement or poetry or music," and has also described herself as "an intercultural, multidisciplinary and intersectional solo artist." However, she describes her primary medium as "movement," which manifests through her body-centered practice.[6]

Curator Beatrice Gralton has noted that Taumoepeau is "an example of an artist who sits quite beautifully at this nexus of performance, visual arts, dance and filmmaking."[7] However, her moving body is both her primary material *and* content due to its extension to the territory of her nation and region: "I don't separate myself, my own personal body from this region, Oceania or the Pacific."[8] It has been said that Taumoepeau "mimicked, trained and un-learned dance, in multiple institutions of learning, starting with her village, a suburban church hall, the club and a university."[9] She has described how, during her childhood, she would:

> . . . travel back and forth to my village in Tonga and it was there that I had an indigenous heritage practise [sic] of dancing in large presentations with my school or with my clan and, of course, obligatory village fundraisers where we do that crazy thing of slapping money on the well-oiled skin of the dancer and whisper amongst each other about the dancer's genealogy and virginity. I'd return to Sydney and attend ballet, tap, and jazz classes in my neighbourhood church hall which I affectionately refer to as part of my parents' assimilation plan.[10]

In works such as *Repatriate* (2015), *Disaffected* (2016), and *Kumi Fonua aka Portality 39* (2010 in discussion with Professor Hufanga Dr. Okusitino Mahina) Taumoepeau performed Pacific dance movements, remarkably in *Repatriate* against the pressure of rising water within a human-sized, Perspex box. In this work, which I have seen in its live and screen-based installation versions, Taumoepeau occupied a slightly more-than-human-sized Perspex tank that slowly filled with water. She wore flesh-colored underwear and children's flotation devices around her arms, legs, and as a ring around her waist. She also wore a long black wig. She describes her role in the work as "a woman who represents an island of some sort," and performed a collection of Pacific Island dance moves that she had learned

Latai Taumoepeau, *Repatriate I*, Performance view for Liveworks Festival of Experimental Art, Carriageworks, Sydney, 2016. Commissioned by Performance Space. Photo: Alex Davies.

throughout her life. As the water rose, those movements became more and more difficult, and she slowly submerged.[11]

Taumoepeau's choreographic knowledges manifest in her work as both specific dance forms and action-based work that often pitches the body against other materials for symbolic effect, such as her durational work with water and ice. Here she describes the choice to shovel/move ice from one random spot to another in *Ocean Island, Mine!*:

> This is the dance of today. This kind of labour work. These are the movement phrases we have today. They aren't always these beautiful abstract hand gestures we have always had. Of course, those will always be beautiful, but these are still abstract and modern. Who are we today?[12]

Taumoepeau deploys the materials, media, and exhibition/presentation format that best serve the content she is working with, and the body in movement holds these things, connecting the parts to the whole.

In keeping with the approach taken in this book, I return to the physical

performance of Taumoepeau and Aloua that took the simple act of walking on glass to press the work's themes through its material. Aloua had a pedestrian gait and casual manner, methodically working each section of glass underfoot with a twisting motion from his hip. Taumoepeau's performance emphasized the precarity of walking on broken glass while encumbered by heavy platform shoes and with restricted vision. Like Hassabi, Latai's performance modelled a dancer's mastery of the effects of gravity, balancing carefully on her uneven and shifting surface to support her complex movement choices. She worked with her knees well bent, one arm in the air for balance, and took extended lunges on legs turned awkwardly in or out, which increased the impression of precarity. Her progress was supported by leaning on her *ike* as a prop, or against the wall of sacks. This physical performance embodied her concepts of "fragility," "strength," "resilience," and "adaptation," making her corporeality a metaphor for her island homeland which shares these qualities.[13]

In *The Last Resort*, sitting within a contemporary art Biennale and presented among visual artworks at one of the event's major venues, Taumoepeau brought many of the aesthetic strategies of the neo-avant-garde (Minimalism, Neo-Dada, conceptual) and post-conceptual art (including specifically dance traditions therein), into dialogue with the politically charged content that runs across her entire body of mostly solo works. The particular combination of durational performance, documentation, material installation, sound score, and video work makes *The Last Resort* distinct from her other works which have been either on-site and durational, made for theater, or screen-based.[14] In its composition, it recalls the monumental scale and task-based, single action of the neo-avant-garde, has concepts that are realized through and as the material ("fragility," "strength," "resilience," "adaptation"), and touches on land art in its final state as a glass landscape alongside the ecological imperatives behind the work.

Regarding the post-conceptual, we recall Osborne's definition: "it denotes an art premissed [sic] on the complex historical experience and critical legacy of conceptual art, broadly construed in such a way as to register the fundamental mutation of the ontology of the artwork carried by that legacy."[15] Taumoepeau presents her work within a contemporary art context and self-consciously engages with the conditions conceptual art wrought: the ontological crisis that would see the end of art's autonomy. To repeat: *the autonomy of dance as a desired state of the art will not be recovered from this condition*, and I will return to how this dovetails with

Tongan notions of the co-dependence of the arts. Taumoepeau's work is transdisciplinary and telescopic in nature.[16] It is *trans-* or across multiple art forms through which it creates a whole (dance, performance, sculpture, video art, yet always with the skilled body at its center), and references multiple socioeconomic formations (manufacturing, tourism, contemporary art, cultural traditions), practices (culturally specific to Tonga and within the performance art tradition), and discourses (ecological studies, Tongan philosophy, theories of embodiment). And it is *telescopic* regarding, first, *genealogies of practice*, second, *acknowledgement of place*, and third, *the connection to her larger body of work*.

Regarding genealogies of practice, alongside the cultural systems of knowledge that inform the work, Taumoepeau's approach to *The Last Resort* is in the tradition of contemporary activist performance work. This can be traced from Yvonne Rainer's protests against the Vietnam War in *Trio A with Flags* (1970), Carolee Schneemann's *Interior Scroll* (1975), and Ana Mendieta's quieter *Silueta* series (1973-1978) in the twentieth century, through to Tehching Hseih working slightly after those female artists, to more recent work by Indigenous Australian, S.J Norman. As such, her practice also references the history of performance art, including risks to the artist's body in the service of stark political messaging. Turning to acknowledgement of place, Taumoepeau's work is telescopic through her position as "belonging to black Australia," and she places her art in dialogue with local Indigenous and Pacific Rim communities and nations at risk alongside Tonga.[17] She describes how she works on Gadigal land in Sydney, but as first-generation Australian on her mother's side, she spent much time during her childhood in Tonga, and this homeland is directly summoned through the various elements of the work.[18] The venue for *The Last Resort*, Cockatoo Island, is also significant regarding the repression of Australia's First Nations people: a former island prison, it housed some Indigenous inmates, several of whom died, and was home to a Tent Embassy in 2000.[19] Taumoepeau's work in this place keeps alive the many geographic, political, and cultural resonances of these time-space associations.

Regarding the connection to her larger body of work, *The Last Resort* links to Taumoepeau's performance across a series of works that constitute an ongoing practice, including developments, exchanges, and performances in which she works with consistent materials, corporeal methodologies, and concepts. In these ways, *The Last Resort* realizes the conditions of post-dance by challenging the very ontology of art through exceeding

the conditions of autonomy, with no idealized present but with reference to a project that is made up of events, encounters, and activities that overlap and accumulate. The notion that choreography is not reducible to performance, introduced in the work of Shelley Lasica in Case Study 8, is all the more potent here due to the layers of context that framed Taumoepeau and Aloua's corporeal performance on Cockatoo Island. The work is processual, consisting of a durational action that was witnessed and recorded but which connects to Taumoepeau's life work of addressing ecological trauma across geographical and historical terrain, and unfortunately, into the future. This last point regarding the telescopic nature of Taumoepeau's work challenges the terms through which I have been discussing dance as a contemporary art medium.

Taumoepeau has been described by Pacific studies scholar Talei Luscia Mangioni as "one of the most pertinent Oceanian voices on climate change in the Australian art scene today," adding that "the arts are central to resistance in Pacific movement making."[20] Taumoepeau is an engaged activist: she was a delegate for the UNF Climate Change Conference COP13 in 2007, is currently working with 350.org on civil acts of disobedience, and engages in community work supporting young writers and media artists. She believes that "art needs to have a function and make a strong statement," and makes work about "the things that are important to me."[21] Her primary subject matter is the impact of rising sea levels due to thermal expansion on the island nations of Moana Oceania (Pacific). Sea levels have risen fifteen centimeters in the last one hundred years, and in Tonga, "6 millimeters per year, which is double the global average."[22] With a projection of a one-to-four-meter rise by the year 2100 based on the current rate of increase (impacted by changes in greenhouse gas emissions), this could result in Tongans becoming "a nation of climate refugees" with up to 43 percent of the population displaced.[23] As Taumoepeau notes, "[Tongans] are already seeing an increase in tsunamis and king tides and dealing with that on a daily basis."[24] In *Repatriate*, Taumoepeau used her body as a metaphor for a Pacific Island as described and the affect it produces is devastating. She speaks of the urgent threat of displacement:

> When one comes from an island, there is actually nowhere to go. I think the issue I had with making this work is identifying the worst-case scenario and that being the complete submergence of the islands which also means dispossession, loss of culture, loss of language, urbanisation, and the rise of an underclass. Also [the] people that still live on the islands don't want

> to leave their homes, and when they see how countries like Australia treat asylum seekers and refugees there's no way they want to leave their homes. People have said in the past . . . that they refuse to leave: there's no dignity in that type of exodus.[25]

The threat is no less than the obliteration of Taumoepeau's homeland due to international apathy.

Mangioni explains the political conditions that shape Taumoepeau's work through the artist's identity with both her island home of Tonga and her status as a first-generation Australian. She makes clear that the ways in which Taumoepeau's work telescopes and networks is thoroughly intertwined with the artist's cultural position:

> As the largest and wealthiest member of the Pacific Islands Forum, the Commonwealth of Australia, a violent fiction established on the unceded lands of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples, is lamentably a significant arbiter of political decision making for the region. Vastly distinct from its neighbour Aotearoa/New Zealand, Australia, with its majority-settler public and its government with next to no Pacific representation, lacks a Pacific cultural literacy despite its historical relationship to the Pacific and its growing Pacific Islander population . . . I use the term 'Australian apathy' to refer to the calculated mechanisms of obfuscation and deferral successive Australian governments have used since the 1990s to respond to Pacific leaders' demands for climate-change action.[26]

Taumoepeau's "physical insertion into a climate-change visual imaginary . . . with her body deployed at the epicenter," is the result of the condition of her body as co-extensive with the site of national trauma: as Mangioni states, "using her body as what she refers to as the 'primary cultural material' of Oceania, [Taumoepeau] seeks to embody an inclusive pan-Oceanian regional identity that is based on resistance."[27] She combines this primary, corporeal material, in a work like *The Last Resort*, with glass and its connection to sand, pollution, injury, sustenance, and recycling in a politicized model of *material as idea*.

Earlier I mentioned how *The Persistence of Dance* has demonstrated both the challenges and insights made apparent when mapping the development of contemporary dance against equivalent phases in contemporary art. But there are other discursive mismatches in the dance-gallery narrative. Taumoepeau's art has some connection to the "non-dance" aesthet-

ics described in Chapters 4 and 5 in relation to conceptual dance but is more in step with a return to the centrality of the body in recent dance (or post-dance) in the context of a broader material turn in contemporary art described in Chapter 8. If we think about a work like *The Last Resort*, conceptual dance strategies such as simplified performance scenarios, a preoccupation with presence, and "a deep dialogue with visual arts and with performance art" are clear.[28] However, key characteristics such as anti-representation, a critique of visuality and movement, anti-expression, and intense self-reflexivity are at odds with the powerful, embodied activism at the heart of Taumoepeau's work.

There are also limitations to the applicability of the general conditions of the conceptual and post-conceptual or post-dance to *The Last Resort* and other works by Taumoepeau. This is reflected in the artist's own meta-critical relationship with Western contemporary art: "art is a construction: the way it exists and the way I am complicit in it is a white people's thing."[29] She also notes that:

> I don't use terms like 'traditional' and 'contemporary' in my practice. I prefer to look at heritage culture as being part of a time that I am still continuing to practice but through other means that are relevant to where I am. So I think all performance that's generated now is contemporary regardless of when it was choreographed or when it was made.[30]

In this sense, Taumoepeau would consider her work "contemporary" but within a continuity of cultural practice that extends temporally backwards and into the future of the oral culture of the Pacific Islands where disciplinary siloing is less relevant. In this way, and in many others, Taumoepeau's work unravels some of the assumptions that form the foundations of art theory and dance atudies as they have been deployed in this book. The provocation that this book both proposes and opposes—that attempted definitions of dance as a discrete art form is a failed project of the twentieth century—becomes redundant in this (re)turn to non-Western models of choreographic practice. After all, dance has always been a product of context: in real time-space, in performance, in corporeal practices situated and complex, in relation to music, visual art, theater, sculpture, *and culture*. Frames for understanding, interpreting, and evaluating in such a situation are at their most contingent, hinted at here in Susan Best's comment: "Contemporary art now points beyond itself, draws in

other disciplines and often requires extensive contextualisation to make an appropriate evaluation of it."[31]

Taumoepeau's work explicitly resists co-option by the various post-aesthetics when one considers Osborne's discussion of the temporally expansive nature of post-conceptual work, which is often unhinged from specific iterations.[32] While I have argued for Taumoepeau's work as telescopic and processual, this characteristic of the post-conceptual also speaks to a certain transcendent characteristic of much of the work covered in this book up to now. Pieces by Sarah Michelson, Boris Charmatz, Xavier Le Roy, Hassabi, Lasica, Adam Linder, and Agatha Gothe-Snape circulate nationally and internationally, with each work referencing general conditions that are more or less transferable across nations, venues, and their audiences. They travel across borders and into places and spaces that accommodate the movement of artworks through the provision of a "neutral space" (read "white space") and a common understanding of the (white) canon of contemporary art. While Latai's works have also been presented in international museum and gallery spaces and connect with contemporary genealogies of activist and conceptual art as noted, their concept or idea always calls out to another place, her homeland of Tonga, so the work is not everywhere and nowhere, in Osborne's account of the post-conceptual.[33] It may travel everywhere, but it hails from a very specific cultural context which is essential to its work. Taumoepeau states:

> I have a saying, 'The more ancient I am, the more contemporary my work is,' so the way that I make my work is a hundred percent centered around Tongan methodology and systems of knowledge. It's how I make the choices of what I make, but it sits well in a Western construct. It also doesn't have to be *identifiably* Pacific for me. The same body in that work is the same body that gets followed around in shopping malls. So my body reads outside my work as a very specific body from a very specific place.[34]

Taumoepeau's work also addresses a very specific public, not a generic one. As Mangioni notes, "while Taumoepeau's work is multi-sited in its strong aesthetic appeal to diverse audiences, it is not necessarily for the Pacific community but rather for white people who exist around it."[35] Mangioni describes how Taumoepeau stages "ecological crises to invoke affective and emotional responses from Australian audiences" as a call to action and antidote to the apathy Mangioni identifies within Australian

politics.[36] Taumoepeau is targeting specifically white audiences with a political agenda in mind.

The urgency of Latai's political message gives this content a volume within her work that references beyond the formal terms of the work in an explicit way, an element that has not appeared as overtly in the other case studies presented here. The minimising of blatant external references so dominant in Hassabi's, Lasica's, and Linder's work, or the common limitation of such references to disciplinary genealogies such as in the case studies by Gothe-Snape, Michelson, and Charmatz, is replaced in Taumoepeau's work with an absolute orientation to a specific time-place and its political, environmental, and cultural condition. This aspect of the work is a product of her self-described position within a "minority," and as noted in Chapter 1, it forces us to confront the condition of contemporary art and dance as predominantly white.[37] Certain artists' gravitation toward dematerialized and dispersed art since the mid-twentieth century can be seen as an aesthetic strategy that both critiques and renews the market economies of visual art. The juxtaposition of Taumoepeau and Aloua's actions in *The Last Resort* against the overwhelming presence of glass bottles and shards that refuse reduction back to sand emphasized the fragility of "intangible" cultural practices, knowledges, and behaviors not as an aesthetic choice, but as a reality. As Katerina Teaiwa notes:

> In recent years there has been a rapid expansion of climate-change research, journalism and field schools, and scientific adaption and mitigation programs, across Kiribati and other Pacific islands. Few of these consider the precarious status of cultural heritage and knowledge . . . A Pacific song or dance is rarely only an empty form of entertainment—a dance and its accompanying chant may contain centuries of corporeal, social and environmental knowledge reflecting the need for balance between human societies and their natural environments.[38]

And Taumoepeau scholar Maria White writes, "the disproportional force of her body against a rising sea level or a melting glacier is an aesthetic of power imbalance."[39] Taumoepeau herself states, "what are the things that don't survive in forced relocation? It is the most intangible cultural practices that don't survive—the things that are not object-based."[40] The circulation of art objects and cultural artefacts will persist well beyond the susceptible, ephemeral resources in Tonga that depend upon community and place, such as dancing.

Conclusion

The methodology chosen for this book has been in dialogue with paradigms of contemporary art and contemporary dance as they have been theorized by mostly Australian, American, and European artists, curators, and theorists. I have argued for dance as a contemporary art, but what is the future of such a model of contemporary art? The Judson exhibition in 2018 laid bare some difficult facts about American contemporary dance.[41] What had, at the time, seemed like radical, embodied creative practices in relation to a center consisting of male sculptors, Minimalism with a capital "M," major modern dance companies, and established theater venues, was now the white, middle-class birthplace of developments in dance that would influence decades of more white dance. Recalling David Velasco's words quoted in Chapter 3, that the contemporary arts canon "never really worked" for dance, there are layers of inclusion and exclusion that complicate the advocacy-driven thrust of this project.[42] If the alternative status of dance in relation to stable canons/art categories is connected to its responsiveness to specific *contexts* and its emphasis on *process*, the work of an artist like Taumoepeau disrupts the linear trajectories of art historiographies through a powerful co-dependence with the here and now. It is *deeply* contextual and processual, engaging in practices that are wedded to very specific people, places, and cultures. Taumoepeau's work speaks back to the limitations of contemporary art frameworks and places itself within a redressive wave that has its sights on diversifying accessible and visible art and culture. The critique of the male, white canon expressed in Gothe-Snape's *Rhetorical Chorus* is part of a broad wave of feminist, queer, indigenous, and neuro-diverse art that is finally displacing the international dominance of the Western patriarchy. If, as art scholar Pamela Zeplin notes, there is an "acute omission of contemporary Pacific art in Australian museums," this tide is turning.[43]

Conclusion

Persistent Resistance

I begin to conclude with a quote from UK choreographer Jonathan Burrows cited in Case Study 6 because I think it reflects some important things about the condition of contemporary dance as an art medium when it appears among many others. He is discussing Boris Charmatz's *If Tate Modern was Musée de la danse?* at Tate Modern, London, in 2015:

> to somehow keep occupying these spaces that can't be easily identified but live in the body and can be activated anywhere, and as much as we worry that we should be more popular, nevertheless we enjoy this place of privileged deviancy that pulls people in, and has nothing to do with history but is about defiant and intelligent becoming.[1]

Burrows is arguing for the specificity of dance as an art of occupation or inhabitation, an art that demands and takes up space, both real and imaginary. When dancing occurs in museums, gallery space becomes dance space as the dancing brings all of its culture with it; the studio, the theater, the nightclub, the training, the applause. Much of the discourse on the encounter between dance and the museum hinges on the distinguishing practical aspects of dance and proceeds by comparison of spatial/venue conditions; show/rehearsal/practice time versus museum time; floors instead of walls; shared spaces with audiences versus discrete spaces; flagship cultural destinations versus community-embedded dance venues; all of the dancing versus high-art contemporary dance. But at the heart of these discussions is the medium of the dancer as a person. They present in a given work somewhere on the subject-object sliding scale that Xavier Le Roy describes in "Notes on Exhibition Works Involving Live

Human Actions Performed in Public": "we are sometimes more subject than object, and sometimes more object than subject . . . a variable proportion of the two, depending on the circumstances."[2] However, at the end of the day, the art form most often consists of living and breathing people performing "live human actions." In his article, this point leads Le Roy to describe, in detail, the people cost involved in this field of work. Maria Hassabi echoes this when she notes that one of her first questions to curators is regarding the budget, hence the time scale and number of dancers she can work with.[3]

Through their presence, a singular dancer can evoke the many instances of their "becoming" through their practice and training, and the many other contexts and histories of which they are a product. This recalls Mark Franko's comparison of the body archive of the dancer and the object-based museum archive cited in Chapter 5: "the wealth of museum collections is productive of extreme poverty whereas the poverty of dance is productive of extreme wealth."[4] This inversion of accepted terms (the commodifiable art product versus the immaterial dance) is political and claims something back for dance from comparisons that often describe the art form as deficient. It also resonates with Burrows's evocation in the above quote of a community that is international in reach but also minor, a status that conditions all of dance's manifestations.[5]

Burrows underscores the important presencing of dance that actualizes this "wealth" in his use of the Deleuzian term, *becoming*, which philosopher Rosi Braidotti describes as "the affirmation of the positivity of difference, meant as a multiple and constant process of transformation. Teleological order and fixed identities are relinquished in favour of a flux of multiple becoming."[6] In much dance and choreography, arguably more than any other art form, distinctions between practice and product are slippery or suspended. As noted in Chapter 2, staying with process (remaining ongoing, contingent, and unstable) is a fundamental characteristic of the art form. This keeps questions alive for audiences encountering dance in new contexts: What is it that we are seeing? Is it art? A person? A practice? A repeatable choreographic work? An exchange? A duet involving me? A collective dance involving everyone in the space? Did they author the movement? The openness of the form, so often discussed in relation to an apparent a priori social function for dance, is actually this non-linear becoming in shared space-time that enlivens and engages audiences and visitors.

But Burrows's quote is not really about dance in the gallery—it is about *dance*. He speaks from and for the dance community, and paints a picture

of solidarity, knowledges in circulation, agility, mobility, inclusivity, and defiance. Putting dance first, the question must always be asked, is the gallery where *this* dance belongs? This might be a question of affiliation; as Steve Paxton says, his work along with that of many other dance artists "was always related to visual arts," regardless of where it appeared.[7] The question of affiliation or intention, mentioned throughout *The Persistence of Dance*, informs the distinction I seek to make in defining a model of dance as a contemporary art medium. As Hassabi notes, it's a distinct field and it requires some discursive attention and new literacies.[8] Such a definition will be specific and does not encompass the many and varied occurrences of dancing in the museum or gallery, or cross-disciplinary work that brings dance and visual arts collaborators into dialogue. My definition refers to work that first appeared in earnest in the second-wave dance avant-garde in mid-century North America and has been in a deep relation with the conditions of contemporary art as it has globalized, begun to de-colonize, and ranged across unlimited media, bodies, places, spaces, devices, histories, and cultural specificities. This is not a case of visual art subsuming dance but of an expanded notion of contemporary art that acknowledges the complicity of dance and choreography in its formulation since at least the mid-twentieth century. This might be matched to the concepts of post-dance and a-disciplinarity.

I have thus attempted to define, throughout *The Persistence of Dance*, a specific and still emerging field of creative practice and resulting works. Such a field can be defined by negation as a provocation; however, dance as a contemporary art medium may also present in the following forms in some instances:

NOT revisions of stage-based works for gallery spaces
NOT reworks or remounts of historical choreographies
NOT works made for proscenium theaters located in multi-arts centers
NOT choreographic commissions appearing in public programs to address participatory institutional agendas
NOT scores to be enacted by a hired dancer
NOT video documentations
NOT choreographers responding to permanent collections
NOT aligned with performance art which has its genealogy in painting, sculpture and theater.[9]

Such work sometimes appears in galleries and museums, but can also be site-specific, screen-based, publication-based, or community-based.

Some of the most important work in the field takes full account—when relevant—of being sited in contexts designed and traditionally reserved for visual art works, as we have seen in the work of Hassabi, Shelley Lasica, Latai Taumoepeau, and Adam Linder, and historically Trisha Brown and Simone Forti. It expects to be understood and assessed in dialogue with works in other contemporary art media such as painting, sculpture, land art, video art (with which it might also engage directly), and if it addresses its disciplinary affiliations with theater, it does so with the self-reflexivity typical of post-disciplinary art.

One of the important continuities with the mid-century activity in this field is the central role played by critical discourse. As a project, *The Persistence of Dance* began with specific case studies and disciplinary aspects of late twentieth/early twenty-first century art works operating between and across dance and the visual arts. The critical framework emerged in response to the work of the work and engages with various fields of discourse: the *art historical narratives* of major creative developments since the 1950s; *dance analysis* as it has developed since the birth of contemporary dance at the turn of the twentieth century; new *curatorial theory* developing alongside new practices since the 1990s; and both *dance* and *art theory* driven by scholars and artists that is connected to the conceptual turn in the arts more broadly. The project as a whole models an interdisciplinary critical approach in line with an emerging field of scholarship led by largely female academics conversant in both dance and visual arts theory and practices. What has been attempted both here and in the companion book, *Choreography, Visual Art and Experimental Composition 1950s-1970s*, is a mapping of a genealogy that is of major significance to the current condition of the arts.[10] The scope, methodology, and conclusions of *The Persistence of Dance* have addressed our current, critical point in time at the cusp of a new era for the art form when it is well clear of the disciplinary siloing that characterized much of its public profile in the twentieth century. Having mobilized the two major critical frameworks identified by Hal Foster as shaping recent art theory—"on the one hand, the model of a medium-specific Modernism challenged by an interdisciplinary postmodernism, and, on the other, the model of a historical avant-garde . . . and a neoavant-garde,"—I have also signalled the limits of the same as attention turns to the regional, the culturally specific, and the "local models" that avoid being "paradigmatic," exemplified in the work of Taumoepeau.[11] Overall, it is a project that will hopefully generate rigorous responses, counter-arguments, refinements, and revisions.

The state of play for artists such as Sarah Michelson, Meg Stuart,

Lasica, Agatha Gothe-Snape, Linder, Taumoepeau, and Philipp Gehmacher has clearly outstripped both critical discourse and institutional practices. Alongside a continued thickening of critical work on such artists, the most urgent next step is to address the ethical and political aspects of this new field of work that so often interfaces with the museum or gallery as an institution. This includes processes for commissioning, presenting, archiving, acquiring, and collecting such work. With acquisition of choreographic works by a major gallery now underway, various research projects have emerged which address these issues, including *Precarious Movements: Choreography and the Museum*, involving the University of New South Wales, the Art Gallery of New South Wales (AGNSW), Tate UK, National Gallery of Victoria, and Monash University Museum of Art.[12] This project turns its attention to best practice in light of the new demands that choreographic works are making on institutional systems and processes, working with artists as team members, consultants, workshop leaders, commissioned case studies, and anthology contributors.

Finally, what next for the artists and their creative work? Franko and Burrows note that the value—and values—of dance slip away from commodity-based markets to occupy a truly powerful counter-position of resistance, or "privileged deviancy" in Burrows's terms.[13] Franko's idea is that dance creates its own museum in each instance in dancing bodies, thus constituting an "emancipatory procedure" when relocated to the museum, defying history with what Burrows describes as its "intelligent becoming."[14] The body of the dancer thus generates these spaces through action, rather than being activated and mastered by the space. Like a lover who is always just out of reach, dance sometimes seems to dangle possibilities under the nose of the institution only to reveal that it not only lacks commitment to the institution, it will take itself into whatever spaces it requires.

Notes

Chapter 1

1. *Dance* is used in this book to refer to the discipline (historical, institutional, pedagogical, practical); *dancing* is the act of dance by human and non-human performers, choreographed or not.

Choreography refers to the technologies of composition associated with dance historically and currently as it is applied to humans and non-humans, and the phenomena produced whether performed or not.

2. *Contemporary dance* is defined via French dance theorist Laurence Louppe as the art form of the twentieth century that was largely unrelated to the theater dance that preceded it and encompasses various movements, including modern, tanztheater, post-modern, physical theatre, etcetera. So the term is applied retrospectively by Louppe to encompass the entire gamut of dance as an artistic practice across the twentieth century (Laurence Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, translated by Sally Gardner [Alton, Hampshire: Dance Books, 2010], p. 23).

Contemporary as it is applied to art, is defined via art theorists Peter Osborne and Terry Smith as a term first appearing post-Second World War in order to differentiate from "the modern," and being in broad circulation since the 1990s "as a critical, social and historical concept" when it took hold as an alternative to "postmodern." (Peter Osborne, "The Postconceptual Condition Or, the Cultural Logic of High Capitalism Today," *Radical Philosophy* 184 [Mar/Apr 2014]: p. 24; and Terry Smith, *What Is Contemporary Art?* [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009], p. 242). Rather than a consistent set of characteristics, Smith describes "the incommensurate particularity and radical incompleteness that is natural to the contemporary" (p. 253).

3. Julia Robinson, "John Cage and Investiture: Unmanning the System," in *The Anarchy of Silence: John Cage and Experimental Art*, edited by Julia Robinson (Barcelona: Museu d'Art Contemporani de Barcelona, 2009), p. 57n9. Both performance art and the choreographic field under discussion here are distinct "from art theory's interest in a generalized concept of 'theatre' (often linked to the avant-garde via Antonin Artaud, Bertolt Brecht or Samuel Beckett) as an

unwitting provocateur used to map developments in the visual arts in the work of Michael Fried and others" (Erin Brannigan, *Choreography, Visual Art and Experimental Composition 1950s-1970s* [London: Routledge, 2022], p. 21). This experimental lineage of theater produced the field of "contemporary performance" that is also moving into galleries. See Gavin Kroeber's discussion of the "museum as production house" within an "expanded" notion of theater that departs from the "show" model (Gavin Kroeber and Tom Sellar, "Economies of Experience," *Theater* 44, no. 2 [2014]: pp. 126 and 132). While I am arguing for a model of dance that is distinct from performance and theater, see Kate Elswit's *Theatre & Dance* for a counterpoint on the interdependence between certain dance traditions and theater (London: Palgrave, 2018).

4. I am referring here to discourses such as those surrounding the institutional attention given to choreographer Boris Charmatz's provocation, *Musée de la danse*, discussed in Part III.

5. André Lepecki writes in 2017 that "it is . . . important to note that what makes the current new/not-new performative turn in the arts quite an interesting event is the fact that it is essentially a *choreographic* (or *dance*) *turn* . . . the current turn is deeply informed by dance and choreography" ("Dance, Choreography, and the Visual: Elements for a Contemporary Imagination," in *Is the Living Body the Last Thing Left Alive? The New Performance Turn, Its Histories and Its Institutions*, edited by Cosmin Costinas and Ana Janevski [Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2017], p. 12).

6. David Velasco, "The Year in Dance," *Artforum International* 51, no. 4 (2012): p. 99.

7. Carrie Lambert-Beatty, *Being Watched: Yvonne Rainer and the 1960s* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2008); Meredith Morse, *Soft is Fast: Simone Forti in the 1960s and After* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2016); and Susan Rosenberg, *Trisha Brown: Choreography as Visual Art* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2017). See also Brannigan, *Choreography, Visual Art and Experimental Composition 1950s-1970s*, which is a companion to this book. The first volume focuses on the second-wave dance avant-garde, while this one looks at the third, and arguments set out there are carried into this book, hence the many cross-references.

8. The first-wave dance avant-garde that broke with classical ballet at the turn of the twentieth century is referred to peripherally throughout what follows but is beyond the scope of this project. Exchanges with the visual arts in the earlier period amounted to a parallelism where artists rarely took on a medium outside their own to realize works of art, despite aesthetic and formal exchanges across disciplines.

My use of the term *intermedial* interchangeably with *transmedial* follows John Cage's student Dick Higgins's use of intermediality in his 1965 article "Intermedia," and philosopher and Osborne's association of the term with the advanced art of our contemporary situation (Dick Higgins, "Intermedia," in *Horizons: The Poetics and Theory of the Intermedia* [Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1984], pp. 18–28; Peter Osborne, "Survey," in *Conceptual Art*, edited by Peter Osborne [London: Phaidon Press Limited, 2002], pp. 12–51). Higgins's article first appeared in *The Something Else Newsletter* 1, no. 1 (February 1966).

The terms *interdisciplinary* and *transdisciplinary* follow the same logic, telescoping out from the material, creative disciplines to the historical, pedagogical, and institutional disciplines that shape the contemporary arts and their reception.

9. Brannigan, *Choreography, Visual Art and Experimental Composition 1950s-1970s*.

10. Velasco notes in 2017, "the term *choreography* has in recent years detached from dance and, like *curate*, has been abstracted and exported and instrumentalized (gentrified?) for other professional gambits" ("Split City," in *Sarah Michelson*, edited by David Velasco [New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 2017], p. 59. Italics in original.). An example is artist and theorist Edgar Schmitz's project *CHOREOGRAPHIC* (2016-), which imports choreography "into the mainframe of contemporary visual art" to understand "the materiality of composite production," and "as a set of language games playing with deformatting institutional practices" regarding curation and exhibitions ("Choreographic and Free Indirect Speech," accessed October 13, 2022, online: https://art.gold.ac.uk/choreographic/?page_id=225).

11. Smith, *What Is Contemporary Art?*, p. 8.

12. Smith, *What Is Contemporary Art?*, p. 242. Smith cites Peter Timms: "Why does the market have such overwhelming power, even in areas such as government funding and public broadcasting, previously thought to be its foil?" (p. 246).

13. Catherine Wood, "The Year in Performance," *Artforum International* 54, no. 4 (2015): p. 130. Artist Adam Linder also notes, "I think art has always co-opted different disciplines, for better or worse. It's just that at the moment certain properties of dance are appealing to the art world" (David Everitt Howe, "Dance in the Ruins: Trajal Harrell, Adam Linder and Alexandra Bachzetsis on Their Work, Its Institutionalization, and the Art World," *Mousse* 50, October-November [2015]: p. 81).

14. A research project, *Precarious Movements: Choreography and the Museum* (2021-2024), led by myself and involving the Art Gallery of New South Wales (AGNSW), National Gallery of Victoria, Tate UK, and Monash University Museum of Art is confronting the institutional tensions first articulated by commentators such as Andy Horwitz writing in *Culturebot* in 2012 (https://www.unsw.edu.au/arts-design-architecture/our-schools/arts-media/our-research/our-projects/precarious-movements-choreography-museum). It follows other projects such as *Performance: Conservation, Materiality, Knowledge* (https://performanceconservationmaterialityknowledge.com/) and *Dancing Museums* (https://www.dancingmuseums.com/).

15. Brannigan, *Choreography, Visual Art and Experimental Composition 1950s-1970s*, p. 5.

16. Noémie Solomon, "Introduction," in *Danse: An Anthology*, edited by Noémie Solomon (Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2014), p. 20.

17. See, for instance, Jonah Westerman and Catherine Wood, "From the Institution of Performance to the Performance of Institutions," in *The Methuen Drama Companion to Performance Art*, edited by Bertie Ferdman and Jovana Sto-

kic (London: Bloomsbury, 2020), pp. 220-46; Pamela Bianchi, "Choreographed Exhibition/Exhibited Choreography," *Re.bus* 9 (2020): pp. 109-29; Claire Bishop, "Black Box, White Cube, Gray Zone: Dance Exhibitions and Audience Attention," *The Drama Review* 62, no. 2 (Summer 2018): pp. 22-42.

18. Smith, *What Is Contemporary Art?*, pp. 245 and 253; and Claire Bishop, with drawings by Dan Perjovschi, *Radical Museology: or, What's 'Contemporary' in Museums of Contemporary Art?* (London: Koenig Books, 2013), on the anachronic citing Georges Didi-Huberman, p. 20. The history, and limits, of formal analysis in visual art is discussed in Chapter 7 in relation to dance analysis.

19. As we will see in Chapter 4, continuities between the two periods are a point of contention.

20. See, for instance, *Artists in the Archive: Creative and Curatorial Engagements with Documents of Art and Performance*, edited by Paul Clarke, Simon Jones, Nick Kaye, and Johanna Linsley (London: Routledge, 2018).

21. One exception is Parts IV and V where I engage with the work of Osborne who takes an aesthetic-philosophical approach to the contemporary aesthetic context, and where I refer to the philosophical turn in current dance studies in relation to other similar historical moments in its development. In the past, I have most often engaged with philosophy to support my critical work.

22. For more on the recent philosophical turn in dance studies see Erin Brannigan, "Talking Back: What Dance Might Make of Badiou's Philosophical Project," *Performance Philosophy* 4, no. 2 (2018): pp. 1-20. On the Foucauldian turn in dance studies in the 1990s see Nalina Wait and Erin Brannigan, "Body-States and the Site of Authority: The Emancipated Dancer," in *Oxford Handbook of Dance and Competition*, edited by Sherril Dodds (New York: Oxford University Press, 2018), pp. 283-304.

23. Petra Sabisch, *Choreographing Relations* (Munich: epodium, 2011); Derek P. McCormack, *Refrains for Moving Bodies: Experience and Experiment in Affective Spaces* (Durham, NC; London: Duke University Press, 2013); Jenn Joy, *The Choreographic* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2014); Bojana Cvejić, *Choreographing Problems: Expressive Concepts in European Contemporary Dance and Performance* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015); André Lepecki, *Singularities* (London: Routledge, 2016) and *Exhausting Dance: Performance and the Politics of Movement* (New York; London: Routledge, 2006); and Ramsay Burt, *Ungoverning Dance* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017). It should be noted that Deleuze only mentions dance in passing in projects that are not directly related to dance, so dance studies scholars, such as Cvejić, turn to his aesthetic philosophy in his cinema books and beyond, to his philosophy more generally.

24. Smith, *What Is Contemporary Art?,* pp. 245-55.

25. Ralph Lemon, "B-Sides," in *Sarah Michelson*, p. 51. Lemon is an important voice, drawing attention to the racism of contemporary dance in his works such as *Some Sweet Day* (2012) curated for the MoMA Atrium, in which he asked several important artists to respond to the space and his question "what is black music?" (Lemon, pp. 46-47). He also takes this up in his publications such as *Come Home Charley Patton* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2013), which is part of his *Geography Trilogy*. These examples juxtapose American formalism (in the vein of Bruce Nauman and MoMA) with the history of racism

in America, citing the "bad taste" of African-American music and recounting a re-enactment of the Freedom Bus Ride in 1961 with his daughter.

26. Judy Hussie-Taylor, "Curation as Choreography: A Dialogue between Judy Hussie-Taylor and Ralph Lemon," *Theater* 44, no. 2 (2014): p. 108. This is in reference to *Some Sweet Day* (2012).

27. Miguel Gutierrez, "Does Abstraction Belong to White People?," *BOMB* November 7, 2018, accessed April 15, 2019, online: https://bombmagazine.org/articles/miguel-gutierrez-1/. In this article Gutierrez lists various personal encounters with casual and institutional racism and observes, "conversations about racial equity are virtually non-existent in the social and artistic settings I find myself in [in Europe]," but also indicates a lack of address to these issues in American contemporary dance. The same observation could be extended to Australia.

28. See Thomas F. DeFrantz, "Dancing the Museum Black: Activist Animations of the Social," in *Moving Spaces Enacting Dance, Performance, and the Digital in the Museum*, edited by Susanne Franco and Gabriella Giannachi (Venice: Venezia Edizioni Ca' Foscari: 2021), pp. 101–14; and "Dancing the Museum," in *Curating Live Arts: Critical Perspectives, Essays, and Conversations on Theory and Practice*, edited by Dena Davida, Jane Gabriels, Véronique Hudon, and Marc Pronovost (New York: Berghahn Books, 2019), pp. 217–43. DeFrantz also curated *Donald Byrd: The America That Is To Be* (2019/2020) at Frye Art Museum in Seattle, a survey of the career of Bryd since the 1980s (*Donald Byrd: The America That Is To Be*, curated by Thomas F. DeFrantz, Frye Art Museum, Seattle, October 12, 2019–January 26, 2020. This exhibition had daily scheduled performances.).

29. Adriano Pedrosa, Julia Bryan-Wilson, and Olivia Ardui, editors, *Histórias da Dança / Histories of Dance, Vol. 1: Catalogue* (São Paulo: MASP, Museu de Arte de São Paulo Assis Chateaubriand, 2020); and Julia Bryan-Wilson and Olivia Ardui, editors, *Histórias da Dança / Histories of Dance, Vol. 2: Anthology* (São Paulo: MASP, Museu de Arte de São Paulo Assis Chateaubriand, 2020).

30. See Thomas DeFrantz, "Identifying the Endgame," *Theater* 47, no. 1 (2017): pp. 2–15 and André Lepecki, "Decolonizing the Curatorial," *Theater* 47, no. 1 (2017): pp. 101–15. DeFrantz identifies the failure of "inclusive" programming to attract a "black middle-class audience" to North American institutions due to the persistence of an "about" framework rather than a "for" one (pp. 3–13).

31. Peter Bürger, *Theory of the Avant-Garde*, translated by Michael Shaw (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984).

32. Rosalind E. Krauss, *The Originality of the Avant-Garde and Other Modernist Myths* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1986), pp. 157–58. She gives the example of the recurrence of "the grid" throughout the history of avant-garde art, from Kazimir Malevich to Sol LeWitt.

33. Rosalind Krauss, *A Voyage on the North Sea: Art in the Age of the Post-Medium Condition* (New York: Thames & Hudson, 1999).

34. I thank Professor Susan Best for the term "asynchronous" to describe the links between conceptual work across dance and visual art.

35. Mark Franko and André Lepecki, "Editor's Note: Dance in the Museum," *Dance Research Journal* 46, no. 3 (2014): p. 2. The authors are referring to Nauman's *Untitled* (1969), in which he writes, "hire a dancer to perform for 30 min-

utes each day." Some curators are sensitive to the local ecology. Claire Bishop quotes Catherine Wood on the "organic" development of early dance programming at Tate Modern through engagement with young artists interested in dance and choreography ("The Perils and Possibilities of Dance in the Museum: Tate, MoMA and Whitney," *Dance Research Journal* 46, no. 3 [2014]: p. 67).

36. Catherine Damman, "Presence at the Creation," *Artforum International* 57, no. 1 (September 2018), accessed March 12, 2019, online: https://www.artforum.com/print/201807/catherine-damman-on-judson-dance-theater-76332

37. For more on the Neo-Dada artists working across dance and the visual arts see Brannigan, *Choreography, Visual Art and Experimental Composition 1950s-1970s*.

38. The other side of this tendency has seen contemporary visual artists employing dance-based approaches and strategies in much the same way that Robert Rauschenberg and Nauman did in the 1960s. While a survey of such work lies outside the scope of this book, some of those artists would include Tracey Emin, Adrian Piper, Mike Kelly, Anne Imhof, Janine Antoni, Isaac Julien, Kelly Nipper, Nina Beier, Pablo Bronstein, and in Australia, Shaun Gladwell, Daniel Crooks, Kate Murphy, Sally Smart, and David Rosetzky.

39. Alain Badiou says that aesthetic philosophers working with living, contemporary artists also have an advantage: "it is a great victory for a philosopher to incorporate a living artist" because it "creates effects which have more potency" than the interpretation of historical artists (Alain Badiou, "Cinema and Philosophy," Masterclass, University of New South Wales, Sydney, November 27, 2014).

40. Fabián Barba, "The Local Prejudice of Contemporary Dance," *Documenta: Contemporaneities 2* (2016) pp. 46-63.

41. Velasco's *Modern Dance* series includes *Sarah Michelson*, edited by David Velasco (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 2017), *Boris Charmatz*, edited by Ana Janevski (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 2017), and *Ralph Lemon*, edited by Thomas Lax (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 2016). I return to discuss this series in Chapter 3.

42. Julie Ewington, "Situated Reading," in *Agatha Gothe-Snape: The Outcome is Certain*, edited by Hannah Mathews and Melissa Ratliff (Melbourne: Monash University Museum of Art and Perimeter Editions, 2020), p. 22; and Josefine Wikström, *Practices of Relations in Task-Dance and the Event-Score: A Critique of Performance* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2021).

43. Osborne, "The Postconceptual Condition," p. 26.

Case Study 1

1. Ralph Lemon, "B-Sides," in *Sarah Michelson*, edited by David Velasco (New York: MoMA Publications, 2017), p. 44. Michelson commentator David Velasco asserts the artist's commitment to disciplinary critique *and* identification ("1000 words," *Artforum International* 47, no. 9 [2009]: pp. 215-16). Velasco's criticism of the negative response to Michelson's work from dance critics such as Joan Acocella and Alastair Macaulay underlines his position as a post-disciplinary critic for post-disciplinary work. Elsewhere in *Artforum*, Velasco

pays homage to Annette Michelson who is an obvious precedent for his "cross over" into dance criticism; Yvonne Rainer was for Annette Michelson as Sarah Michelson is for Velasco, dance artists whose transmedial vision places their work at the cutting edge of experimentation ("Motion Capture," *Artforum International* 51, no. 1 [2012]: pp. 199-200). In fact, Michelson's attention to Rainer's *Trio A* (1966) set out the terms for its ongoing significance for dance theory ("Yvonne Rainer, Part One: The Dancer and the Dance," *Artforum* January [1974]: pp. 58-59).

2. "Whitney Museum Unveils Design by Renzo Piano for New Downtown Building," accessed March 30, 2019, online: https://www.dexigner.com/news/14766. As noted by Claire Bishop, "choreography was not made an integral part of any [Whitney] Biennial until 2012, when curators Jay Sanders and Elisabeth Sussman dedicated the Emily Fisher Landau galleries, on the fourth floor of the museum, to dance and performance" ("The Perils and Possibilities of Dance in the Museum: Tate, MoMA and Whitney," *Dance Research Journal* 46, no. 3 [2014]: pp. 70-71). MoMA's The People's Studio opened in 2019 and is geared towards "participatory programs" (https://www.moma.org/calendar/groups/7).

3. Gia Kourlas, "Q&A: Sarah Michelson Talks about Her Latest Premiere," *Time Out*, January 16, 2014, accessed March 22, 2019, online: https://www.timeout.com/newyork/dance/q-a-sarah-michelson-talks-about-her-latest-premiere. Michelson's relationship with Kourlas (who declares herself "as beautifully and as stupidly devoted to dance" as Michelson), echoes Jill Johnston's close associations with the experimental performance scene she chronicled. Kourlas provided Michelson with the Balanchine quote that featured in *Devotion Study #1* (Gia Kourlas, "In Reverance to the American Spirit: Early Works by Sarah Michelson," in *Sarah Michelson*, p. 23).

4. This account of the work is drawn from interviews and reviews as cited, and video footage that is no longer available online.

5. *Devotion Study #1* (2011) was followed by *4* (2014) which Bishop describes as "another minimalist work of choreographic endurance (this time involving somersaults)" ("The Perils and Possibilities of Dance in the Museum," p. 71).

6. David Velasco, "I'll Be Your Mirror," *Artforum International* 52, no. 5 (2014): p. 176. Michelson had presented *Daylight (for Minneapolis)* at the Walker Art Center in 2005 and *Dover Beach* at the Chapter Arts Centre, Cardiff in 2008. Her work following *Devotion Study #1, 4*, was even more significant in this regard as Velasco points out: "perhaps, the first theatrical dance work commissioned as a stand-alone exhibition *in* [sic] exhibition space since members of the Judson generation were brought in by the Whitney in the early 1970s" (Velasco, "Split City," p. 73).

7. In 2015 MoMA acquired the rights "to teach, perform, and reconstruct props" for their first choreographic acquisition, aptly Simone Forti's *Dance Constructions* (1960), and pioneered new processes that will be a benchmark for other institutions ("MoMA Collects: Simone Forti's *Dance Constructions*," accessed March 30, 2019, online: https://www.moma.org/explore/inside_out/2016/01/27/moma-collects-simone-fortis-dance-constructions/). The documentation process surrounding this acquisition owes much to the archival protocols of art museums, the department that has traditionally held performance content in

such institutions. This was confirmed in a conversation with Art Gallery of New South Wales archivist Stephen Miller in March 2019, and indicated in the transferal of MoMA's materials relating to a short-lived Department of Dance and Theater Design (1944-1948) to its archive (Kathy Halbriech, "Shall We Dance at MoMA? An Introduction," in *Sarah Michelson*, p. 10). MoMA's Department of Media and Performance Art was instituted in 2009.

8. Marissa Perel, "Gimme Shelter | Talking with Sarah Michelson about 'Devotion Study #1' at the Whitney Biennial," *Arts 21 Magazine* (April 13, 2012), accessed March 30, 2019, online: http://magazine.art21.org/2012/04/13/gimme-shelter-talking-with-sarah-michelson-about-devotion-study-1-at-the-whitney-biennial/#.XC7r_c8zZE4

9. "Sarah Michelson in Conversation with Curator Philip Bither, 2011," Walker Art Center, accessed March 30, 2019, online: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rzdw_0YzXRU

10. Deborah Jowitt, "Walking Backward in Devotion," *DanceBeat* March 2, 2012, accessed January 1, 2019, online: https://www.artsjournal.com/dancebeat/2012/03/walking-backward-in-devotion/. André Lepecki notes that the horizontal position of the arms enacts "one of the infamous 'stress positions' used by so many regimes . . . to inflict pain" (see "Choreopolice and Choreopolitics: Or, the Task of the Dancer," *TDR: The Drama Review* 57, no. 4 [Winter 2013]: p. 24).

11. Perel, "Gimme Shelter," n.p.

12. Velasco, "I'll Be Your Mirror," p. 176. According to Velasco, Michelson's "mythopoetic" references include the work of important American choreographers Twyla Tharp and Merce Cunningham through covert means such as score, qualities of movement, and costume coloring, rather than directly quoting vocabulary.

13. The relationship between conceptual artists and an emerging conceptual form of dance in the mid-twentieth century is also the topic of "Chapter 4: Dance and the Neo-Avant-Garde," in Erin Brannigan, *Choreography, Visual Art and Experimental Composition 1950s-1970s* (London: Routledge, 2022), pp. 132-69.

14. David Velasco describes *Devotion Study #1* (2011) as a "homage" to Cunningham ("I'll Be Your Mirror," p. 174). See also "Sarah Michelson in Conversation with Curator Philip Bither, 2011."

15. Velasco, "I'll Be Your Mirror," p. 174.

16. Velasco and Jowitt reference the sweaty costumes of the dancers. Given the tongue-in-cheek nature of authorial cues in the work, it is ironic that Michelson has been lauded as artist-genius, charged with producing "some of the most significant dance work of the early years of the new millennium" by Velasco, who has edited a MoMA publication on the artist (Velasco, "Split City," p. 59).

17. Lepecki, "Choreopolice and Choreopolitics," p. 24.

18. Lepecki, "Choreopolice and Choreopolitics," pp. 24-25.

19. Michelson states, "I'm always trying to understand what a dance work is" ("Sarah Michelson in Conversation with Curator Philip Bither, 2011").

20. Ralph Lemon, "The Artist's Artists," *Artforum International* 55, no. 4 (December 2016): p. 100. He is referring to Michelson's *tournament* (2015) but the statement could apply to her entire ouevre.

21. David Velasco, "A Room of Their Own," *Artforum International* 50, no. 9 (May 2012): p. 278.

22. Velasco, "Split City," p. 62.

23. Kourlas, "In Reverance," p. 27.

24. Jowitt, "Walking Backward in Devotion," n.p.

25. Ralph Lemon, "Sarah Michelson," *BOMB* #114 (2010), accessed January 4, 2019, online: https://bombmagazine.org/articles/sarah-michelson/

26. Perel, "Gimme Shelter," n.p. Michelson differentiates "'my' audience . . . [who] . . . want to understand what's been made" from "the art-going audience who are very empowered, generally, to take or leave what's around them." Michelson perhaps addressed this in *4* by positioning the dancers in front of the elevator so that the audience could see people enter and leave as part of the work (Velasco, "Split City," p. 75).

27. Velasco, "I'll Be Your Mirror," p. 176.

28. Velasco, "I'll Be Your Mirror," p. 179.

29. "Whitney Stories: Sarah Michelson," accessed January 4, 2019, online: https://vimeo.com/116592122

30. Velasco, "Split City," pp. 62-63 and Kourlas, "In Reverance," p. 24. Michelson states, "I think that undoing the expectations of your own theatrical community are [sic] important" (Velasco, "Split City," p. 62).

31. Perel, "Gimme Shelter," n.p.

32. Jowitt, "Walking Backward in Devotion," n.p.

33. Susan Rosenberg, *Trisha Brown: Choreography as Visual Art* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2017), p. 95.

Chapter 2

1. Shelley Lasica, "Writing the Past Dance Ideologies," *Writings on Dance* 2 (1987): p. 26, italics added. These comments from Lasica are based on an interview she did with Trisha Brown.

2. Lasica, "Writing the Past Dance Ideologies," p. 26n15.

3. The term *experimental composition* is taken from the title of John Cage's most famous course given at New York's New School where he was a member of the faculty from 1956 to 1961; it was renamed from "Composition" to "Experimental Composition" in 1958 (Heather Anderson, "Histories of the New School," accessed April 17, 2020, online: http://newschoolhistories.org/people/john-cage/). Applied to other arts, it refers to the Cagean strategy of repeatedly "confronting the limits that defined the discipline of composing" in a given art form (Julia Robinson, "John Cage and Investiture: Unmanning the System," in *The Anarchy of Silence: John Cage and Experimental Art*, edited by Julia Robinson [Barcelona: Museu d'Art Contemporani de Barcelona, 2009], p. 59).

4. Stephen Muecke, "Motorcycles, Snails, Latour: Criticism without Judgment," *Cultural Studies Review* 18, no. 1 (2012): p. 42. Muecke explains that this phrase has its provenance in the "vitalist" thought or philosophy of Indigenous Australian culture regarding "the maintenance of culture."

5. Muecke, "Motorcycles, Snails, Latour," p. 48. Within the discipline, Susan Melrose calls for a dance "theoretics" that is in tune with "choreographic multi-

dimensional composition, collaboration, and catalysis" through access to the various stages of choreographic production ("Expert-intuitive and Deliberative Processes: Struggles in [the Wording of] Creative Decision-making in 'Dance'," in *Contemporary Choreography: A Critical Reader*, edited by Jo Butterworth and Liesbeth Wildschut [London: Routledge, 2018], p. 33).

6. Laurence Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, translated by Sally Gardner (Alton, Hampshire: Dance Books, 2010), p. 12. An example of an approach to dance as a contemporary art via choreographic elements is Toni Pape, Noémie Solomon, and Alanna Thain's account of their participation in Tino Sehgal's *This Situation* (2007) ("Welcome to 'This Situation': Tino Sehgal's Impersonal Ethics," *Dance Research Journal* 46, no. 3 [2014]: pp. 89-90). Another is Thomas F. DeFrantz in "Dancing the Museum Black: Activist Animations of the Social," in which he describes the "breath" and "gravity" of performing bodies as keys to the value of dancers in museum spaces (*Moving Spaces Enacting Dance, Performance, and the Digital in the Museum*, edited by Susanne Franco and Gabriella Giannachi [Venice: Venezia Edizioni Ca' Foscari, 2021], p. 106).

7. For histories of compositional approaches to dance since the turn of the twentieth century see, for example: Susan Leigh Foster, *Reading Dancing: Bodies and Subjects in Contemporary American Dance* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986); Brenda Dixon Gottschild, *Digging the Africanist Presence in American Performance* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1996); Nancy Reynolds and Malcolm McCormick, *No Fixed Points:* Dance in the Twentieth Century (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003); and Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*. What is still generally lacking is a decentralization of dance composition languages to be inclusive of cultural practices outside the West. African-American scholars such as Dixon-Gottschild and DeFrantz, and anthologies such as *Worlding Dance*, edited by Susan Leigh Foster (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009), and an early corrective, *Meaning in Motion*, edited by Jane Desmond (Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press, 1997), have begun to turn the ship around.

8. While the body cultures referred to in such work had connections to industrial rationalization (e.g., Taylorism) and codification (e.g., the various Modern techniques), the countercultural qualities of nonlinear, corporeal knowledges and modalities would shadow the same and resist assimilation into capitalist frameworks in art, thought, and pedagogy.

9. Alongside the English-language dance artist-theorists and dance theorists listed in Chapter 1, Solomon has edited two anthologies surveying this field with translations from French of key French and Belgian theorists such as Christophe Wavelet, Michel Bernard, Louppe, Isabelle Ginot, Myriam van Imschoot, Julie Perrin, and Isabelle Launay (*Danse: An Anthology* and *Danse: A Catalogue* [Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2014 and 2015]).

10. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, pp. 3-4. For more on Louppe's model of poetics in relation to contemporary dance see Brannigan, *Choreography, Visual Art and Experimental Composition 1950s-1970s* (London: Routledge, 2022) and Erin Brannigan, "Context, Discipline, and Understanding: The Poetics of Shelley Lasica's Gallery-Based Work," *Performance Paradigm* 13 (2017): pp. 97-117.

11. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 4.

12. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 6.

13. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 46.

14. Louppe's work often contains comments such as the following: "there is, in filigree detail, a wide range of body work which still remains to be considered and re-considered again and again: today more so than ever" (Laurence Louppe, "Singular, Moving Geographies: An Interview with Hubert Godard," *Writings on Dance: The French Issue* 15 [Winter 1996]: p. 13).

15. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 70.

16. Sally Gardner, "Practising Research, Researching Practice," *Cultural Studies Review* 18, no. 1 (2012): pp. 143–44.

17. The term *the alternative sciences of contemporary dance* emerged from a discussion among conference panel members Erin Brannigan, Justine Shih Pearson, Julie-Anne Long, and Nalina Wait in preparation for a presentation at the Australasian Association for Theatre, Drama and Performance Studies (ADSA) conference in 2015. For a more detailed account of this lineage see Nalina Wait, *Improvised Dance: (In)Corporeal Knowledges* (London: Routledge, 2023). On this history see also Isabelle Ginot, "From Shusterman's Somaesthetics to a Radical Epistemology of Somatics," *Dance Research Journal* 42, no. 1 (2010): pp. 12–29.

18. Mette Ingvartsen, "EVERYBODYS BERLIN, November 2009," in *Everybodys Group Self-Interviews* (Everybodys Publications, 2009), p. 3. See also *Everybodys Toolkit*, accessed May 4, 2022, online: http://www.everybodystoolbox.net/. Susan Melrose reiterates that dance operates "outside of language" and exemplifies a system that "is neither 'structured like language,' nor is it 'textual' or 'non-textual' (the latter a negative definition) . . . it's [sic] measure is taken from 'dance' and from other performance modes, not from the linguistic/discursive" ("Expert-intuitive and Deliberative Processes," p. 27).

19. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 41.

20. Doris Humphrey, *The Art of Making Dances* (Hightstown, NJ: Princeton Book Company, 1987 [1959]), p. 46.

21. Melrose, "Expert-intuitive and Deliberative Processes," pp. 25–38.

22. Bojana Kunst, "Some Thoughts on the Labour of the Dancer," in *Post-Dance*, edited by Danjel Andersson, Mette Edvardsen, and Mårten Spångberg (Cullberg: MDT, 2017), pp. 130–31. She concludes, "the productive capacity of dance, which is deeply imaginative and poetic, it is an abundant spending of energy and effort through wasteful and utterly ludicrous work" (p. 131).

23. André Lepecki, "Zones of Resonance: Mutual Formations in Dance and the Visual Arts Since the 1960s," in *Move. Choreographing You: Art and Dance Since the 1960s*, edited by Stephanie Rosenthal (Manchester: Cornerhouse Publications, 2011), p. 153.

24. Sally Gardner, "Notes on Choreography," *Performance Research* 13, no. 1 (2008): pp. 55–60.

25. *Motion Bank* was initiated by The Forsythe Company in 2010 and is ongoing. Scott deLahunta leads the project (accessed April 24, 2019, online: http://motionbank.org/).

26. Dorothea von Hantelmann, "When You Mix Something, It's Good to

Know Your Ingredients: Modes of Addressing and Economies of Attention in the Visual and Performing Arts," *How to Frame: On the Threshold of Performing and Visual Arts*, edited by Barbara Gronau, Matthias von Hartz, and Carolin Hochleichter (Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2016), p. 49.

27. Some of the italicized language used here is taken from Jeremy Prynne's "Poetic Thought," which has been influential in my approach here and elsewhere (*Textual Practice*, 24, no. 4 [2010]: pp. 595-606). See Erin Brannigan "Context, Discipline and Understanding," pp. 97-117, for more on Prynne's model of poetic thought and its potential application to dance.

28. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 69. And Laban himself states, "As I was about to start work, to be the first among dancers to speak about a world where language alone is not good enough, I was well aware of the difficulty of this task" (quoted in Karen K. Bradley, *Rudolf Laban* [London: Routledge, 2008], p. 39).

29. William Forsythe, "Choreographic Objects," in *William Forsythe and the Practice of Choreography: It Starts From Any Point*, edited by Steven Spier (London: Routledge, 2011), p. 90.

30. On the cultural and geographical specificity of dance language see Eleanor Bauer and Juliette Mapp, "Edition #1: How Dance Thinks," March 13, 2018, accessed May 5, 2022, online: https://www.uniarts.se/english/about-uniarts/department-of-dance/how-dance-thinks

31. Yvane Chapuis, "Toward a Critical Reading of Contemporary Dance," in *Danse: An Anthology*, p. 138. Literacy across multiple fields of creative practice is de rigueur in the studio; it is a challenge for art historical formulations to keep up.

32. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 17. This can be compared with, say, Lepecki's focus on movement as the traditional basis of dance as a discipline. See André Lepecki, *Exhausting Dance: Performance and the Politics of Movement* (London: Routledge, 2006).

33. Cartesian dualism: "the view that a human being is a composite of two fundamentally different substances, one material (the body) and the other immaterial (the mind or soul)" (Peter King, "Body and Soul," edited by John Marenbon, *The Oxford Handbook of Medieval Philosophy* [New York: Oxford University Press, 2012], p. 1). While Descartes's dualism was a version of a Platonic model of the same, King goes on to say that a "non-reductive materialism" was the main consensus in medieval or pre-modern philosophy (p. 1).

34. Jean-François Lyotard, "Can Thought Go On Without A Body?," translated by Bruce Boone and Lee Hildreth, *Discourse* 11, no. 1 (Fall-Winter 1988-89): p. 78.

35. Gilles Deleuze, *Cinema 2: The Time-Image*, translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Robert Galeta (London: Continuum, 2005), p. 182. Unlike Lyotard, Deleuze acknowledges that "life" extends to the "unthought" or is outside of philosophy.

36. Nalina Wait, *Improvised Dance: (In)Corporeal Knowledges* (London: Routledge, 2023), p. 210.

37. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 39. The practices she mentions here are Pilates, ideokinesis, Feldenkrais, Alexander Technique, contact improvisation, and Butoh.

38. Jefta van Dinther, "Changing (One's Mind)," in *6 Months 1 Location (6M1L)*, edited by Mette Ingvartsen (Everybodys Publications, 2009), p. 52.

39. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 59. There is also an earlier precedent for this sentiment. According to Newhall and Chamberlain, in Wigman's dance philosophy, "dance became the very experience of existence itself, or *Dasein*," after Heidegger (Mary Anne Santos Newhall and F. Chamberlain, *Mary Wigman* [London: Routledge, 2008], pp. 71 and 78).

40. Dominique Brun, Anne Collod, Simon Hecquet, and Christophe Wavelet, "Le Quatuor Albrecht Knust," in *Danse: An Anthology*, edited by Noémie Solomon (Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2014), pp. 37–38.

41. See Erin Manning on dance and attention: "a body must be open to landing in more ways than one. It must attend to its tendency toward habit in order to evolve toward openness-to-invention . . . it must learn to respond not only to actual landings but to virtual forces of cues that don't land . . . it is less being attentive-to than becoming in attention-with" (*Always More Than One: Individuation's Dance* [Durham, NC; London: Duke University Press, 2013], p. 108 and also Chapter 6, "The Dance of Attention").

42. Jane Goodall, "Knowing What You're Doing," *The Performance Space Quarterly* 14 (Winter 1997): pp. 20–23; and William McClure, "Beheaded," *The Performance Space Quarterly* 14 (Winter 1997): pp. 24–26.

43. See, for example, Erin Manning and Brian Massumi, *Thought in the Act: Passages in the Ecology of Experience* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014). But as early as Laban there were concepts of "mobile thinking" to express the knowledges human movement brings to experience more generally (Rudolf von Laban, *The Mastery of Movement*, third edition [Boston, MA: Play Inc., 1971 (1950)], p. 6).

44. Erin Brannigan and Rhiannon Newton, "Propositions for Doing Dancing," *Runway* 36 (2018), accessed April 17, 2019, online: http://runway.org.au/propositions-dancing.

45. Rhiannon Newton, *Doing Dancing* (2017), First Draft Gallery, Sydney, August 2–25, 2017. This gallery-based work incorporated Gertrude Stein's text on Isadora Duncan, "Orta, or One Dancing," into a series of performances and installations over three weeks.

46. Chrysa Parkinson, "Reflecting on Practice," in *6 Months 1 Location (6M1L)*, p. 32.

47. This paragraph is taken from Brannigan and Newton, "Propositions for Doing Dancing," n.p.

48. Louppe citing Godard, "Singular, Moving Geographies," p. 21. The concept of singularity being mobilized here has no connection to Lepecki's use of the term in its Deleuzian sense (via Georges Didi-Huberman) in André Lepecki, *Singularities: Dance in the Age of Performance* (London: Routledge, 2016). There he writes, "[singularity] is not synonymous to the 'unique,' to the 'particular,' to the 'singular,' and even less to the 'individual.' Rather, singularity is 'irreducible, and therefore, a bearer of strangeness' as philosopher of art Georges Didi-Huberman proposes" (Lepecki, *Singularities: Dance in the Age of Performance,* p. 6). The singularity of the dancing body in much dance theory (as opposed to the choreographic event under discussion by Lepecki) has been considered all of these things: unique, particular, irreducible, and strange.

49. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 50.

50. Susan Melrose, "Expert-Intuitive and Deliberative Processes," pp. 31 and 29. Melrose states that she prefers the use of *signature* and *singularity* to *the body* in such discussions.

51. Erin Brannigan, *Dancefilm: Choreography and the Moving Image* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), p. 142.

52. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 23.

53. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 45.

54. For example, Lepecki, *Singularities: Dance in the Age of Performance*, p. 6.

55. Yvonne Rainer, "Interview by the Camera Obscura Collective," in *A Woman Who . . . Essays, Interviews, Scripts* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999 [1976]), p. 144. She says, ". . . the flaw in the ideal of the 'neutral doer.' I wrote that one can't 'do' a *grand jeté*, one has to 'dance' it. Well, neither can one 'do' a walk without investing it with character. From the beginning one of the reasons Steve Paxton's . . . walking people were so effective was that the walk was so simply and astonishingly 'expressive of self'." She is referring to Steve Paxton's *Satisfyin' Lover* (1967).

56. Bojana Kunst, "Subversion and the Dancing Body: Autonomy on Display," *Performance Research: A Journal of the Performing Arts* 8, no. 2 (2003): pp. 61 and 67. "Autonomy thus became the key strategy employed by the body to enter the stage of modernity and disclose its own contemporary flow: it is autonomous yet evasive, self-disclosing yet artificial, an eternally wanted but never touched self-rotating wheel. Not only does this bodily departure to modernity reveal itself as a specific aesthetic strategy, but it is a philosophical, aesthetic, political and ideological utopia; a new possibility of articulating subjective embodiment" (Kunst, p. 62).

57. Jonathan Burrows and Jan Ritsema, "Weak Dance Strong Questions," *Performance Research* 8, no. 2 (2003), p. 32. They quote Spinoza (no ref.): "the recognition of being composed by an ensemble of an infinity of infinite ensembles of extensive parts, inside or outside, which belong to me under characteristic rapports, these characteristic rapports express only a certain level of power which forms my essence, my essence according to me, so to say the essence specific to me."

58. See Nalina Wait and Erin Brannigan, "Body-States and the Site of Authority: The Emancipated Dancer," in *Oxford Handbook of Dance and Competition*, edited by Sherril Dodds (New York: Oxford University Press, 2018), pp. 283-304 for an account of this literature.

59. Michel Foucault, "Utopian Body," in *Sensorium: Embodied Experience, Technology, and Contemporary Art*, translated by Lucia Allias, edited by Caroline Jones (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2006), pp. 229-34. See Mark Franko's commentary on this interview in relation to dance: "Archaeological Choreographic Practices: Foucault and Forsythe," *History of the Human Sciences* 24, no. 4 (2011): pp. 97-112.

60. Kunst, "Subversion and the Dancing Body," pp. 61-68.

61. Kunst, "Subversion and the Dancing Body," p. 63, italics in original. The philosophical tradition she is referring to is Badiou/Mallarmé/Nietzsche, which is discussed in Erin Brannigan, "Talking Back: What Dance Might Make of Badiou's Philosophical Project," *Performance Philosophy* 4, no. 2 (2019): pp.

354-73. Kunst also offers an account of the dangers of this autonomy, citing as an extreme example the exportation of American "(post)modern dance by the American government, as an exemplar of autonomy in dance; a democratic and cultural body of capitalism" (Kunst, p. 64). She also mentions the privileging of Western contemporary dance regarding notions of autonomy, which she links to the stultification of "modern dance": "Western contemporary dance has twisted the potentiality and autonomy of the body, as well as the discovery of the body in-between making it a specific and exclusive privilege" (Kunst, p. 65).

62. Burrows and Ritsema, "Weak Dance Strong Questions," p. 31.

63. Jennifer Lacey, "Jennifer Lacey in Conversation with Mathieu Copeland Gare de l'Est, Paris, 16 October 2010," in *Choreographing Exhibitions*, edited by Mathieu Copeland and Julie Pellegrin (Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2013), p. 127. The collective profile of dance has been mobilized in many contexts. Elsewhere I discuss how curators Carlos Basualdo and Erica Battle use dance as a metaphor for collaboration to frame their exhibition, *Dancing Around the Bride: Cage, Cunningham, Johns, Rauschenberg, and Duchamp* (Erin Brannigan, "Choreography and the Gallery: Curation as Revision," *Dance Research Journal* 47, no. 1 [2015]: p. 5). I also discuss Robert Rauschenberg's attraction to the dance scene as "community" in *Choreography, Visual Art and Experimental Composition 1950s-1970s* and how this shaped his developing aesthetics (Chapter 5, "Choreographic Tools for the Visual Arts," pp. 185-219).

64. Noémie Solomon, "Introduction," in *Danse: An Anthology*, pp. 19-21. In the writing of Erin Manning and, more recently, with Massumi, dance as relational informs a model of aesthetics drawing on the philosophy of Deleuze and his tradition, and theories of affect. See Manning and Massumi, *Thought in the Act*; Manning, *Always More Than One: Individuation's Dance*; and Manning, *Relationscapes: Movement, Art, Philosophy* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2009). Louppe is characteristically succinct on this theme: "the dancing body is a multidirectional geography of relations with oneself, and with the world" (Louppe, "Singular, Moving Geographies," p. 14).

65. Christophe Wavelet, Jérôme Bel, and Xavier Le Roy, "Which Body for Which Collective, Which Collective for Which Body?," in *Peripheral Vision and Collective Body*, edited by Museion Bozen/Bolzano (Bolzano: Museion, 2008), pp. 84 and 116.

66. Wavelet, "Which Body for Which Collective," p. 116.

67. Wavelet, "Which Body for Which Collective," p. 85. Le Roy describes a similar period of isolation, taking on all production roles for his early solo works which was followed by a commitment to working collectively "according to a principle of equality" (pp. 97-98).

68. Wavelet, "Which Body for Which Collective," p. 90.

69. Wavelet, "Which Body for Which Collective," pp. 88 and 95-96.

70. Frédéric Pouillaude, "*Scène* and Contemporaneity," translated by Noémie Solomon, *TDR: The Drama Review* 51, no. 2 (2007): p. 127. Italics in original.

71. Pouillaude, "*Scène* and Contemporaneity," pp. 129-30.

72. Terry Smith, *What Is Contemporary Art?* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009), p. 254. This is elaborated as being distinct for being contemporaneous as he further develops the concept in his writing.

73. Smith, *What Is Contemporary Art?* p. 254.

74. Trajal Harrell, "Trajal Harrell Interviews Himself as Alexandre Roccoli On SHOWPONY June 2008," in *Everybodys Self-Interviews*, edited by Mette Ingvartsen and Alice Chauchat (Everybodys Publications, 2008), p. 49. For more on community in relation to dance work see also *Curating Your Moves: Michael Helland in Conversation with Chrysa Parkinson* (Stockholm: DOCH School of Dance and Circus, Stockholm University of the Arts, 2017), pp. 7–12, and Chapter 1 in the present book on the role of community in Sarah Michelson's work.

75. Catherine Craft, *An Audience of Artists: Dada, Neo-Dada, and the Emergence of Abstract Expressionism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012). On lack of life-work division for dance artists see various texts in Ingvartsen, *6 Months 1 Location (6M1L)*.

76. Parts of this section first appeared in Brannigan, "Choreography and the Gallery: Curation as Revision."

77. Jonathan Burrows, interview with the author, Perth 2012. The longer quote is from "Rebelling Against Limit," in *Danse: An Anthology*, pp. 81–87.

78. Mary Wigman, *The Language of Dance*, translated by Walter Sorrell (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1966), p. 8. The original German edition was published in 1963.

79. Sally Gardner, "Choreography, or Framed Kinaesthetics," in *Framed Movements* (Melbourne: Australian Centre for Contemporary Art, 2014), n.p. Cvejić describes the "coincidence of the source, instrument and site" in the figure of the dancer, and that this fact is central to its specific status among the arts (Bojana Cvejić, *Choreographing Problems: Expressive Concepts in European Contemporary Dance and Performance* [London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015], p. 9).

80. Carolyn Brown, *Chance and Circumstance: Twenty Years with Cage and Cunningham* (Evanstown, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2007), p. 94.

81. Kunst, "Subversion and the Dancing Body," pp. 66–67. Italics in original.

82. Brannigan and Newton, "Propositions for Doing Dancing," n.p.

83. Kunst, "Subversion and the Dancing Body," p. 67. Italics in original.

84. Lepecki, *Singularities*, pp. 36–37. He is quoting José Gil, "Paradoxical Body," in *Planes of Composition: Dance, Theory and the Global*, edited by André Lepecki and Jenn Joy (London; New York; Calcutta: Seagull Press, 2009), p. 89.

85. Laban was clear regarding the participatory nature of dance in relation to its theater context: "In a picture, the mind of the onlooker is invited to go on its way . . . The audience at a play, a mime, or a ballet" is invited into "a real inner participation on his part" (Laban, *The Mastery of Movement*, p. 10).

86. John Martin, "Dance as a Means of Communication," in *What is Dance?*, edited by Roger Copeland and Marshall Cohen (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983), p. 22.

87. Mary M. Smyth, "Kinesthetic Communication in Dance," *Dance Research Journal* 16, no. 2 (1984): p. 19.

88. Susan Leigh Foster, *Choreographing Empathy: Kinaesthesia in Performance* (London: Routledge, 2009), p. 1. See also the *Watching Dance: Kinaesthetic Empathy* research project led by Dee Reynolds and Matthew Reason (accessed November 2, 2022, online: https://gtr.ukri.org/projects?ref=AH%2FF011229%2F1#/tabOverview).

89. Hubert Godard and Suely Rolnik, "Blindsight," in *Peripheral Vision and Collective Body*, edited by Museion Bozen/Bolzano (Bolzano: Museion, 2008), pp. 177-219. See Brannigan, "Choreography and the Gallery: Curation as Revision," for an application of Godard's theories to curatorial approaches to dance and the gallery. And, for an application of these ideas to curatorial theory, see Suely Rolnik, "The Knowing-Body Compass in Curatorial Practices," *Theater* 47, no. 1 (2017): pp. 116-36.

90. Godard and Rolnik, "Blindsight," p. 178.

91. Godard and Rolnik, "Blindsight," p. 180.

92. Godard and Rolnik, "Blindsight," pp. 180-83.

93. Godard and Rolnik, "Blindsight," p. 204.

94. Godard and Rolnik, "Blindsight," p. 201. Godard applies this to the way Clark positions the spectator *among* the physical elements of the work: "what I like too, is that she uses what we call the sixth sense; the sense of posture, the sense of the movements of one's own body, which she constantly uses to modify the rest too . . . all the ways we have of changing the posture of sight . . . I say posture, for sight is necessarily borne of the other senses and, notably, of physical posture. If I manage to completely change the universe of posture, the posture of sight will change too" (Godard and Rolnik, "Blindsight," p. 208).

95. Godard and Rolnik, "Blindsight," p. 208.

96. Godard and Rolnik, "Blindsight," pp. 196-98.

97. Lucy Lippard, *Six Years: The Dematerialization of the Art Object from 1966 to 1972* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997); Amelia Jones, *Body Art: Performing the Subject* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998); Nicolas Bourriaud, *Relational Aesthetics* (Paris: Les Presses du Réel, 2002); Claire Bishop, ed., *Participation: Documents of Contemporary Art* (London: Whitechapel Gallery and the MIT Press, 2006); Claire Bishop, *Artificial Hells: Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship* (London: Verso, 2012); Susan Best, *Visualizing Feeling: Affect and the Feminine Avant-Garde* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2014). Kirsten Maar talks about the participation of audiences through watching and being watched in gallery contexts (Kirsten Maar, "Exhibiting Choreography," in *Assign and Arrange: Methodologies of Presentation in Art and Dance*, edited by Maren Butte, Kirsten Maar, Fiona McGovern, Marie-France Rafael, and Jörn Schafaff [Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2014], p. 106). I like this subtle notion of the term which could be applied to Forti, Lasica, Linder, etcetera.

98. Parts of this section appeared in Erin Brannigan, "Context, Discipline and Understanding," pp. 97-117.

99. See Melrose, "Expert-Intuitive and Deliberative Processes," pp. 36-37 for an account of this view of process in dance, and the challenges this poses to the expert outsider regarding access and understanding (and the resulting impact on dance studies).

100. Parkinson, "Reflecting on Practice," p. 31.

101. See, for instance, my discussion of curator Mathieu Copeland's use of choreography as a metaphor for curation in Chapter 3. In Cvejić's work on proceduralism and dance she notes, "I registered three fields where choreography serves as a technical term (since 2000): molecular biology, information tech-

nology, and diplomacy" (Bojana Cvejić, "Proceduralism," in *Parallel Slalom: A Lexicon of Non-Aligned Poetics*, edited by Bojana Cvejić and Goran Sergej Pristas [Belgrade and Zagreb: Walking Theory—TkH, 2013], pp. 239-40).

102. Cvejić, "Proceduralism," p. 240. Kunst links this interest in process to neoliberal models of labour and changes in dance "which demands a public genealogical critique of his or her labour and permanent exposition of the methods of work, processes and approach to movement" (Kunst, "Some Thoughts on the Labour of the Dancer," p. 125).

103. Chrysa Parkinson, "We Make Up What Matters to Us," *The Dancer as Agent Conference* website, November 23, 2013, accessed April 20, 2022, online: http://oralsite.be/pages/Dancer_As_Agent_About/

104. Parkinson, "Reflecting on Practice," pp. 24-25 and 29.

105. Sally Gardner agrees with this definition of practice: "Practices involve doing things, often without any intention of getting results, if results are evidence of things that already have a name. This openness inheres in 'the live,' the corporeal, the somatic aspects of practices" (Gardner, "Practising Research, Researching Practice," p. 141).

106. Parkinson, "Reflecting on Practice," p. 26. Parkinson would disagree, making a distinction between training (which is "about learning and improving on specific tasks . . . You're goal-oriented") and practice which, "for the most part, is independent of teachers, and intensely subjective" (Parkinson, p. 31).

107. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 76.

108. Alain Badiou, *Handbook of Inaesthetics*, translated by Alberto Toscano (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2005), pp. 59-60.

109. Paxton, cited by Gardner, "Notes on Choreography," p. 57.

110. Vivian Sobchack states, "intentionality (in life as in dance) is motility" ("Choreography for One, Two, and Three Legs [A Phenomenological Meditation in Movements]," *Topoi* 24 [2005]: p. 57).

111. Megan V. Nicely, "Dancer Walks Away Unscathed: Or, How to Survive a Dance," *PAJ* 114 (2016): p. 66.

112. "The Dancer as Agent," *The Dancer as Agent Conference* website. The conference was curated by Kristine Slettevold, Chrysa Parkinson, and Cecilia Roos at the University of Dance and Circus, Stockholm.

113. Parkinson, "We Make Up What Matters to Us," n.p.

114. Jonathan Burrows, "Body Not Fit for Purpose," *Performance Research* 20, no. 5 (2015): p. 82. He is referring to this and another article written for *Performance Research* in 2003, and the related works. Burrows referred to dance as unstable at an artist's talk I attended at *Lightmoves Festival of Screendance*, Limerick, Ireland (November 2016). His sentiments echo William Forsythe on choreography as "an environment of grammatical rule governed by exception, the contradiction of absolute proof visibly in agreement with the demonstration of its own failure" ("Choreographic Objects," p. 90).

Case Study 2

1. Parts of this section were first published in Erin Brannigan, "Choreography as Concept, Dancing as Material," *Performance Research ON (UN)KNOWNS* 26, no. 2 (2021): pp. 24-31.

2. Bart De Baere and Charles Esche, "Exhibitions Histories Talk: Bart De Baere," *Afterall Online*, accessed December 4, 2018, online: https://www.afterall.org/online/exhibition-histories-talks-bart-de-baere-video-online#.XAXXVRMzaAx. The exhibition *Traffic*, curated by Nicolas Bourriaud two years later in 1996 at CAPC Musée d'Art Contemporain de Bordeaux, is considered by some to be the first relational aesthetics exhibition (and Bourriaud coined the term) but De Baere regards it as "the beginning of the end" ("Exhibitions Histories Talk: Bart De Baere"). *This Is the Show and the Show Is Many Things / Extra Muros*, Museum of Contemporary Art, Ghent, curated by Bart De Baere, September 17-November 27, 1994. The exhibition included other choreographers Donna Uchizono and Christine De Smedt, and artists Jan-Erik Andersson, Wouter van Riessen, Kari Juutilainen, Daniel Faust, Amos Hetz, Damaged Goods, Louise Bourgeois, Henrietta Lehtonen, Claire Roudenko-Bertin, Anne Decock, Eran Schaerf, ManfreDu Schu, Jason Rhoades, Uri Tzaig, Fabrice Hybert, Suchan Kinoshita, Luc Tuymans, Maria Roosen, and Mark Manders. Participants in Stuart's work were Adrienne Altenhaus, Florence Augendre, Lieve Cuisinier, Igor De Baecke, Sigrid De Baecke, Marian De Coninck, Peter De Rouck, Christine De Smedt, Els de Wachter, Marc Dewit, Anna Drijbooms, Dulcinea Elens, David Freeman, Paul Gazzola, Lisa Gunstone, Leen Gyselinck, Kaat Gysen, David Hernandez, Jos Kuypers, Benoît Lachambre, Caro Lambert, Lawrence Malstaf, Lilia Mestre, Agnes Moors, Leen Ochelen, Fien Sulmont, Steffi Thuysbaert, Katrien van Aerschot, Hans Van den Broeck, Paul Van Hool, Gerd Van Looy, Marianne Verschooris, and Philippe Weiler. The company gave me access to a protected video link by an unknown videographer.

3. "This Is the Show and the Show Is Many Things / Extra Muros," accessed December 4, 2018, online: http://www.damagedgoods.be/this-is-the-show-and-the-show-is-many-things. Themes of public versus private, subjectivity and identity, spectatorial labour, radical movement forms, repetition, image-making, and violence persist in her ongoing body of work.

4. Rudi Laermans, *Moving Together: Theorizing and Making Contemporary Dance* (Amsterdam: Valiz, 2015), p. 19. Italics in original.

5. Meg Stuart, "In Pieces," in *Are We Here Yet? Damaged Goods and Meg Stuart*, edited by Jeroen Peeters (Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2010), p. 118.

6. De Baere and Esche, "Exhibitions Histories Talk: Bart De Baere," n.p.

7. Meg Stuart, "Dear Ann Hamilton," in *Are We Here Yet?*, p. 81. We will see a similar fascination with recalibrating the dance audience's position in relation to the dancers in Maria Hassabi's work in Case Study 9.

8. "This Is the Show and the Show Is Many Things / Extra Muros," n.p.

9. "This Is the Show and the Show Is Many Things / Extra Muros," n.p.

10. André Lepecki, "Dramaturging: A Quasi-objective Gaze on Anti-memory [1992-98]," in *Are We Here Yet?*, p. 64.

11. Lepecki, "Dramaturging," p. 68.

12. Stuart, "Dear Ann Hamilton," p. 81. She goes on to say that art would thus gain a temporal dimension, and the dance "would become a fixed image." The result of her collaboration with Ann Hamilton was *Appetite* (1998) in which "the whole theatre was made into a big sculpture" (Lepecki, "Dramaturging," p. 71). *Splayed Out Mind* (1997) was a work with installation artist Gary Hill and *Insert Skin #1—They Live in Our Breath* (1996) was a collaboration with performance

artist Lawrence Malstaf. Stuart writes that "the precision of Gary's video images challenged me to work more minimally than I had done previously. Each action is stripped to a single image. Every movement is measured" (Stuart, "In Pieces," p. 120). *No One is Watching* (1995) is a slightly earlier collaboration with artist Lawrence Carroll.

13. Stuart, "Meeting Foreign Languages," in *Are We Here Yet?*, p. 83.

14. "*knots and then,*" accessed February 23, 2023, online: https://www.damagedgoods.be/en/knots-and-then

15. "*rune*," accessed March 20, 2022, online: https://www.damagedgoods.be/en/rune. *rune* (2021), premiered at *Sculpture Festival*, curated by Carolin Brandl and Hanno Leichtmann, Georg Kolbe Museum, Berlin, October 10, 2021. Credits: performers Meg Stuart and Sigal Zouk, musician Klaus Janek.

16. Meg Stuart and Varinia Canto Vila, *confirm humanity* (2022), premiered at *Lifes* exhibition, curated by Aram Moshayedi and Robert Soros with Nicholas Barlow and dramaturgy by Adam Linder, Hammer Museum, Los Angeles, March 8-13, 2022, hourly 2.45-6pm.

17. Stuart, "Meeting Foreign Languages," p. 82. She goes on to describe her interest in the historical, intermedial collaborations covered in Chapters 4 to 7.

18. Jeroen Peeters, *Through the Back: Situating Vision between Moving Bodies* (Helsinki: Theatre Academy of the University of the Arts Helsinki, 2014), p. 92.

19. Peeters, *Through the Back*, p. 108.

20. Peeters, *Through the Back*, p. 97. Peeters refers to this as a "mental theatre," p. 99.

Chapter 3

1. *13 Rooms*, curated by Hans Ulrich Obrist and Klaus Biesenbach, Kaldor Public Art Project #27, Pier 2/3, Sydney, April 2013. Parts of sections 3.1 and 3.2 of this chapter first appeared in Erin Brannigan, "Choreography and the Gallery: Curation as Revision," *Dance Research Journal* 47, no. 1 (2015): pp. 5-25.

2. Hans Ulrich Obrist and Klaus Biesenbach, "Curator's Talk," *13 Rooms*, April 11, 2013, Pier 2/3, Sydney. See participant Rebecca Hilton's comments on the role of the dancers in this exhibition (Rebecca Hilton, "DANCERNESS," *Performance Paradigm* 13 [2017]: p. 196).

3. See Abigail Levine, "Being a Thing: The Work of Performing in the Museum," *Women & Performance: A Journal of Feminist Theory* 23, no. 2 (2013): 291-303, on these debates as they emerged in North America.

4. *Yvonne Rainer: Radical Juxtapositions 1961-2002*, curated by Sid Sachs, the Rosenwald-Wolf Gallery, University of the Arts, Philadelphia, October 19-November 30, 2002; and *Dancing Around the Bride: Cage, Cunningham, Johns, Rauschenberg, and Duchamp*, curated by Carlos Basualdo and Erica Battle with a mise en scène by artist Philippe Parreno, Philadelphia Museum of Art, October 2012-January, 2013, and the Barbican, London, February 14-June 9, 2013. See also: *Trisha Brown: Danse précis de liberté*, curated by Corinne Diserens, Centre de la Vieille Charité, Marseille, July 20-September 27, 1998; *Trisha Brown: Dance and Art in Dialogue 1961-2001*, curated by Hendel Teicher, Addison Gallery of American Art at Phillips Academy in Andover, Massachusetts, and the Tang Teaching Museum, February 1-June 1, 2003; *Performance 2: Simone Forti*,

curated by Klaus Biesenbach and Jenny Schlenzka, MoMA, New York, March 7-8, 2009; *Off the Wall: Part 2—Seven Works by Trisha Brown*, curated by Chrissie Iles, Anne and Joel Ehrenkranz, and Limor Tomer, The Whitney, New York, September 30-October 3, 2010; *Laurie Anderson, Trisha Brown, Gordon Matta-Clark: Pioneers of the Downtown Scene New York 1970s*, curated by Lydia Yee, the Barbican, London, March 3-May 22, 2011; *Yvonne Rainer: Space, Body, Language*, curated by Dr. Barbara Engelbach and Yilmaz Dziewior, Museum Ludwig, April 28-July 29, 2012; *Yvonne Rainer: Dances and Films*, Getty Research Institute, May 27-October 12, 2014; *Yvonne Rainer: Dance Works*, curated by Catherine Wood, Raven Row Gallery, London, July 11-August 10, 2014; and *Simone Forti: Thinking with the Body. A Retrospective in Motion*, curated by Sabine Breitwieser, with Katja Mittendorfer-Oppolzer, Museum der Moderne, Salzburg, July 18-November 9, 2014. See Claire Bishop, "The Perils and Possibilities of Dance in the Museum: Tate, MoMA and Whitney," *Dance Research Journal* 46, no. 3 (2014): pp. 62-76; and Brannigan, "Choreography and the Gallery," for a further overview of this curatorial activity.

5. *Judson Dance Theater: The Work is Never Done*, curated by Ana Janevski, Thomas J. Lax, and Martha Joseph, MoMA, New York, September 16, 2018-February 3, 2019. I did not attend this exhibition so am reliant on reports from colleagues, along with the publications and discourse surrounding the event.

6. A colleague noted the corrective measures used to frame some of the events with hosts and facilitators such as African-American choreographer Ishmael Houston-Jones, and special events such as a music video session with Tanisha Scott. Another point worth making is that a rigorous account of one set of minored artists in a given period (a status I would claim for the dance artists around Judson) opens space for other counter histories that run parallel to them, a project begun by Ramsay Burt in *Judson Dance Theater: Performative Traces* (London: Routledge, 2006), which gives special attention to queer artists and camp aesthetics within the Judson scene.

7. For one account of this history see Erin Brannigan, *Choreography, Visual Art and Experimental Composition 1950s-1970s* (London: Routledge, 2022).

8. David Velasco, "Preface," in *Sarah Michelson*, edited by David Velasco (MoMA Publications), p. 7. When Ralph Lemon asked Michelson how she felt about her work being presented in this atrium space in his program *Some Sweet Day* (2012), she replied, "it was amazing to experience the wind of the canon blow me and Nicole [Mannarino] to smithereens" (Ralph Lemon, "B-Sides," in *Sarah Michelson*, p. 54).

9. Isabelle Ginot, "A Common Place," in *Danse: An Anthology*, edited by Noémie Solomon (Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2014), p. 169. Ginot is writing in 2003 about the comparison between conceptual art and conceptual dance addressed in Chapter 6.

10. Regarding the modern/post-modern terminology debate, see Susan Manning, "Modernist Dogma and Post-Modern Rhetoric: A Response to Sally Banes' 'Terpsichore in Sneakers'," *Tulane Drama Review* 32, no. 4 (1988): pp. 32-39 and Sally Banes and Susan Manning, "Terpsichore in Combat Boots," *Tulane Drama Review* 33, no. 1 (Spring, 1989): pp. 13-16.

11. Velasco argues that the "tendentious" title of his series for MoMA, *Mod-*

ern Dance, is an unashamedly market-focused alignment of the series to its institutional home. He then goes on to justify it on aesthetic grounds, citing the artists' (to date Lemon, Michelson, and Boris Charmatz) critique of disciplinarity, subversive tactics, authorial assertion, and use of spectacle as being aligned with a dance modernism that includes Martha Graham and Rainer ("Preface," pp. 7–8).

12. See Brannigan, *Choreography, Visual Art and Experimental Composition 1950s-1970s* on dance as an undisciplined discipline: "Australian dance theorist Elizabeth Dempster argues that dance happily suffers from a lack of *disciplinary assertiveness*, producing *an undisciplined discipline* that is generative of 'unregulated' knowledges and processes. What does it mean to claim dance as lacking assertion? What would it mean to embrace this disciplinary humility, this quality of being unwilling to stand one's ground over or above something else, essentially a non-competitive attitude?" (p. 15).

13. See Claire Bishop and Terry Smith, "Museum Models, Radical Spectatorship," in *Talking Contemporary Curating*, edited by Terry Smith (New York: Independent Curators International, 2015), p. 144. The most fierce and articulate critique of this tendency is from Buren whose 1972 *Documenta 5* catalogue contribution, "Exhibition of an Exhibition," was updated in "Where are the Artists?," a response to Jens Hoffmann's provocation for an e-Flux event in 2003-2004, *The Next Documenta Should be Curated by an Artist* ("Exhibition of an Exhibition," *Documenta 5* catalogue [Kassell: Germany, Documenta GmbH, 1972], s17, p. 9; and "Where Are the Artists?," in *The Next Documenta Should be Curated by an Artist*, edited by Jens Hoffmann [Frankfurt: E-Flux/Revolver, 2004], accessed November 2, 2022, online: http://projects.e-flux.com/next_doc/d_buren_printable.html).

14. Jonathan Burrows, "Keynote Address for the Postdance Conference in Stockholm," in *Post-Dance*, edited by Danjel Andersson, Mette Edvardsen, and Marten Spångberg (Stockholm: MDT, 2017), p. 91.

15. Daniel Buren, "The Function of the Studio," *October* 10 (1979): pp. 51–58.

16. Buren, "The Function of the Studio," p. 53.

17. See note 5, Chapter 1. While not as pronounced, performance studies notes that experimental performance is gaining attention in galleries and their critical discourses. See Adrian Heathfield, *Out of Now: The Lifeworks of Tehching Hsieh* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2009) in which he writes: "concurrently a broad stream of contemporary art practice has taken a 'performative turn' toward live, *ad hoc*, itinerant, process-based, participatory and relational expressions. This has lead to a revivification of performance and a mining of Performance Art's histories and meanings" (p. 13).

18. For details of the extent of dance programming at MoMA, Tate Modern, and The Whitney, see Claire Bishop, "The Perils and Possibilities of Dance in the Museum," pp. 62–76.

19. See the special issues of *Theater* 44, no. 2 (2014), "Performance Curators" and *Theater* 47, no. 1 (2017), "Curating Crisis," as well as the earlier *Frakcija Magazine for Performing Arts*, no. 55 (2010), "Curating Performing Arts," and the

more recent *Curating Live Arts: Critical Perspectives, Essays, and Conversations on Theory and Practice*, edited by Dena Davida, Jane Gabriels, Véronique Hudon, and Marc Pronovost (New York: Berghahn Books, 2019). The details of these discussions are beyond the scope of this work which, as noted in Chapter 1, only touches on the fields of museum and curatorial studies.

20. Jérôme Bel, quoted in "Jérôme Bel and Boris Charmatz: Emails 2009-2010," in *Danse: An Anthology*, pp. 245-46. Charmatz echoes this sentiment regarding the desire coming *from* the museum: "The dancing museum has been invented to avoid having to wonder how to respond to the invitation extended by the museums to living art" (Marcella Lista, "Play Dead: Dance, Museums, and the 'Time-Based Arts,'" *DRJ* 46, no. 3 [2014]: p. 7).

21. Yvonne Rainer, "Some Random Ruminations on Value," MoMA, accessed August 10, 2015, online: https://www.moma.org/d/pdfs/W1siZiIsIjIwMTUvMTAvMzAvYnlqZnJmNmRuX1lSVmFsdWVTdGF0ZW1lbnQucGRmIl1d/YRValueStatement.pdf?sha=2c5003c925c62e45. This article was written in association with Rainer's work, *The Concept of Dust, or How Do You Look When There's Nothing Left to Move?*, The Werner and Elaine Dannheisser Lobby Gallery, fourth floor, MoMA, New York, June 9-14, 2015.

For another perspective on the limitations and attractions of the gallery, see choreographer Mette Edvardsen: "When I started making my own work, it felt important to insist and remain within the field of dance and choreography, which was not yet so expanded. But there was an infatuation with the visual arts going on, and what I was doing 'looked like' it could be visual arts. I was handling objects in space, working with perspective, details, colours and simple actions. Sure I could perform my pieces in galleries or museums, and I did. But it was important to me to not place my work within the visual arts, and like this to be defined as something else, and instead to widen the notion of what dance could be" ("The Picture of a Stone," in *Post-Dance*, p. 219). Edvardsen appeared in the dance-focused 2016 Biennale of Sydney, but not in galleries.

22. *Dancing, Seeing / Tanzen, Sehen*, curated by Eva Schmidt, Museum für Gegenwartskunst Siegen, Germany, February 18-May 28, 2007. The historical approach included Douglas Gordon and Dan Graham alongside Felix Gonzalez-Torres and Antonia Baehr (*Tanzen, Sehen* catalogue, edited by Eva Schmidt [Frankfurt am Main: Revolver, 2007]).

23. Email correspondence with the author, August 27, 2013. Translation: a "desperate desire of the museum for dance."

24. Bishop, "The Perils and Possibilities," p. 67. Wood was promoted, in 2022, to Director of Programme at Tate, indicating how central dance and performance have become to the institution's core business.

25. Block Universe performance art festival, director Louise O'Kelly (http://blockuniverse.co.uk/about/), Performance Exchange platform, director Rose Lejeune (https://www.performance-exchange.org/about/), Something Great Collection, associate co-director Julia Asperska (https://somethinggreat.de/Something-Great-Collection), and If I Can't Dance, I don't want to be part of your revolution in Amsterdam (https://ificantdance.org/).

26. Gertrude Contemporary (https://gertrude.org.au/); West Space (https://westspace.org.au/); Firstdraft (https://firstdraft.org.au/); and Artspace (https://www.artspace.org.au/).

27. *What I Think About When I Think About Dancing*, curated by Emma Saunders and Lisa Havilah, Campbelltown Arts Centre, November 16, 2009-January 2, 2010. Havilah writes, "contemporary art centres that sit within suburban contexts provide the greatest level of opportunity for the development and application of new models of contemporary curatorial practice" (Lisa Havilah, "[untitled]," in *What I Think About When I Think About Dancing*, edited by Lisa Havilah, Emma Saunders, and Susan Gibb [Campbelltown: Campbelltown Arts Centre, 2009], p. 21). Agatha Gothe-Snape cites this as a pivotal juncture in her development, and many other artists included in the exhibition—The Brown Council, The Fondue Set, Kate Murphy, The Kingpins—have gone on to lead transmedial approaches in the Sydney contemporary art scene.

28. Hannah Mathews curated *Action/Response* in 2013 (https://www.artshouse.com.au/events/actionresponse/), *Framed Movements* (Australian Centre for Contemporary Art, Melbourne, October 10-November 23, 2014), and *ACCA in the City* in 2015 (https://acca.melbourne/exhibition/acca-in-the-city/). In 2022 she curated the first exhibition of Lasica's work at Monash University of Modern Art in Melbourne, *WHEN I AM NOT THERE*, an innovative model of "performance-exhibition" discussed briefly in Case Study 5 and which toured to the Art Gallery of New South Wales (AGNSW) in 2023.

29. These included *Choreography and the Gallery One-Day Salon* at AGNSW, April 27, 2016, facilitated by myself and co-organized with Melissa Ratliff.

30. See the Kier Choreographic Award, accessed August 20, 2020, online: https://thekeirfoundation.org/project/keir-choreographic-award-2020/. The inclusion of non-choreographers in the competition led local dance artist and theorist Julie-Anne Long to describe an "underrepresentation of dance-in-dance" (Julie-Anne Long, "Sometimes a Seam, Sometimes a Disconnect," *Real-Time* 119, February/March [2014]: p. 24, accessed June 24, 2014, online: http://www.realtimearts.net/article/issue119/11464). She continues: "Once again there is a crack where it appears that the gap between choreographic ideas and choreographic craft has widened" (p. 24).

31. Bojana Cvejić is one such critic: "the current second performance turn in visual art consists of accommodating and adapting already existing works of dance and performance for the purpose of enhancing audience participation. This is part of a larger condition of total aestheticization of consumer-capitalist life, where art is a potent instrument" ("Bojana Cvejić Interview by Christina Schmid," *The Third Rail Quarterly*, 11 [2017]: p. 5). Curator Hélène Lesterlin has a refreshing take on this argument: "artists whose work is based in the live presence of the human body performing dance-based, non-virtuosic, non-narrative, and unintelligible (to most people) movement is not exactly going to bring in the crowds" ("Dance and the Museum: Helene Lesterlin Responds," *Critical Correspondence* (May 5, 2014), accessed October 13, 2022, online: https://movementresearch.org/publications/critical-correspondence/dance-and-the-museum-helene-lesterlin-responds).

32. Catherine Wood, "The Year in Performance," *Artforum International* 54,

no. 4 (2015), p. 130. She is referring to Hal Foster's *Bad New Days: Art, Criticism, Emergency* (Brooklyn: Verso, 2015). See also Benjamin Buchloh, "Rock Paper Scissors," *Artforum* (Sept 2017), accessed April 20, 2022, online: https://www.artforum.com/print/201707/benjamin-h-d-buchloh-on-some-means-and-ends-of-sculpture-at-venice-muenster-and-documenta-70461

33. Bojana Cvejić, *Choreographing Problems: Expressive Concepts in European Contemporary Dance and Performance* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), p. 8, citing Stewart Martin, "The Absolute Artwork Meets the Absolute Commodity," *Radical Philosophy* 146 (2007): pp. 17–25 and "The Subsumption of Art under Capital," in *Aesthetics and Contemporary Art*, edited by Armen Avanessian and Luke Skrebowski (Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2011), pp. 146–57.

34. Wood, "The Year in Performance," pp. 129–30. As an example of visual arts "rapacious consumption," see star curator Hans Ulrich Obrist on absorbing dance into the exhibition mode: "Diaghilev believed you could bring everything together in ballet; along with Stravinsky, Braque, Picasso, Gontcharova, and Popova, he invented a kind of *Gesamtkunstwerk* . . . this *Gesamtkunstwerk* is possible today through the exhibition where you can incorporate all disciplines. So yes, I think the future is the exhibition" ("Hans Ulrich Obrist in conversation with Mathieu Copeland: The Fragility of Exhibitions, Stroll in Hyde Park, London, 31 October 2011," in *Choreographing Exhibitions*, edited by Mathieu Copeland and Julie Pellegrin [Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2013], p. 173).

35. On the recurrence of dance appearing in the (actual) footnotes of art history and theory as an influence on contemporary art's evolution and its subsequent "minoring" see Brannigan, *Choreography, Visual Art and Experimental Composition 1950s–1970s*, p. 2.

36. Yvonne Rainer, "Responses: 4," in *BMW TATE LIVE: If Tate Modern was Musée de la danse?*, accessed April 12, 2022, online: https://www.tate.org.uk/documents/998/if_tate_modern_musee_dela_danse_booklet.pdf

37. Boris Charmatz and Mark Franko, "Interview with Boris Charmatz," *Dance Research Journal* 46, no. 3 (2014): p. 52.

38. While all of these exhibitions included new commissions or public programs featuring contemporary artists, the field-defining work they did was dependent upon the historical canon.

39. David Velasco, "The Year in Dance," *Artforum International* 51, no. 4 (2012): pp. 99 and 302.

40. Curator Alanna Heiss comments, "how important were curators at the time . . . ? They were not important at all because they weren't doing shows that were of any interest" (quoted in Lydia Yee, "All Work, All Play," *Laurie Anderson, Trisha Brown, Gordon Matta-Clark: Pioneers of the Downtown Scene New York 1970s*, edited by Lydia Yee [Munich: Prestel Verlag, 2011], p. 87).

41. Buren, "Where are the Artists?," n.p. This follows his inflammatory comment in 1972 that "more and more, the subject of an exhibition tends not to be the display of artworks, but the exhibition of the exhibition as a work of art" ("Exhibition of an Exhibition," p. 9).

42. Sally Banes, *Greenwich Village 1963: Avant-Garde Performance and the Effervescent Body* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1993), p. 52. This period followed the co-ops of the 1950s documented in the exhibitions and catalogues:

Joellen Bard, *Tenth Street Days: The Co-ops of the 50s* (New York: Education, Art & Service, Inc., 1977) and Melissa Rachleff, *Inventing Downtown: Artist-Run Galleries in New York City 1952-1965* (New York: Grey Art Gallery, New York University, 2017).

43. John Brockman quoted in Susan Rosenberg, *Trisha Brown: Choreography as Visual Art* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2017), p. 69. Trisha Brown was in the program as were other choreographers Remy Charlip and Aileen Passloff.

44. On the programming of dance works at The Whitney et al. in the late 1960s and early 1970s and the exclusion of dance from progressive exhibitions occurring around the same time, see Erin Brannigan, "Interlude #3: Exhibitions and Exclusions," in *Choreography, Visual Art and Experimental Composition 1950s-1970s*, pp. 221-25.

45. Pamela Bianchi, "Choreographed Exhibition/Exhibited Choreography," *Re.bus* 9 (2020): p. 116.

Case Study 3

1. Mathieu Copeland, "A Choreographed Exhibition—Kunst Halle St. Gallen, 1/12/07-13/01/08," accessed February 20, 2014, online: www.mathieucopeland.net. The same exhibition was presented in the French venue and described by curator Julie Pellegrin in "This is Not a Catalogue," in *Choreographing Exhibitions*, edited by Mathieu Copeland and Julie Pellegrin (Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2013), pp. 17-18. I did not see this exhibition so am reliant on the extensive catalogue and other secondary sources.

2. Pablo Leon de la Barra, "'A Choreographed Exhibition' by Mathieu Copeland," *Centre for Aesthetic Revolution*, November 30, 2007, accessed March 30, 2021, online: http://centrefortheaestheticrevolution.blogspot.com/2007/11/choreographed-exhibition-by-mathieu.html

3. Mickaël Phelippeau, Virginie Thomas, Carole Perdereau, and Maeva Cunci, "LeClubdes5," in *Choreographing Exhibitions*, p. 182.

4. Discussed at the end of Erin Brannigan, *Choreography, Visual Art and Experimental Composition 1950s-1970s* (London: Routledge, 2022), p. 227, Foster believed that "conceptual gesture, material process, and performative action . . . would dominate the advanced art of the 1960s" (Hal Foster, "Made Out of the Real World: Lessons from the Fulton Street Studio," in *Robert Rauschenberg, edited by David Frankel* [New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 2016], p. 96). Early exhibitions or singular works that approached dance *in* the gallery in this way include Trisha Brown's *another fearless dance concert* (1971) and Deborah Hay's earlier *911: A Dance Concert by Deborah Hay* (1969) both at The Whitney. More recent examples include *Work/Travail/Arbeid* (2015) by Anne Teresa De Keersmaeker at Wiels Contemporary Arts Centre, Brussels, and *WHEN I AM NOT THERE* (2022) by Shelley Lasica and curator Hannah Mathews at Monash University Museum of Art, Melbourne.

5. Mathieu Copeland, "Choreographing Exhibitions: An Exhibition Happening Everywhere, at All Times, with and for Everyone," in *Choreographing Exhibitions*, p. 21.

6. Yves Klein, *La Spécialisation de la Sensibilité à l'État Matière Première en*

Sensibilité Picturale Stabilisée, Le Vide (The Specialization of Sensibility in the Raw Material State into Stabilized Pictorial Sensibility, The Void) (April 28, 1958), Iris Clert Gallery, Paris. Graciela Carnevale, *Acción del Encierro (Confinement Action)* (1968), Ciclo de Arte Experimental exhibition, Rosario, Argentina.

7. Van Imschoot co-founded Sarma and has worked with Meg Stuart and others as dance dramaturg; Lepecki is one of the most prominent dance theorists of the last two to three decades; Formis works across philosophy, performance, and dance; and Charmatz is a world-renowned French choreographer.

8. See: Julia Robinson, "From Abstraction to Model: George Brecht's Events and the Conceptual Turn in Art of the 1960s," *October* 127 (2009): pp. 77-108; Liz Kotz, *Words to Be Looked at: Language in 1960s Art* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2010); Myriam Van Imschoot, "Rests in Pieces: On Scores, Notations and the Trace in Dance," in *Danse: An Anthology*, edited by Noémie Solomon (Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2014), pp. 41-54; and Josefine Wikström, *Practices of Relations in Task-Dance and the Event-Score: A Critique of Performance* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2021). The exchange between music scores, spoken word scores, and action scores during the mid-century neo-avant-garde is rich terrain for further intermedial studies begun by Wikström, but is beyond the scope of this project, which only touches on this area of practice.

9. Lacey has an impressive body of work made for the gallery through her partnership with artist Nadia Lauro. See Alexandra Baudelot, "Jennifer Lacey and Nadia Lauro: Choreographic Dispositifs," in *Danse: An Anthology*, edited by Noémie Solomon (Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2014), pp. 177-85; and, in French, Alexandra Baudelot, *Jennifer Lacey and Nadia Lauro: Dispositifs Chorégraphiques* (Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2007).

10. Jennifer Lacey, "Jennifer Lacey in Conversation with Mathieu Copeland Gare de l'Est, Paris, 16 October 2010," in *Choreographing Exhibitions*, p. 123.

11. Lacey, p. 123. Lacey continues: "the displacing of a dance piece from the theatre was neither new nor challenging for me," suggesting that Copeland's approach was not as radical as it aspired to be.

12. It is interesting to note here that Copeland admits to seeing the exhibition in St. Gallen only at the opening and closing, limiting his access to what he calls a "critical experience of the ephemeral" ("Jennifer Lacey in Conversation with Mathieu Copeland," pp. 124-25). On care and ethics in this field see *Precarious Movements: Choreography and the Museum Research Forum*, March 30-31, 2020, accessed date, online: https://www.unsw.edu.au/arts-design-architecture/our-schools/arts-media/our-research/our-projects/precarious-movements-choreography-museum

13. Copeland, "Choreographing Exhibitions," p. 19.

14. Mathieu Copeland, "Jérôme Bel in Conversation with Mathieu Copeland, London, 22 November 2011," in *Choreographing Exhibitions*, p. 49.

15. Bart De Baere notes the rise of "curator culture": "the whole curatorial development, what is it? It's an expropriation of people . . . the curator is the one who does it . . . we are abusing people all of the time" (Bart De Baere and Charles Esche, "Exhibitions Histories Talk: Bart De Baere," *Afterall Online*, accessed December 4, 2018, online: https://www.afterall.org/online/exhibition-histories-talks-bart-de-baere-video-online#.XAXXVRMzaAx

16. Toni Pape, Noémie Solomon, and Alanna Thain, "Welcome to *This Situa-*

tion: Tino Sehgal's Impersonal Ethics," *Dance Research Journal* 46, no. 3 (2014): p. 94.

17. Le Clubdes5, "LE CLUBDES5, PARIS, Spring 2009," in *Everybodys Group Self-Interviews*, edited by Alice Chauchat and Mette Ingvartsen (Everybodys Publications, 2009), pp. 54–55.

18. Copeland followed this exhibition with *VOIDS, A Retrospective*, co-curated at Centre Pompidou in 2009, which demonstrated clearly the creative journey he was on regarding the ephemeral: "consisting of nothing more than nine identical empty rooms that were, in fact, created by nine different artists, each with a different concept" ("Mathieu Copeland This Week at MoMA," accessed April 7, 2019, online: https://www.moma.org/explore/inside_out/2013/04/16/mathieu-copeland-this-week-at-moma). Much more recently he curated the one-off *A Staged Exhibition* at La Ferme du Buisson, September 11, 2021, in collaboration with choreographer Lacey, composer Laetitia Sadier, and artist/set designer Gaylen Gerber, as a follow-up to *A Choreographed Exhibition*.

19. Inés Moreno, "Opening Hours," *Dance Research Journal* 46, no. 3 (2014): pp. 80 and 85.

20. Lacey, "Jennifer Lacey in Conversation with Mathieu Copeland," pp. 123–24. Perdereau reports in response, "Jennifer Lacey asks us to walk on all fours with our eyes closed, to massage our feet and hands, to pee often, to eat dry fruits and grapes, and not to look at ourselves . . . Thanks again Jennifer! Thanks for making breathing room in the exhibition," "LeClubdes5," pp. 183–84.

21. Anneke Jaspers, "Passing Honey Between Hands," in *Agatha Gothe-Snape: The Outcome is Certain*, edited by Hannah Mathews and Melissa Ratliff (Melbourne: Monash University Museum of Art and Perimeter Editions, 2020), p. 120; and Erin Brannigan, "Agatha Gothe-Snape interview, March 27, 2019."

Case Study 4

1. *Ghost Telephone*, curated by Adrian Heathfield, 20th Biennale of Sydney, Art Gallery of New South Wales, March 15–April 15, 2016. Credits: "*Ghost Telephone* was realized in collaboration with Anneke Jaspers (Curator, Contemporary Art) and Andrew Yip (iGLAM Research Fellow) at the Art Gallery of New South Wales" (Adrian Heathfield, "Ghost Telephone," accessed April 10, 2022, online: https://www.adrianheathfield.net/project/ghost-telephone).

The fourth artist was musician Hahn Rowe who often creates scores for performance. For more on dance works presented within this Biennale see Erin Brannigan, "Positively Unassertive: Dancing in the Art Gallery of NSW," *Broadsheet* 45, no. 2 (2016): pp. 26–29 and an issue of *Performance Paradigm* 13 (2017) resulting from *Choreography and the Gallery One-Day Salon*, facilitated by Erin Brannigan, Biennale of Sydney, Art Gallery of New South Wales and University of New South Wales, April 27, 2016. Lachambre and Gehmacher both worked with Meg Stuart in the early 1990s, and Parkinson is a leading commentator, theorist and artist within experimental dance in Europe, having worked with Boris Charmatz, Jonathan Burrows, Eszter Salamon, and Mette Ingvartsen, among many others.

2. "Ghost Telephone: A One-Month-Long Chain Performance, Curated by Adrian Heathfield," in *The Guide: 20th Biennale of Sydney* (Sydney: Biennale of Sydney, 2016), p. 129.

3. Heathfield, "Ghost Telephone," 129.

4. Heathfield, "Ghost Telephone," n.p.

5. Theron Schmidt, "What Kind of Work is This? Performance and Materialisms in the Gallery," *Performance Paradigm* 13 (2017): p. 14.

6. Brannigan, "Positively Unassertive," p. 27.

7. "Ghost Telephone: A Month-Long Chain Performance," room notes, unpublished. The exhibition ran from March 15-April 15, 2016, and I note the contingency of my observations over two to three hours.

8. Daniel Palmer, "Beside the White Cube," in *Daniel Von Sturmer: Material from Another Medium*, catalogue (Melbourne: Centre for Contemporary Photography, 2001), unpaginated.

9. Regarding the influence of the downtown New York dance scene on Nauman and his peers in the 1960s and 1970s, see Erin Brannigan, "Interlude #2: Choreographers and Artists," in *Choreography, Visual Art and Experimental Composition 1950s-1970s* (London: Routledge, 2022), pp. 170-84. At the time of the Biennale, Gehmacher was enrolled at the University of Applied Arts, Vienna, studying "Sculpture and Space" which appears to have influenced his approach to this piece (Philipp Gehmacher, "Biography," accessed April 10, 2022, online: http://www.philippgehmacher.net/assets/documents/2020e-09-10_CV%20Philipp%20Gehmacher%20long_en%20(SL-MacBook-Air.locals%20in%20Konflikt%20stehende%20Kopie%202020-10-25).pdf).

10. Stephanie Rosenthal, "Prologue: Embassy of Spirits," in *20th Biennale of Sydney: The Future is Already Here—It's Just Not Evenly Distributed* (Sydney: Biennale of Sydney, 2016), pp. 196-97.

11. *my shapes, your words, their grey* (2013) was first performed in two contexts simultaneously: as an exhibition in Gehmacher's studio, and as performance in Halle G at Tanzquartier Wien, Vienna; it was then adapted to various theater and gallery contexts (Gehmacher, "Biography"). The exhibition version of the work includes videos, photographs, and text drawings alongside peformances, and he conceives of the whole as "performance" (Gehmacher quoted in Helmut Ploebst, "A Desired Room in Grey," in *Der Standard Online*, November 19, 2013, accessed April 10, 2022, online: https://www.derstandard.at/story/1381373848857/ein-wunschraum-in-grau).

12. Helmut Ploebst, "A Desired Room in Grey," n.p.

Case Study 5

1. Christina Schmid, "Bojana Cvejić," *The Third Rail Quarterly* 11 (2017), accessed April 7, 2021, online: http://thirdrailquarterly.org/bojana-cvejic/

2. For more on the use of Foucault's theory of subjection in dance studies, see Erin Brannigan and Nalina Wait, "Non-Competitive Body States: Corporeal Freedom and Innovation in Contemporary Dance," in *The Oxford Handbook of Dance and Competition*, edited by Sherril Dodds (New York: Oxford University Press, 2018), pp. 283-304.

3. Erin Brannigan and Nalina Wait, "Non-Competitive Body States," pp. 283-304. For more on Cvejić's notion of the "transindividual," see Bojana Cvejić and Ana Vujanović, *Toward a Transindividual Self* (Oslo: Oslo National Academy of the Arts, 2022).

4. Bojana Cvejić, *Spatial Confessions (On the question of instituting the public)* (May 21-24, 2014). This was a four-day program of "live and online performances, talks and films, all of which explored how people perform in public and how they present themselves as both social citizens and private individuals" ("*Spatial Confessions [On the question of instituting the public]*," accessed April 10, 2022, online: https://www.tate.org.uk/research/publications/performance-at-tate/case-studies/bojana-cvejic). See also Bojana Cvejić and Ana Vujanović, *Public Sphere for Performance* (B_Books, 2015), accessed April 10, 2022, online: https://issuu.com/katalogija/docs/____public_sphere_web-single

5. Tino Sehgal, *Carte Blanche to Tino Sehgal*, curated by Rebecca Lamarche-Vadel, Palais de Tokyo, Paris, October 12-December 18, 2016; *Some Sweet Day*, curated by Ralph Lemon, October 15-November 4, 2012, MoMA, New York.

6. Judson member Judith Dunn notes that "no important [decisions] were made until everyone concerned and present agreed" (quoted in Sally Banes, *Greenwich Village 1963: Avant-Garde Performance and the Effervescent Body* [Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1993], p. 69). Going further than democracy, their system demanded consensus, the most challenging system of rule.

7. Sally Banes, *Greenwich Village 1963*, p. 73.

8. Sally Banes, *Greenwich Village 1963*, p. 35. She goes on to map the professional and social networks surrounding Judson Dance Theater, describing "a work life indissolubly woven together with a social life . . . deeply linking work and play" (pp. 71-73).

9. Yvonne Rainer, *Continuous Project—Altered Daily*, The Whitney Museum of American Art, March 31-April 2, 1970. The dancers listed on the program are Becky Arnold, Douglas Dunn, David Gordon, Barbara Lloyd, Steve Paxton, Rainer "and others." First performed Pratt Institute, Brooklyn, 1969.

10. Wendy Perron, *The Grand Union: Accidental Anarchists of Downtown Dance, 1970-1976* (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2020), p. 59.

11. On the inequities in current US models see Naomi M. Jackson's important work, including "Curatorial Discourse and Equity Tensions in Contemporary Dance Presenting in the United States," in *Curating Live Arts: Critical Perspectives, Essays, and Conversations on Theory and Practice*, edited by Dena Davida, Jane Gabriels, Véronique Hudon, and Marc Pronovost (New York: Berghahn Books, 2019), pp. 244-72 and Naomi M. Jackson, *Dance and Ethics: Moving Towards a More Humane Dance Culture* (Bristol: Intellect Books, 2022).

12. Terry Smith, *What Is Contemporary Art?* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009), pp. 250-52 and 262.

13. Jacuzzi is "a convergence of Amsterdam-based choreographers, who act as a fluid support structure for each other and a host body for a multitude of movement practices and performance related events," supported by the AkzoNobel Arts Foundation (https://jacuzzi.hotglue.me/). Chez Bushwick, founded in 2002 by choreographer Jonah Bokaer, is "an artist-run organization based in Brooklyn, [and] is dedicated to the advancement of interdisciplinary art and perfor-

mance, with a strong focus on new choreography" that sits within the supportive context of the Jonah Bokaer Arts Foundation (https://www.chezbushwick.net/). ReadyMade Works "is the artist-led home for independent dance in Sydney—run by artists, for artists" (https://www.readymadeworks.com.au/). I thank Alice Heyward and Brooke Stamp for their help with this list.

14. "Insister Space," accessed April 10, 2022, online: http://insisterspace.se/about/

15. *To Do/To Make*, curated by Shelley Lasica and Zoe Theodore, 215 Albion St, Brunswick, Melbourne, September 8, 2018. *To Do/To Make 2*, October 21, 2018. Artists included: Ellen Davies, Alice Heyward and Megan Payne, Jess Gall, Arini Byng and Rebecca Jensen, Jo Lloyd, Jacqui Shelton, Lasica, Sarah Aiken, Brooke Stamp and Anna McMahon, and Fiona MacDonald. I have not seen these programs so information presented here is based on an interview with Zoe Theodore and Lasica (April 4, 2022) from which all following quotes are taken, and video documentation, "*To Do/To Make*," accessed March 20, 2022, online: https://vimeo.com/305287149

16. Theodore and Lasica cite as influential the curatorial work of Hannah Mathews on *ACCA in the City* in 2015 (https://acca.melbourne/exhibition/acca-in-the-city/), which Theodore worked on, or her *Action/Response* in 2013 (https://www.artshouse.com.au/events/actionresponse/). Internationally they admire the work of Louise O'Kelly's Block Universe Festival in London (http://blockuniverse.co.uk/about/), and If I Can't Dance, I don't want to be part of your revolution in Amsterdam (https://ificantdance.org/).

17. Erin Brannigan, "Interview with Zoe Theodore and Shelley Lasica, April 4, 2022." All subsequent quotes are taken from this interview.

18. Jennifer Lacey, "Jennifer Lacey in Conversation with Mathieu Copeland Gare de l'Est, Paris, 16 October 2010," in *Choreographing Exhibitions*, edited by Mathieu Copeland and Julie Pellegrin (Dijon: Les Presses du Réel), 2013, p. 127.

19. Christophe Wavelet, Jérôme Bel, and Xavier Le Roy, "Which Body for Which Collective, Which Collective for Which Body?," in *Peripheral Vision and Collective Body*, edited by Museion Bozen/Bolzano (Bolzano: Museion, 2008), pp. 84 and 116.

20. Smith, *What Is Contemporary Art?*, p. 254.

21. Boris Groys, "Exhibitions, Installations, and Nostalgia," in *Talking Contemporary Curating*, edited by Terry Smith (New York: Independent Curators International, 2015), pp. 62–79.

22. Daniel Buren, "Where are the Artists?," in *The Next Documenta Should be Curated by an Artist*, edited by Jens Hoffmann (Frankfurt: E-Flux/Revolver, 2004). Accessed November 2, 2022, online: http://projects.e-flux.com/next_doc/d_buren_printable.html

Chapter 4

1. John Cage, "Grace and Clarity," in *Silence: Lectures and Writings* (50th Anniversary Edition) (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2011), p. 89.

2. For more on this see Erin Brannigan, *Choreography, Visual Art and Experimental Composition 1950s-1970s* (London: Routledge, 2022).

3. Isabelle Ginot, "A Common Place," in *Danse: An Anthology*, edited by Noémie Solomon (Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2014), p. 161. This article was originally published in French in *Repères Cahiers du Danse: Talking about Danse* 11 (La Briqueterie / CDC of Val-de-Marne, March 2003). For one comparison of the two avant-gardes see André Lepecki, "Dance, Choreography, and the Visual: Elements for a Contemporary Imagination," in *Is the Living Body the Last Thing Left Alive? The New Performance Turn, Its Histories and Its Institutions*, edited by Cosmin Costinas and Ana Janevski (Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2017), pp. 12–19.

4. On non-dance see Jean-Marc Adolphe and Gérard Mayen, "The 'Non-dance' Is Still Dancing," *Movement* 1 (May 2004), translation accessed December 28, 2018 online: http://sarma.be/docs/784. It should be noted that non-dance was a term that was also applied to the second-wave avant-garde. See Walter Terry's review of Judson Dance Theater quoted in Chapter 6. Many other terms have been used to describe this particular set of artists. Cvejić refers to "think-dance" in 2002, citing American choreographer Jill Sigman ("Can One Dance the Logical Scaffolding of Dance?," *Frakcija* 24/25 [2002]: n.p.).

5. Jonathan Burrows, "Keynote Address for the Postdance Conference in Stockholm," in *POST-DANCE*, edited by Danjel Andersson, Mette Edvardsen, and Mårten Spångberg (Stockholm: MDT, 2017), p. 94.

6. Burrows, "Keynote Address," p. 95. He notes a "shift of perception [was] the real revolution" (p. 96).

7. Peter Osborne, "Survey," in *Conceptual Art*, edited by Peter Osborne (London: Phaidon Press Limited, 2002), p. 18.

8. The use of the term "Minimalism" for dance is discussed in depth in "Chapter 3: Dance and Minimalism," in Brannigan, *Choreography, Visual Art and Experimental Composition 1950s-1970s*, pp. 86–131. For the debates around the use of "post-modernism" for dance see fn10, Chapter 3.

9. Bojana Cvejić, *Choreographing Problems: Expressive Concepts in European Contemporary Dance and Performance* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), p. 6.

10. Bojana Cvejić, "To End with Judgement by Way of Clarification," translated and reproduced in *Danse: An Anthology*, pp. 145–57 (originally published in *It Takes Place When It Doesn't. On Dance and Performance*, edited by Martina Hochmuth, Krassimira Kruschkova, and Georg Schollhammer [Frankfurt: Revolver-Archiv für Aktuelle Kunst, 2006], pp. 49–58). See also Bojana Cvejić, "The Passion for Proceduralism," *Maska* 19, nos. 84–85 (2004): p. 32. There is a caveat in the footnotes of the former that Cvejić and Le Roy may have changed their opinions since 2005, but this article has had much the same effect as Rainer's comparison of dance with Minimalism, that is, legitimizing the terms and putting them into circulation rather than dismantling them (Yvonne Rainer, "A Quasi Survey of Some 'Minimalist' Tendencies in the Quantitatively Minimal Dance Activity Amidst the Plethora, or an Analysis of *Trio A*," in *Minimal Art: A Critical Survey*, edited by Gregory Battcock [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995], pp. 263–73).

11. Cvejić, *Choreographing Problems*, p. 6.

12. Cvejić sets the time frame for the emergence of the practices often described as "conceptual" as 1998–2007 (*Choreographing Problems*, p. 1) but Lepecki refers to the tendency as emergent since "the early nineties" ("Concept

and Presence: The Contemporary European Dance Scene," in *Rethinking Dance History: A Reader*, edited by Alexandra Carter [London: Routledge, 2004], p. 171). For more on "conceptual dance" see also André Lepecki, *Exhausting Dance: Performance and the Politics of Movement* (New York and London: Routledge, 2006), *Singularities: Dance in the Age of Performance* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2016), and "Dance, Choreography, and the Visual: Elements for a Contemporary Imagination," pp. 12–19; Ramsay Burt, *Ungoverning Dance* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017); Petra Sabisch, *Choreographing Relations* (Munich: epodium, 2011); Jeroen Peeters, *Through the Back: Situating Vision between Moving Bodies* (Helsinki: Theatre Academy of the University of the Arts, Helsinki, 2014); and Rudi Laermans, *Moving Together: Theorizing and Making Contemporary Dance* (Amsterdam: Valiz, 2015).

13. Cvejić, *Choreographing Problems*, p. 6 and "To End with Judgment by Way of Clarification," pp. 150 and 153. Burt works with a similar set of artists including Cvejić herself (*Ungoverning Dance*). Ginot also mentions Myriam Gourfink, Emmanuelle Huynh, Christian Rizzo, Alain Buffard, and Cécile Proust ("A Common Place," pp. 160–61). Lepecki's list covers more artists outside France, including German artists Thomas Lehmen and Felix Ruckert, and Portuguese artists João Fiadeiro and Miguel Pereira ("Concept and Presence," p. 171). Peeters writes about artists named here and also Benoît Lachambre and Meg Stuart, who is also mentioned by Lepecki but generally sits outside the discourse on this field (Peeters, *Through the Back*). Laermans places Stuart at the origins of conceptual dance, as noted in Case Study 2, so perhaps her proto-conceptual status generally excludes her. Laermans also has a specifically Flemish take on the field (*Moving Together*, pp. 17–21).

14. Lepecki, "Dance, Choreography, and the Visual," p. 13.

15. Jean-Marc Adolphe, "Introduction: Emancipated Dance File," accessed December 28, 2017, online: http://sarma.be/docs/784. This view is consolidated in Costinas and Janevski, *Is the Living Body the Last Thing Left Alive?*, in which multiple contributions link the emergence of conceptual dance to the "new performance turn" in the visual arts.

16. In fact "conceptual" is sometimes interchangeable with "philosophical," "theoretical," and "discursive" in the relevant texts. See Erin Brannigan, "Talking Back: What Dance Might Make of Badiou's Philosophical Project," *Performance Philosophy* 4, no. 2 (2019): pp. 354–73 regarding the Foucauldian framework of the earlier philosophical turn.

17. See, for instance, Sabisch, *Choreographing Relations*; Derek P. McCormack, *Refrains for Moving Bodies: Experience and Experiment in Affective Spaces* (Durham, NC; London: Duke University Press, 2013); Jenn Joy, *The Choreographic* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2014); Cvejić, *Choreographing Problems*; Lepecki, *Singularities*; and Burt, *Ungoverning Dance*.

18. Cvejić, *Choreographing Problems*, p. 2. Peter Osborne observes that a parallel turn to philosophy in art criticism has been a response to an apparent "legitimation crisis" in the field of contemporary art, which enlists the support of the "established cultural authority of philosophy" (Peter Osborne, *Anywhere or Not at All: Philosophy of Contemporary Art* [London: Verso, 2013], p. 6). This may perhaps also apply to the fields of dance and performance studies.

19. Cvejić, "To End with Judgement by Way of Clarification," p. 139.

20. Dance artists who have published writing related to their choreographic work are listed in 2.3 Writing Dancing, in Chapter 2.

21. Mårten Spångberg, "Something Like a Phenomenon," *Frakcija* 24/25 (2002): n.p. He also references Deleuze in this article and Thierry de Duve on Marcel Duchamp who is generally considered the originator of conceptual art. Spångberg notes "the Duchampian effect in dance" such as Bel's piece *Xavier Le Roy* (1999), which Bel officially authored yet Le Roy choreographed using Bel's signature elements (Spångberg, "Something Like a Phenomenon," n.p.). This work of Bel's was in the conceptual tradition of Duchamp signing a toilet made by another, or Robert Rauschenberg signing an erased drawing by Willem de Kooning. On the work *Xavier Le Roy* see Katja Werner, "Various—Katja Werner," accessed December 12, 2018, online: http://www.Jérômebel.fr/index.php?p=5&cid=195

22. Christophe Wavelet, Jérôme Bel, and Xavier Le Roy, "Which Body for Which Collective, Which Collective for Which Body?", translated by Melissa Thackway, in *Peripheral Vision and Collective Body*, edited by Museion Bozen/Bolzano (Bolzano: Museion Bozen, 2008), p. 85.

23. Bojana Cvejić, "Xavier Le Roy: The Dissenting Choreography of One Frenchman Less," in *Contemporary French Theatre and Performance*, edited by Clare Finburgh and Carl Lavery (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011), pp. 188–99. However, Cvejić is quick to point out that, in her experience, the artist's own references to Deleuze and other philosophers have been "occasional and inconsistent," and she distances her method from theirs (Cvejić, *Choreographing Problems*, p. 4).

24. Cvejić, "Xavier Le Roy," p. 148. Lucy Lippard, *Six Years: The Dematerialization of the Art Object from 1966 to 1972* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997), p. x.

25. Liz Kotz, "Language between Performance and Photography," *October* 111 (2005): p. 3.

26. Branden Joseph quoting Tony Conrad in *Beyond the Dream Syndicate: Tony Conrad and the Arts after Cage (A "Minor" History)* (New York: Zone Books, 2011), p. 160. Exceptions here may be Burrows and Edvardsen whose *Speaking Dance* (2006) and *No Title* (2014), respectively, use spoken language as compositional material alongside and intertwined with the movement and general composition so that they are both doing similar work. While there is more work to be done on such distinctions, it is beyond the scope of this chapter.

27. Sol LeWitt, "Paragraphs on Conceptual Art," *Artforum* 5, no. 10 (1967): p. 80. Apart from Flynt's interest in philosophy, American conceptual artist Joseph Kosuth and the British Art & Language group in the late 1960s shared an interest in analytic philosophy (thanks to Susan Best for this point).

28. Jeremy Prynne, "Poetic Thought," *Textual Practice* 24, no. 4 (2010): p. 596; and Laurence Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, translated by Sally Gardner (Alton, Hampshire: Dance Books, 2010), p. 12. See Chapter 1 in the present work on Louppe's poetics.

29. I thank my Writing Dancing group, and particularly Lizzie Thomson, for helping me arrive at this language.

30. Lepecki, "Concept and Presence," p. 170. He elaborates that there are examples of both "a restepping of known paths and . . . a stumbling upon the unexpected reconfigurations of what might have been there" (Lepecki, p. 170).

31. Lepecki, *Exhausting Dance*, p. 135n2. In taking this position, Lepecki opposes Cvejić's assertion a year before that "conceptual dance cannot be seen as part of the historical project of Modernism, as it was the case with Conceptual art" (Cvejić, "To End with Judgement by Way of Clarification," p. 148). She denies a lineage from "Merce Cunningham—Yvonne Rainer—Xavier Le Roy" that I believe is clear, as discussed elsewhere in this chapter (Cvejić, "Xavier Le Roy," p. 149). Lepecki revisited his comparison of the two periods of dance experimentation in "Dance, Choreography, and the Visual" in 2017, arguing for ephemerality, corporeality, precariousness, scoring, and performativity as the points of differentiation from the second wave (pp. 12–15, 18–19).

32. Private correspondence with author, August 27, 2013.

33. Ginot, "A Common Place," pp. 160–65.

34. Lepecki, "Concept and Presence," pp. 170, 173. Regarding "theory," Lepecki refers specifically to "performance theory," indicating the marginalization of dance knowledges in much of this literature.

35. Adolphe and Mayen, "The 'Non-dance' Is Still Dancing," n.p. They also add strategies "to tackle the crisis of spectacular representation: deceptive strategies, scrambling incessant disciplinary definitions, criticism of the codes at work in the performative relationship, active investment of [sic] the paradoxes that work the perception of the spectators, etc."

36. Pouillaude, Frédéric, "*Scène* and Contemporaneity," translated by Noémie Solomon, *TDR: The Drama Review* 51, no. 2 (2007): p. 130.

37. Burt, *Ungoverning Dance*, p. 9.

38. Cvejić, *Choreographing Problems*, pp. 11, 17, 24, 25, 31.

39. Cvejić, *Choreographing Problems*, p. 31.

40. See Lepecki, *Exhausting Dance*, p. 135n2 and "Concept and Presence," pp. 179–80. Another theorist who picks up this thread is Julie Perrin who compares the work of Huynh to Brown regarding strategies of reduction ("Loose Association: Emmanuelle Huynh to Trisha Brown," in *Danse: An Anthology*, pp. 187–202).

41. Lepecki sees the continuities between the mid-century and the recent avant-garde as a turn to the visual arts for "compositional integrity" (particularly reductive strategies), and a critique of representation, presence, virtuosity, visuality, and complex staging ("Concept and Presence," p. 174). Ginot is more circumspect, stating that "this most recent stage has, obviously, borrowed many of its new values from the US avant-gardes of the 1960s and 1970s, or at least to the narrative about them that has been privileged in France" ("Dis-identifying: Dancing Bodies and Analysing Eyes at Work," *Discourses in Dance* 2, no. 1 [2004], unpaginated, accessed March 31, 2019, online: http://sarma.be/docs/602).

42. "Chronology of Dances, 1961–1979," in *Trisha Brown: Dance and Art in Dialogue*, edited by Hendel Teicher (Andover, MA: Addison Gallery of American Art, 2002), p. 301. Regarding *Trio A*, see Carrie Lambert, "'Moving Still' Mediating Yvonne Rainer's *Trio A*," *October* 89 (1999): pp. 87–112.

43. See Cvejić, "Xavier Le Roy," p. 189 for a more detailed definition of *dispositif*.

44. Sol LeWitt, "Paragraphs on Conceptual Art," *Artforum* 5, no. 10 (1967): p. 80. According to Buchloh, LeWitt's writing on conceptual art is the most widely accepted authority on the subject (Benjamin Buchloh, "Conceptual Art 1962-1969: From the Aesthetic of Administration to the Critique of Institutions," *October* 55 [1990]: p. 108n1).

45. Mark Franko and André Lepecki, "Editor's Note: Dance in the Museum," *Dance Research Journal* 46, no. 3 (2014): p. 2. The authors are referring to Nauman's *Untitled* (1969), in which he writes, "hire a dancer to perform for 30 minutes each day." Curators can also, of course, be sensitive to the local ecology. Claire Bishop quotes Catherine Wood on the "organic" development of early dance programming at Tate Modern through engagement with young artists interested in dance and choreography ("The Perils and Possibilities of Dance in the Museum: Tate, MoMA and Whitney," *Dance Research Journal* 46, no. 3 [2014]: p. 67).

46. Catherine Damman, "Presence at the Creation," *Artforum International* 57, no. 1 (Sep 2018), accessed March 12, 2019, online: https://www.artforum.com/print/201807/catherine-damman-on-judson-dance-theater-76332

47. While a survey of such work lies outside the scope of this book, some of those artists are listed in note 38 Chapter 1.

Case Study 6

1. Some ideas developed in this section were first articulated in Erin Brannigan, "Choreography and the Gallery: Curation as Revision," *Dance Research Journal* 47, no. 1 (2015): pp. 5-25.

2. Theorist Bojana Cvejić lists "bodiliness" as the first characteristic of Charmatz's work. As she notes, this is a challenge to the prevalence of a denial of the virtuosic dancer in much conceptual dance, as described in Chapter 4 ("The Vertiginous Invasion of a Tribe Called Dance: Boris Charmatz's *Héâtre-élévision [Pseudo Performance]*," in *Boris Charmatz*, edited by Ana Janevski [New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 2017], pp. 53-54).

3. This workshop was followed by *Statuts* in 2001 at La Ferme du Buisson, another multidisciplinary project in which "the entire place was mobilized; the dancers were constantly present" (Gilles Amalvi, "More or Less Dance: A Multifaceted Portrait of Boris Charmatz," in *Boris Charmatz*, p. 126). Perhaps this inspired Mathieu Copeland's *A Choreographed Exhibition* (2007) in the same venue six years later (Case Study 3).

4. Noémie Solomon, "Choreography Unstill: Experimental Imaginaries in Boris Charmatz's *Flip Book*," in *Boris Charmatz*, p. 79.

5. This political activity informs his important publication, *Undertraining: On a Contemporary Dance*, and his work overall (Boris Charmatz and Isabelle Launay, *Undertraining: On a Contemporary Dance*, translated by Anna Preger [Paris: Les Presses du Réel, 2011]).

6. Jérôme Bel quoted in Amalvi, "More or Less Dance," p. 127.

7. Boris Charmatz, "Manifesto for Dancing Museum," accessed March 29, 2019, online: https://www.moma.org/momaorg/shared/pdfs/docs/calendar/manifesto_dancing_museum.pdf

8. Charmatz quoted in Catherine Wood, "Boris Charmatz: An Architecture of Attention (Revisited)," in *Boris Charmatz*, p. 93.

9. Benjamin Buchloh, Rosalind Krauss, Alexander Alberro, Thierry de Duve, Martha Buskirk, and Yve-Alain Bois, "Conceptual Art and the Reception of Duchamp," *October* 70 (1994): p. 136.

10. Henry M. Sayre, "Chapter 3: Tracing Dance: Collaboration and the New *Gesamtkunstwerk*," in *The Object of Performance: The American Avant-Garde since 1970* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1989), p. 140. Italics in original.

11. Brown states, "I was excluded from the traditional theaters . . . because of the economics of dance, so the streets became one of the few places I could do my works" (Brown quoted in Susan Rosenberg, *Trisha Brown: Choreography as Visual Art* [Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2017], p. 66). Peter Bürger controversially argues that, in terms of the Neo-Dada painters and sculptors, "the neo-avant-garde institutionalizes the *avant garde as art* and thus negates genuinely avant-gardist intentions," a criticism that Neo-Dada dance may be excluded from (*Theory of the Avant-Garde*, translated by Michael Shaw [Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984], p. 58. Italics in original.).

12. Boris Charmatz, "Manifesto for Dancing Museum," n.p.

13. His manifesto opens with the words, "I'm not losing my temper, I simply wish to propose removing the word Centre, then the word Choreographic, then the word National!" (Charmatz, "Manifesto for Dancing Museum," n.p.).

14. Bel was quoted in Chapter 1: "for several years now I've failed to find a solution to the London Tate Modern's demand for an exhibition of dance . . . But I never managed to find an adequate connection between the museum framework and dance . . ." ("Jérôme Bel and Boris Charmatz: Emails 2009-2010," in *Danse: An Anthology*, edited by Noémie Solomon [Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2014], pp. 245-46).

15. Boris Charmatz, *If Tate Modern was Musée de la danse?* "a proposition initiated by" Catherine Wood Senior Curator, International Art (Performance), Tate Modern and Boris Charmatz, May 15 and 16, 2015, Tate Modern, London (*BMW TATE LIVE: If Tate Modern was Musée de la danse?* Accessed April 12, 2022, online: https://www.tate.org.uk/documents/998/if_tate_modern_musee_dela_danse_booklet.pdf). I did not attend this exhibition in person but streamed some of the performances live online.

16. *BMW TATE LIVE: If Tate Modern was Musée de la danse?*, n.p.

17. Catherine Wood, "Interview: Catherine Wood and Boris Charmatz," in *BMW TATE LIVE*, n.p.

18. Jonathan Burrows, "Keynote Address for the Postdance Conference in Stockholm," in *Post-Dance*, edited by Danjel Andersson, Mette Edvardsen, and Mårten Spångberg (Stockholm: MDT, 2017), p. 91.

19. Charmatz, "Manifesto for a Dancing Museum," n.p.

20. Alessandra Nicifero, "OCCUPY MoMA: The (Risks and) Potentials of a Musée de la danse!," *Dance Research Journal* 46, no. 3 (December 2014): p. 41. Catherine Wood agrees that Charmatz meets the gallery on more neutral ground: "in the past few years there has been a degree of debate about the question of why

art museums programme dance, as though there is a clear line between visual artists who work with bodies, gestures and relations and those who were dance-trained. Charmatz is one of the artists who refuses that distinction . . ." ("The Year in Performance," *Artforum International* 54, no. 4 [2015]: p. 132).

21. Mark Franko, "Museum Artifact Act," In *Danse: An Anthology*, edited by Noémie Solomon, pp. 251–59. Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2014: pp. 254–55.

22. *20 Dancers for the XX Century* (2013–2017) has been performed many times with different casts and works, including at MoMA, New York (October 18–20, 2013), Tate Modern, London (May 15–16, 2015), and Museo Nacional Centro de Arte Reina Sofía, Madrid (December 17, 2016). The work has also been staged in other public spaces such as libraries, other civic buildings, and parks. I have not encountered this work live but have viewed excerpts from the iterations at Tate Modern, May 15 and 16, 2015 (accessed April 12, 2022, online: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=skX--k7ejWM) and Treptower Park, Berlin, June 27–28, 2014 (accessed April 12, 2022, online: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M00EGR-gK5c).

23. Brian Seibert, "Artwork on Foot Attracts New Vantage Points," *The New York Times* (October 20, 2013), p. C3. Seibert also describes it as "messy but fascinating and worthwhile."

24. Charmatz is clear about the advocacy at the heart of the project: "to work for the political future of dance" (Charmatz and Franko, "Interview with Boris Charmatz," p. 51). As noted elsewhere, the question of the dance archive is omnipresent in the first decades of the twenty-first century.

25. "*20 Dancers for the XX Century*," accessed April 5, 2019, online: http://www.borischarmatz.org/?20-danseurs-pour-le-xxe-siecle-157. The project implicitly rather than explicitly questioned where the authority lies for solos drawn from the dancer's own corporeal archive. Charmatz states, "these dancers are containers of works of art, exhibition and curatorial spaces. In dance, however, these elements maintain a precarious status: while dancers possess the knowledge of the pieces, they don't necessarily possess the rights or the financial means to reconstruct them." But the aim seems to have been to embrace such precarity; he continues: "by owning our heritage we can invent what it is . . . As an audience member watching them you are never sure if they are doing a piece by this or of that choreographer, and this introduces an uncertainty about what you are seeing" (Wood, "Interview: Catherine Wood and Boris Charmatz," n.p.). Yvonne Rainer comments on another of his works, *Flip Book* (2008): "Boris is obviously very prolific and inventive, not afraid to take license or risk with the traces of his antecedents" (Rainer quoted in Amalvi, "More or Less Dance," p. 130).

26. Boris Charmatz, "Boris Charmatz in Conversation with Mathieu Copeland, Paris, 28 October 2011," in *Danse: An Anthology*, p. 109. Possibilities around the acquisition and collection of contemporary dance by major museums has begun to shift with the first acquisition of choreographic works in 2015 by MoMA, who acquired Simone Forti's *Dance Constructions*.

27. "*Dance/Draw*, An Introduction," in *Dance/Draw*, edited by Helen Molesworth (Boston, MA: Institute of Contemporary Art, 2011), p. 16. These

observations relate to excerpts from *20 Dancers for the XX Century* performed at Tate Modern. Another recording of the iteration at Treptower Park, Berlin, reveals a very different set of conditions mimicking busking or community-led, participatory events.

28. Marcella Lista, "Play Dead: Dance, Museums, and the 'Time-Based Arts,'" pp. 5-23; Anton Cramer, "Dance as Artifact: Transformations of the Immaterial," pp. 24-31; Nicifero, "OCCUPY MoMA," pp. 32-44; Charmatz, "Manifesto for a National Choreographic Centre," pp. 45-48; and Charmatz, "Interview with Boris Charmatz," pp. 49-52, all in *Dance Research Journal* special issue, *Dance in the Museum*.

29. Ana Janevski, "The First Move is to Let the Hand Circle," in *Boris Charmatz*, p. 26.

30. See Nicifero on the "living-museums" of Charmatz's *20 Dancers for the XX Century* in his trilogy of works, *Three Collective Gestures*, as being "flattened by the overwhelming museal objectifying culture" at MoMA ("OCCUPY MoMA," p. 39). She also criticizes Charmatz's self-curation as egotistical (p. 38). And Cramer states that Charmatz's programs are more like "exhibition as performance" than a dancing museum ("Dance as Artifact," p. 25).

31. Sara Wookey, "Catherine Wood," in *Who Cares? Dance in the Gallery and Museum*, edited by Sara Wookey (London: Siobhan Davies Dance, 2015), p. 43. In this interview, Wookey and Wood discuss the work of Charmatz as a case study.

Charmatz would disagree: "It is important to explain that performance and dance in the museum do not enliven or invoke an economy or introduce the missing aesthetic element. They put forward new questions of museology, collecting and artistic experience" (Sara Wookey, "Catherine Wood," p. 43). Wood does not have a problem with spectacle in the case of Charmatz: "I've always been interested in spectacle . . . I think spectacle is a glue that makes the audience aware of themselves as a body of people" (Wookey, "Catherine Wood," p. 34).

32. Erin Brannigan, "Interview with Adam Linder, April 20, 2021." Linder notes how this philosophy was extended in Bel's *MoMA Dance Company* (2016) to include the gallery staff: "like Jerome's project at MoMA which was turning the personnel into the company of performers" (Erin Brannigan, "Interview").

33. Boris Charmatz, "Terrain | Boris Charmatz, 'Un essai à ciel ouvert,'—Ein Tanzgrund für Zürich," accessed April 12, 2022, online: http://2019.theaterspektakel.ch/en/program19/production/terrain-boris-charmatz/index.html. *Terrain* is the name of Charmatz's project post *Musée de la danse*. In his acceptance speech when he took up the position of artistic director of Pina Bausch's company in Wuppertal in September 2022 he said, "the company lacks working space and the three studios are not enough? So we will set up a workspace with no walls or roof in one of the city parks; we will become a company porous to passers-by, to rain, to cold and heat; a company which has black-box theaters encoded in its DNA, but which can make do with the landscapes of the Ruhr, which can think about social and energy transition, which is not afraid of getting our feet wet" ("Speech, Boris Charmatz Press Conference, October 21, 2021," accessed April 12, 2022, online: https://www.pinabausch.de/fileadmin/user_upload/Speech_Boris_Charmatz.pdf).

34. Wood, "Interview: Catherine Wood and Boris Charmatz," n.p. This is not to say that Charmatz has never produced choreography that approaches the conditions of contemporary art. I discuss such work below in relation to *manger* (2014).

35. Biographical information on Charmatz is gleaned from Helmut Ploebst, *No Wind No Word* (Munich: K. Kieser Verlag, 2001), pp. 173–76.

36. Bree Richards, "Boris Charmatz," *The Guide: 20th Biennale of Sydney* (Sydney: Biennale of Sydney, 2016), p. 245.

37. Jeroen Peeters, *Through the Back: Situating Vision between Moving Bodies* (Helsinki: Theatre Academy of the University of the Arts, Helsinki, 2014), p. 91.

38. Jeroen Peeters, *Through the Back*, p. 113. This description of the dancing body has some affinity with the notion of dance as "unassertive" (see Chapter 1).

39. Dimitri Chamblas quoted in Amalvi, "More or Less Dance," p. 122.

40. Richards, "Boris Charmatz," p. 245.

41. On the contagion of bodily states see John Martin and Godard in Chapter 2.

42. Wood, "Boris Charmatz," pp. 89 and 91. She is drawing a comparison here between Charmatz and Tino Sehgal or Martin Creed whose conceptual work with the body "names the individual parts of the performance situation" in contrast to Charmatz's more opaque approach to meaning production (Wood, "Boris Charmatz"). Rainer coined the phrase that "dance is hard to see" ("A Quasi Survey of Some 'Minimalist' Tendencies in the Quantitatively Minimal Dance Activity Amidst the Plethora, or an Analysis of *Trio A*," in *Minimal Art: A Critical Survey*, edited by Gregory Battcock [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995 (1968)], p. 271).

43. Charmatz's avoidance of choreographic structures that operate across multiple bodies working as one coordinated unit might be a political choice associated with his promotion of the dancer as a "carrier, emissary, custodian," rather than a translator (Amalvi, "More or Less Dance," p. 123).

44. Christophe Wavelet and Ana Janevski, "How to Write a Counter-History," in *Boris Charmatz*, p. 45. Wood writes, "Charmatz makes *doing* his starting point. His work over the past two decades has obsessed over the physical body as the primary territory for experimentation" ("Boris Charmatz," p. 85, italics in original).

45. Tim Etchells, "Go Slowly, Go: Some Thoughts on Boris Charmatz's *expo zéro* and *brouillon*," in *Boris Charmatz*, p. 64.

46. Charmatz has worked with the sculpture of Toni Grand in *Les disparates* (1994). His choreographies have also been discussed in visual art terms. Wood describes *À bras-le-corps* as "a form of relational sculpture," and *Aatt enen tionon* as best approached as a sculpture to walk around (Wood, "Boris Charmatz," pp. 88–89).

47. Uri Aran, "'I Wanted to Teach the White Cube How to Take Theatricality': An Interview with Adam Linder," *Spike Magazine*, November 1, 2017, accessed April 12, 2022, online: https://www.spikeartmagazine.com/?q=articles/i-wanted-teach-white-cube-how-take-theatricality

Chapter 5

1. Hal Foster, "Made Out of the Real World: Lessons from the Fulton Street Studio," in *Robert Rauschenberg, edited by David Frankel* (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 2016), p. 96. Foster's observations are included in the "Conclusion" of Erin Brannigan, *Choreography, Visual Art and Experimental Composition 1950s-1970s* (London: Routledge, 2022), p. 227 and help connect the present book with the former.

2. William Forsythe, "Choreographic Objects," in *William Forsythe and the Practice of Choreography: It Starts From Any Point*, edited by Steven Spier (London: Routledge, 2011), p. 90. Forsythe's intentions in developing this concept seem to include advocacy: "ideally, choreographic ideas in this form [choreographic objects] would draw an attentive, diverse readership that would eventually understand and, hopefully, champion . . . choreographic thinking" (p. 92).

3. William Forsythe, "Choreographic Objects," p. 92.

4. Camille Hardy, "Contemporary Views from Vienna," *Dance Chronicle* 32 (2009): p. 166.

5. American cultural commentator Andy Horwitz's 2012 three-part essay, "The Economics of Ephemerality," takes Performa and other organizations to task over their discourses surrounding, and engagement with, dance and performance artists (the first part is "Panel as Performance: Deconstructing the Performa Event," in *Culturebot* [October 11, 2012], accessed October 13, 2022, online: https://www.culturebot.org/2012/10/14762/panel-as-performance-deconstructing-the-performa-event/).

6. Mark Franko and André Lepecki, "Editor's Note: Dance in the Museum," *Dance Research Journal* 46, no. 3 (2014): p. 3. *"Retrospective" by Xavier Le Roy*, Fundació Antoni Tàpies in Barcelona, February 24-April 22, 2012.

7. Regarding dance and the archive, see the work of the *Motion Bank* team (http://motionbank.org/en.html), and the various archival projects, foundations, and trusts following the death of Merce Cunningham (https://www.mercecunningham.org/), Pina Bausch (https://www.pinabausch.org/), and Trisha Brown (https://trishabrowncompany.org/archive/about-the-trisha-brown-archive.html). Dunham's Data is a project focused on working with data from Katherine Dunham's archive (https://www.dunhamsdata.org/). Siobhan Davies is a living choreographer who has given much attention to the question of a dance archive in her RePlay project (currently offline).

8. Bojana Cvejić, "Xavier Le Roy's *'Retrospective'*: Choreographing a Problem, and a Mode of Production," in *'Retrospective' by Xavier Le Roy*, edited by Bojana Cvejić (Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2014), p. 9. More could also be said about Le Roy's control over the exhibition and agency of the dancers in dialogue with the Case Studies in Part II.

9. *Expanded Choreography. Situations, Movements, Objects . . .*, MACBA, Fundació Antoni Tàpies, Mercat de les Flors, 28-31 March, 2012, accessed April 8, 2021, online: https://www.macba.cat/en/exhibitions-activities/activities/expanded-choreography-situations-movements-objects. Organized by the University

of Dance and Circus Stockholm, the Museu d'Art Contemporani de Barcelona (MACBA), the Fundació Antoni Tàpies, and the Mercat de les Flors, and devised by Mårten Spångberg. Participants included Bojana Cvejić, Dorothea von Hantelmann, Graham Harman, Ana Janevski, Emma Kim Hagdahl, André Lepecki, Xavier Le Roy, Maria Lind, Isabel de Naverán, Luciana Parisi, Goran Sergej Pristaš, Mårten Spångberg, Francisco Tirado, and Christophe Wavelet. The anthology edited by Cvejić was an outcome of the event.

10. *Expanded Choreography*.

11. See Nalina Wait and Erin Brannigan on the historical mobilization of the philosophy of Michel Foucault in such dance debates ("Body-States and the Site of Authority: The Emancipated Dancer," in *Oxford Handbook of Dance and Competition*, edited by Sherril Dodds [New York: Oxford University Press, 2018], pp. 283-304).

12. See Rudi Laermans on the rise of "collaboration" in contemporary dance authorship (*Moving Together: Theorizing and Making Contemporary Dance* [Amsterdam: Valiz, 2015], pp. 20-21).

13. Lepecki in dialogic mode with Ric Allsopp, "On Choreography," *Performance Research* 13, no. 1 (2008): pp. 1 and 5. For more recent comments from Lepecki on choreography and obedience/control see *Singularities: Dance in the Age of Performance* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2016), p. 29; "9 Variations on Things and Performance," in *Danse: An Anthology*, edited by Noémie Solomon (Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2014), pp. 296-97; and "Moving as Thing: Choreographic Critiques of the Object," *October* 140 (Spring 2012): p. 90.

14. Boyan Manchev, Xavier Le Roy, and Franz Anton Cramer, "Dance, the Metamorphosis of the Body," in *Danse: An Anthology*, p. 118.

15. Katja Praznik, "What About 'Post Contemporary' Dance?," *Maska* 19, nos. 84-85 (2004): p. 19. Her starting point is Hans-Thies Lehmann's *Postdramatic Theatre*, translated by Karen Jürs-Munby (New York and London: Routledge, 2006 [originally published in German, 1999]) and her subject is "the 'new conceptual' dance like Jérôme Bel, Xavier Le Roy and Tino Sehgal" (p. 19).

16. Christophe Wavelet, Jérôme Bel, and Xavier Le Roy, "Which Body for Which Collective, Which Collective for Which Body?," translated by Melissa Thackway, in *Peripheral Vision and Collective Body*, edited by Museion Bozen/Bolzano (Bolzano: Museion, 2008), p. 89.

Mårten Spångberg elaborates on such a sentiment in 2002: "why has it become suspicious to hang out in a studio? The defiance of the studio must not be understood as a crossing out of the importance of dance or movement but of how the 'studio' envelopes what choreography is and through what methods it can be achieved . . . Any tool is relevant as long as it can be conceptually verified" (Spångberg, "Something Like a Phenomenon," *Frakcija* 24/25 [2002], n.p.). Again, there was a mid-twentieth-century precedent for such sentiments. This is Jill Johnston writing in 1968: "standing still as a no man's land between dancing and choreography. With few exceptions, the connection between dancing and choreography is becoming a modern embarrassment. Choreographers are pickled alive in the studio sweat techniques and they're all bottled up" ("Dance Journal" *Village Voice* [July 25, 1968], p. 6).

17. Jérôme Bel and Boris Charmatz, "Jérôme Bel and Boris Charmatz: Emails 2009-2010," in *Danse: An Anthology*, p. 248.

18. Wavelet et al., "Which Body for Which Collective," p. 89. Bel himself trained in one of the contemporary dance centers in France and danced with choreographers such as Angelin Preljocaj. Comparisons with Duchamp and Dada recur across the literature on conceptual dance and suggest strong links to American Neo-Dada.

19. Cvejić, "To End with Judgement by Way of Clarification," in *Danse: An Anthology*, edited by Noémie Solomon (Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2014), p. 149.

20. Joseph Kosuth, "After Philosophy," in *Conceptual Art*, edited by Peter Osborne (London: Phaidon Press Limited, 2002), p. 233.

21. Cvejić, "To End with Judgement by Way of Clarification," p. 153. Modern dance is defined by Cvejić as entailing an "essentialist relation to the medium of dance as an ongoing movement of the body, intentionally regulated by rhythmic, gestural, or other kinds of patterns" (*Choreographing Problems*, pp. 9 and 18). There is a similar approach in Burt's *Ungoverning Dance* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017). That Burt's case studies are "ungoverning" institutionalized dance, leading to a redefinition of the commons, is clearly argued. What the institution and the commons consist of to start with is less clear.

22. Bojana Cvejić, *Choreographing Problems: Expressive Concepts in European Contemporary Dance and Performance* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), pp. 2 and 9. Elsewhere Cvejić refers to "the insulated, navel-gazing French Contemporary-dance scene of the 1990s" ("The Vertiginous Invasion of a Tribe Called Dance: Boris Charmatz's *Héâtre-élévision [Pseudo Performance]*," in *Boris Charmatz*, edited by Ana Janevski [New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 2017], p. 53).

23. Susan Best has written about the deeply ingrained commitment to an impersonal mode in advanced art since the mid-twentieth century that is broadly accepted and rarely criticized (Susan Best, *It's Not Personal* [London: Bloomsbury, 2021], p. 23).

24. Cvejić, *Choreographing Problems*, p. 8, citing Stewart Martin, "The Absolute Artwork Meets the Absolute Commodity," *Radical Philosophy* 146 (2007): pp. 17-25 and "The Subsumption of Art under Capital," in *Aesthetics and Contemporary Art*, edited by Armen Avanessian and Luke Skrebowski (Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2011), pp. 145-57. This recalls Thierry de Duve's "generic" category of art that he argues emerged in the 1960s post-John Cage and had "severed its ties with the specific crafts and traditions" (*Kant after Duchamp* [Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1996], p. 222).

25. Cvejić states, "the current second performance turn in visual art consists of accommodating and adapting already existing works of dance and performance for the purpose of enhancing audience participation. This is part of a larger condition of total aestheticization of consumer-capitalist life, where art is a potent instrument" ("Bojana Cvejić interview by Christina Schmid," *The Third Rail Quarterly* 11 [2017]: p. 5).

26. Catherine Wood, "The Year in Performance," *Artforum International* 54, no. 4 (2015): pp. 129-30 and Hal Foster, "In Praise of Actuality," in *Bad New Days: Art, Criticism, Emergency* (Brooklyn: Verso, 2015), pp. 127-40.

27. See the literature referred to in Brannigan, *Choreography, Visual Art and Experimental Composition 1950s-1970s*, and the central arguments of that book. See also Josefine Wikström's excellent *Practices of Relations in Task-Dance and the Event-Score: A Critique of Performance* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2021) which gives an account of this history through philosophies of aesthetics.

28. Cvejić indicates the French political context and main players in 2011, citing "the majority of French *nouvelle danse* practitioners like Maguy Marin, Régine Chopinot, Angelin Preljocaj or Mathilde Monnier" as exemplars of the institutionalized dance from which the conceptual artists departed ("Xavier Le Roy: The Dissenting Choreography of One Frenchman Less," in *Contemporary French Theatre and Performance*, edited by Clare Finburgh and Carl Lavery [London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011], p. 188). Burt quotes one critic, Dominique Frétard, who perhaps re-coined the term "non-dance" in an article published in *Le Monde* on May 6, 2003 (*Ungoverning Dance* [New York: Oxford University Press, 2017], p. 10). See also Nathalie Yokel and Céline Roux, "The Turn of the 90s: A New Aesthetic and Political Positioning," in *Visages de la Danse* (November 30, 2011), accessed November 14, 2018, online: https://www.journal-laterrasse.fr/hors-serie/le-virage-des-annees-90-un-nouveau-positionnement-esthetique-et-politique/. Jean-Marc Adolphe and Gérard Mayen mention *Le Monde* critics and Frétard explicitly ("The 'Non-dance' is Still Dancing," *Movement* 1 [May 2004], translation accessed December 28, 2018, online: http://sarma.be/docs/784).

29. "Lettre ouverte à Dominique Wallon et aux danseurs contemporains quel avenir pour la création chorégraphique contemporaine?," accessed November 14, 2018, online: http://www.ladanse.com/ACPACA/signataires-du-20-aout.pdf. Christophe Wavelet explains the history of the political action by the dance community in detail in Christophe Wavelet and Ana Janevski, "How to Write a Counter-History: A Conversation," in *Boris Charmatz*, pp. 38-40. For a perspective on the contemporary Flemish situation see Laermans, *Moving Together*, pp. 17-19.

30. Isabelle Ginot, "A Common Place," in *Danse: An Anthology*, p. 159. Christophe Wavelet concurs; he describes what he calls the "choreotypes" of "late 1980s until about 1994 or '95" that constituted "obligatory choreographic formulas" (Wavelet and Janevski, "How to Write a Counter-History," p. 41).

31. Isabelle Ginot, "Dis-identifying: Dancing Bodies and Analysing Eyes at Work," in *Discourses in Dance* 2, no. 1 (2004), n.p., accessed March 31, 2019, online: http://sarma.be/docs/602

32. Alessandra Nicifero, "OCCUPY MoMA: The (Risks and) Potentials of a *Musée de la danse*!," *Dance Research Journal* 46, no. 3 (December 2014): p. 37; and Frédéric Pouillaude, "*Scène* and Contemporaneity," translated by Noémie Solomon, *TDR: The Drama Review* 51, no. 2 (2007): pp. 131-32.

33. Cvejić, *Choreographing Problems*, p. 10.

34. Yokel and Roux, "The Turn of the 90s," n.p. This is supported by comments from French dance artists LeClubdes5: "[The] filiation, between 'Postmodern Dance' and the young [French] choreographers of the nineties is non-historical and even less geographic, but definitely artistic, and it has had a strong impact on the following generations of dancers" ("LE CLUBDES5, PARIS, Spring 2009," in *Everybodys Group Self-Interviews*, edited by Alice Chauchat and Mette

Ingvartsen [Everybodys Publications, 2009], p. 56). Regarding the French reception of American "post-modern" dance, Laermans points out that Le Roy, Bel, Charmatz, and others were involved in Quatuor Albrecht Knust, a performance collective that restaged iconic Judson works such as Steve Paxton's *Satisying Lover* (1967) between 1993 and 2002 (*Moving Together*, p. 210). Lepecki notes how the tide then turned, and as European dance was moving into a third wave of experimental work, American dance faced a "slumbering of choreographic imagination," particularly with Meg Stuart's move to Europe ("Crystallisation: Unmaking American Dance by Tradition," *Dance Theatre Journal* [February 1999]: pp. 26–27).

35. David Velasco, "Split City," in *Sarah Michelson*, edited by David Velasco (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 2017), p. 59.

36. *Choreographic Devices*, 10–12 June, 2022, Institute of Contemporary Arts, London (accessed October 13, 2022, online: https://www.ica.art/media/06238.pdf).

37. *Choreographic Devices*.

38. Claire Bishop, "The Perils and Possibilities of Dance in the Museum: Tate, MoMA and Whitney," *Dance Research Journal* 46, no. 3 (2014): p. 72. Italics in original. Another factor here is access to producers and the important work they do. Charmatz's producer, Angèle Le Grand, played a pivotal role in his success; Amalvi describes how she acted as "his producer, administrator, and dramatist until 2004, creating favourable conditions for the reception of his work" (Gilles Amalvi, "More or Less Dance: A Multifaceted Portrait of Boris Charmatz," in *Boris Charmatz*, p. 123).

39. Wood, "Boris Charmatz," p. 86.

40. Xavier Le Roy and Scarlet Yu, *Temporary Title* (2015). First commissioned as the 31st Kaldor Public Art Project, Carriageworks, Sydney, 20–22 November 2015, with collaborating artists Natalie Abbott, Christine Babinskas, Geraldine Balcazar, Georgia Bettens, Eugene Choi, Matthew Day, Lauren Eiko, Peter Fraser, Ryuichi Fujimura, Alice Heyward, Becky Hilton, David Huggins, Marcus McKenzie, Kathryn Puie, Amaara Raheem, Darcy Wallace, Adam Warburton, and Ivey Wawn (https://kaldorartprojects.org.au/projects/project-31-xavier-le-roy/). Having read Lepecki's description (*Singularities*, pp. 94–100), this work seems to owe much to Le Roy's *Low Pieces* (2010) which I have not seen.

41. Those books are: Petra Sabisch, *Choreographing Relations* (Munich: epodium, 2011); Jenn Joy, *The Choreographic* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2014); Cvejić, *Choreographing Problems*; Lepecki, *Exhausting Dance: Performance and the Politics of Movement* (New York and London: Routledge, 2006) and *Singularities*; Burt, *Ungoverning Dance*; Peeters, *Through the Back: Situating Vision between Moving Bodies* (Helsinki: Theatre Academy of the University of the Arts, Helsinki, 2014); and Laermans, *Moving Together*. A precedent was Helmut Ploebst, *No Wind No Word: New Choreography in the Society of the Spectacle* (Munich: K. Kieser Verlag, 2001), which included Stuart, Charmatz, Bel, and Le Roy, among others. He describes "progressive works of art" characterized by "generous thinking models and intense experiences against the spectacle of sweaty seducers, bourgeois stage dance popularity-maniacs and smoothly designed marketing producers" (p. 13).

42. This quartet, with the addition of Eszter Salamon, are verified as the

widely recognizable group associated with conceptual dance by Wood ("Boris Charmatz: An Architecture of Attention [Revisited]," in *Boris Charmatz*, p. 85).

43. It should be noted that Lepecki has championed many of these female artists for some time, also writing the only theoretical text on Michelson from a choreographic perspective to date (see "Choreopolice and Choreopolitics: Or, the Task of the Dancer," *TDR: The Drama Review* 57, no. 4 [Winter 2013]: pp. 13–27).

44. Ginot, "A Common Place," p. 166. Ginot warns of a new "club" mentality: "the creation of a new 'milieu,' of a new dandyism based, exactly like the previous one, on an aesthetic consensus and signs that make it possible to distinguish between those who 'belong' and those that don't" (Ginot, "A Common Place," p. 166).

Case Study 7

1. This chapter maps some comparisons between Boris Charmatz and Linder. Linder and Charmatz were trained classically from a very young age; Charmatz attended the Paris Opera Ballet and Linder the Royal Ballet School in London. Both also worked with Meg Stuart.

2. Erin Brannigan, "Interview with Adam Linder, April 20, 2021." Linder describes the work of others that "conveys a commitment [to the dancing] that wraps the audience into that moment . . . it's a trap" (Brannigan, "Interview with Adam Linder").

3. As noted in Case Study 6, Buchloh identifies "the transition from self-reflexivity to tautology to contextuality as three stages of conceptual development," with the latter reflecting on "institutions, framework, distribution" (Benjamin Buchloh, Rosalind Krauss, Alexander Alberro, Thierry de Duve, Martha Buskirk, and Yve-Alain Bois, "Conceptual Art and the Reception of Duchamp," *October* 70 [1994]: p. 136).

4. David Everitt Howe, "Dance in the Ruins: Trajal Harrell, Adam Linder and Alexandra Bachzetsis on Their Work, Its Institutionalization, and the Art World," *Mousse* 50, October–November (2015): p. 81. For example, Jérôme Bel's works such as *Véronique Doisneau* (2004) and *Cédric Andrieux* (2009), which made dance culture its target, were "deconstructive works *about* dance," in Linder's words, and are worlds away from the more inclusive critiques of socio-economically conditioned bodies in Linder's work (Jeppe Ugelvig, "Choreographer ADAM LINDER Dances for Hire and Disrupts Contemporary Creative Economies," *032c*, November 12, 2015, accessed April 20, 2022, online: https://032c.com/magazine/choreographer-adam-linder-dances-for-hire-and-disrupts-contemporary-creative-economies, italics in original).

5. Linder also presented *Full Service* (2018), a survey of his *Choreographic Services No. 1–5*. This has been presented at the CCA Wattis Institute, San Francisco and Musée d'Art Moderne Grand-Duc Jean, Luxembourg. Linder's debt to artist Mierle Laderman Ukeles has been discussed by many commentators.

6. Brannigan, "Interview with Adam Linder."

7. I spent some time with *Choreographic Service No. 2: Some Proximity* at MCA as part of the *Biennale of Sydney*, March 16–17, 19–21, 2016. Linder talks about his respect for African-American originating dance forms and his work

with "expert gliders" and freestylers ("Culture Now: Adam Linder," September 11, 2015, accessed March 20, 2020, online: https://archive.ica.art/whats-on/culture-now-adam-linder/).

8. Howe, "Dance in the Ruins," p. 83.

9. Hannes Loichinger and Adam Linder, "Service in Exchange," *Provence: Report AW 18/19* (Autumn, 2019), edited by Tobias Kaspar and Hannes Loichinger (Spector Books), p. 67. The contract also protects the skills of the dancer: "[choreography] needs to safeguard its expertise" (Howe, "Dance in the Ruins," p. 81).

10. In 2021, Linder would qualify this: "I am aware that some of the conceptual framing [of the *Choreographic Services*] was a crutch for understanding how I would work with choreography within the exhibition space and that whole kind of market context, and I no longer want to use [that conceptual framing] in the work that I'm going forward with" (Brannigan, "Interview with Adam Linder").

11. Uri Aran, "'I Wanted to Teach the White Cube How to Take Theatricality': An interview with Adam Linder," *Spike Magazine*, November 1, 2017, accessed April 12, 2022, online: https://www.spikeartmagazine.com/?q=articles/i-wanted-teach-white-cube-how-take-theatricality

12. Howe, "Dance in the Ruins," p. 81. Linder says that the contract makes transparent the capital gains in circulation: "this is all there is; this is not serving anything else but itself" (Adam Linder, "Contract for *Some Proximity*," cited in Jonathan P. Watts with Adam Linder, "S, s, s, s sommme p, p,p,p,proxim, im, im, ity," *un* 9, no. 2 [2015], accessed April 20, 2022, online: https://unprojects.org.au/article/s-s-s-s-sommme-p-pppproxim-im-im-ity/. n.p.).

13. Brannigan, "Interview with Adam Linder."

14. Watts with Linder, "S, s, s, s sommme p, p,p,p,proxim, im, im, ity," n.p.

15. Aran, "'I Wanted to Teach the White Cube How to Take Theatricality'," n.p.

16. Aran, n.p. Linder himself notes, "in practical terms, the purpose is to live off my work, which is not yet entirely happening! *It is* a commodity, it is a service. I'm working and I'm getting paid for my work, but that's just the practical aspect" (Ugelvig, "Choreographer ADAM LINDER Dances for Hire and Disrupts Contemporary Creative Economies," n.p.).

17. Dancer Stamp suggests that the contract is not only a remainder but a promise of the next performed iteration (private correspondence, April 26, 2022).

18. Brannigan, "Interview with Adam Linder."

19. Aran, "'I Wanted to Teach the White Cube How to Take Theatricality'," n.p.

20. Brannigan, "Interview with Adam Linder."

21. Brannigan, "Interview with Adam Linder."

22. Brannigan, "Interview with Adam Linder and Ugelvig, "Choreographer ADAM LINDER Dances for Hire," n.p.

23. Ugelvig, "Choreographer ADAM LINDER Dances for Hire," n.p.

24. Ugelvig.

25. Watts with Linder, "S, s, s, s sommme p, p,p,p,proxim, im, im, ity," n.p.

26. Aran, "'I Wanted to Teach the White Cube How to Take Theatricality'," n.p.

27. Howe, "Dance in the Ruins," p. 83.

28. Linder pushes this to an extreme with *Footnote Service: Some Trade* (2018), where he challenges the museum to find an equivalent to cash within its own assets that it will offer as a "trade" for the performances. The metaphor is sexualized in the performative aspect of the work: "hustle the walls . . . angling for a prospect . . . suspended come on . . . solicit an exchange" (Loichinger and Linder, "Service in Exchange," p. 67). Linder reports that this service was not popular with institutions.

29. Bojana Cvejić, "European Contemporary Dance, before Its Recent Arrival in the Museum," in *Is the Living Body the Last Thing Left Alive? The New Performance Turn, Its Histories and Its Institutions*, edited by Cosmin Costinas and Ana Janevski (Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2017), p. 30.

30. Loichinger and Linder, "Service in Exchange," p. 68.

31. Bojana Cvejić, "To End with Judgement by Way of Clarification," in *Danse: An Anthology*, edited by Noémie Solomon (Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2014), p. 149, italics in original.

32. Loichinger and Linder, "Service in Exchange," p. 68.

33. Brannigan, "Interview with Adam Linder."

34. Brannigan, "Interview with Adam Linder."

35. Linder explains, "so when you hire a 'Service', you're hiring Adam, or Adam and Justin and Jonathan. I'm trying to keep the subjects the primary material, not the concept or the score, arrangements for recasting, and so on. For me a performance is the performers. . . . Yes, absolutely, the work is authored by me. It's my work. But the performers who activate my work are absolutely named and visible and have responsibility" (Howe, "Dance in the Ruins," p. 83).

36. Brannigan, "Interview with Adam Linder."

37. Aran, "'I Wanted to Teach the White Cube How to Take Theatricality'," n.p. He continues: "dance that looks and smells of an accessible, liberal, freeing activity. A saviour for the public-program departments of art institutions. And I think these assumptions around aesthetics, around form and its hitherto 'good politics', are something that I am trying to counter—with how I have been working on the services."

38. Aran, "'I Wanted to Teach the White Cube How to Take Theatricality'."

39. Aran, "'I Wanted to Teach the White Cube How to Take Theatricality'." In opposition to the narrative around deskilling in conceptual dance, Catherine Wood notes the visual arts fascination with the skills of the dance artist, a fascination that Robert Rauschenberg articulated in the 1960s (Sara Wookey, "Catherine Wood," in *Who Cares? Dance in the Gallery and Museum*, edited by Sara Wookey [London: Siobhan Davies Dance, 2015], p. 30).

40. Brannigan, "Interview with Adam Linder." Linder notes that "reflecting on the contexts of different dance forms and the factors that determine their place in the culture at large has been a significant part of my work to date" (Adam Linder, "Life in Performance: Dressing Up, Ballet, Music Videos and Mutant Dance," *Frieze* 174 [October 2015]: p. 44).

41. Brannigan, "Interview with Adam Linder," my emphasis.

42. Brannigan, "Interview with Adam Linder."

43. Brannigan, "Interview with Adam Linder."

44. Brannigan, "Interview with Adam Linder."

45. Linder, "Life in Performance," p. 43.
46. Brannigan, "Interview with Adam Linder."

Chapter 6

1. Xavier Le Roy is often cited stating, "I don't consider myself a conceptual artist and I don't know of one choreographer who works in dance without a concept" (Xavier Le Roy, Jonathan Burrows, and Felix Ruckert, "Meeting of Minds," *Dance Theatre Journal* 20 [2004], p. 10).

2. Cvejić cited in Rudi Laermans, *Moving Together: Theorizing and Making Contemporary Dance* (Amsterdam: Valiz, 2015), p. 206. Laermans links the rise of "primarily conceptually articulated compositional consistency" to the need for anchors to sustain project-based work occuring across multiple periods of development, for language to justify public funding, work with dramaturges, and the growth of dance theory (pp. 206–7).

3. Ramsay Burt, *Ungoverning Dance* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017), pp. 9, 38; and Simone Forti, *Handbook in Motion* (New York: New York University Press, 1974), p. 59.

4. Meredith Morse, "Simone Forti's Huddle and Minimalist Performance," *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Art* 14, no. 1 (2014): p. 36. See Forti's comments on Huddle as "a sculpture" in Breitwieser, "The Workshop Process," in *Simone Forti: Thinking with the Body*, edited by Sabine Breitwieser (Salzburg: Museum der Moderne Salzburg, 2014), p. 29.

5. Jill Johnston, "Dance Journal" *Village Voice*, July 25 (1968): p. 6.

6. Yvonne Rainer, "Looking Myself in the Mouth," *October* 17 (Summer 1981): p. 67. On the influence of Cage on Rainer's method see Erin Brannigan, "4.2 Yvonne Rainer (Works 1961–1965)" in *Choreography, Visual Art and Experimental Composition 1950s–1970s* (London: Routledge, 2022), pp. 142–51.

7. Goldberg quoted in Lydia Yee, "All Work, All Play," in *Laurie Anderson, Trisha Brown, Gordon Matta-Clark: Pioneers of the Downtown Scene New York 1970s*, edited by Lydia Yee (Munich: Prestel Verlag, 2011), p. 79.

8. Trisha Brown, "Trisha Brown," in *Contemporary Dance: An Anthology of Lectures, Interviews and Essays with Many of the Most Important Contemporary American Choreographers, Scholars and Critics*, edited by Anne Livet (New York: Abbeville Press, 1978), p. 45. This is reiterated by Judith Dunn who says, "he posed questions arising out of the most basic elements—structure, method, material . . . evaluation in terms of 'good or bad,' 'acceptable-rejected,' were eliminated from discussion and analysis replaced them. (What did you see, what did you do, what took place, how did you go about constructing and ordering. What are the materials, where did you find or how did you form them, etc.)" (Dunn quoted in Sally Banes, *Democracy's Body: Judson Dance Theater, 1962–1964* [Durham: Duke University Press, 1993], pp. 15–16).

9. Wendy Perron, "Simone Forti: bodynatureartmovementbody," in *Radical Bodies: Anna Halprin, Simone Forti, and Yvonne Rainer in California and New York, 1955–1972*, edited by Ninotchka Bennahum, Wendy Perron, and Bruce Robertson (Santa Barbara, CA: Art, Design and Architecture Museum, 2017), p. 93.

10. Rudolf von Laban, *The Mastery of Movement*, third edition (Boston, MA: Play Inc., 1971 [1950]).

11. Yee, "All Work, All Play," p. 89.

12. Carolyn Brown, *Chance and Circumstance: Twenty Years with Cage and Cunningham*, (Evanstown, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2007), p. 45.

13. Marcella Lista, "Dance is Hard to See. Introduction," in *A Different Way to Move: Minimalismes, New York, 1960-1980*, edited by Marcella Lista (Berlin: Hatje Cantz, 2017), p. 16. She cites Annette Michelson, "Yvonne Rainer, Part One: The Dancer and the Dance," *Artforum* January (1974): pp. 57-63, on these terms.

14. Lista, "Dance is Hard to See. Introduction, p. 19.

15. Laermans, *Moving Together*, p. 203. He goes on to note continuities between the two regarding disciplinary self-reflexivity, testing art versus non-art boundaries, institutional critique, subverting authorship, process-based work, and art as commodity, but adds, "notwithstanding these affinities with Conceptualism, the work of Judson has not been chiefly categorized or analyzed as Conceptual Dance."

16. Graham discussing Nauman's work, "Subject Matter," *End Moments* (New York: Self-published, 1969), p. 21.

17. See Brannigan, *Choreography, Visual Art and Experimental Composition 1950s-1970s*, for a discussion of the exchange between dancers and visual artists during this period and in this geographic location. I have taken the term "lessons from dancing" from Zoe Theodore's curatorial project in Melbourne, Bus Projects, August 1-August 25, 2018 (https://busprojects.org.au/program/lessons-from-dancing).

18. Walter Terry, "The Avant-Garde Dance Becomes Non-Dance with Rauschenberg," *New York Herald Tribune*, January 11, 1966.

19. Kirsten Maar, "Exhibiting Choreography," in *Assign and Arrange: Methodologies of Presentation in Art and Dance*, edited by Maren Butte, Kirsten Maar, Fiona McGovern, Marie-France Rafael, and Jörn Schafaff (Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2014), p. 107 (pp. 93-111). Maar references RoseLee Goldberg on performance as the "materialization of the art concept" in "Space as Praxis," a reflection on her exhibition *Space: A Thousand Words* (1975, Royal College of Art Gallery, co-curated with Bernard Tschumi), first published in *Studio International* 190, no. 977 (September-October 1975): pp. 130-35. Goldberg introduces her argument regarding the centrality of space to the emergence of conceptual art and the associated focus on the bodily apprehension of space through "practice" with the examples of Cage, dance, and minimal sculpture and gives the work of dance artists significant attention and importance. However, there are no dance artists involved in Goldberg's exhibition and only two to three female artists among twenty-five.

20. Brannigan, *Choreography, Visual Art and Experimental Composition 1950s-1970s*, pp. 86-131.

21. Hal Foster, "Made Out of the Real World: Lessons from the Fulton Street Studio," in *Robert Rauschenberg*, edited by David Frankel (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 2016), p. 96. Liz Kotz limits the links between Neo-Dada and conceptual art, stating that Minimalism (and specifically Robert Morris's I-Box [1962]) rehearsed "the kind of structural equivalence among object, language,

photograph" found in conceptual art (Liz Kotz "Language between Performance and Photography," *October* 111 [2005]: p. 16). While this follows Lippard's logic (note fn29, I would argue that this work of Morris's emerged from his performance work with Halprin and Forti and that there is an alternative genealogy from Neo-Dada through LeWitt's conceptualism to the conceptual dance of the late twentieth century.

22. Branden Joseph's account of "concept art" in *Beyond the Dream Syndicate*, read through the work of composers La Monte Young, Henry Flynt, and Tony Conrad in the early 1960s, describes ground-breaking practices that were suppressed in canonical accounts of this tendency in art (*Beyond the Dream Syndicate: Tony Conrad and the Arts after Cage [A "Minor" History]* [New York: Zone Books, 2011]). He argues that their word scores represent an extreme precedent in a longer, intermedial vein. The term "conceptual art" emerged a little later and is associated with LeWitt's 1967 article (Sol LeWitt, "Paragraphs on Conceptual Art," *Artforum* 5, no. 10 [1967]: pp. 79–83).

23. Peter Osborne, "Survey," in *Conceptual Art*, edited by Peter Osborne (London: Phaidon Press Limited, 2002), p. 16. Buchloh notes that conceptual art's deep questioning of the very nature of art makes it inherently resistant to art history and criticism (Benjamin Buchloh, "Conceptual Art 1962–1969: From the Aesthetic of Administration to the Critique of Institutions," *October* 55 [1990]: p. 105). Regarding naming the field, which has a complicated history of debates and conjecture that I will not address, Lippard's book humorously points to the problems of its broad application, stating that her survey covers "so-called conceptual or information or idea art with mentions of such vaguely designated areas as minimal, anti-form, systems, earth, or process art" (Lucy Lippard, *Six Years: The Dematerialization of the Art Object from 1966 to 1972* [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997]).

24. Alexander Alberro, "Introduction: The Way Out is the Way In," in *Art After Conceptual Art*, edited by Sabeth Buchmann and Alexander Alberro (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2006), p. 14.

25. Susan Best, *Visualizing Feeling: Affect and the Feminine Avant-Garde* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2014) and *It's Not Personal: Post 60s Body Art and Performance* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2021); and Jayne Wark, "Conceptual Art and Feminism: Martha Rosler, Adrian Piper, Eleanor Antin, and Martha Wilson," *Woman's Art Journal* 22, no. 1 (Spring–Summer, 2001): pp. 44–50.

26. Henrik Olesen, "Pre Post: Speaking Backwards," in *Art After Conceptual Art*, p. 225.

27. Luis Camnitzer, Jane Farver, and Rachel Weiss, "Foreword," *Global Conceptualism: Points of Origin, 1950s–1980s*, edited by Philomena Mariani (New York: Queens Museum of Art, 1999), p. viii.

28. Zöe Sutherland, "The World as Gallery: Conceptualism and Global Neo-Avant-Garde," *New Left Review* 98 (March/April 2016): p. 83.

29. Lippard sees Minimalism as the precursor of conceptual art, with strong links to the *Primary Structures* exhibition at the Jewish Museum in 1966 and the work of Ad Reinhardt, but she also mentions Marcel Duchamp and Jasper Johns (Lippard, *Six Years*, pp. viii–ix). Lippard and Chandler also mention Rauschenberg's *Erased de Kooning* (1953) as an early example of "ultra-conceptual"

art (Lucy Lippard and John Chandler, "The Dematerialization of Art," originally published in 1967-68 and reproduced in Lucy Lippard, *Changing: Essays in Art Criticism* [New York: E.P. Dutton, 1971], p. 261). Osborne begins with Minimalism but adds Fluxus as an important but under-theorized precedent (Osborne, "Survey," p. 19).

30. Sutherland, "The World as Gallery," p. 111. Regarding art and/in/as the world Lippard notes, "I still try to blur the boundaries between art and everything else as much as possible" (Lippard, *Six Years*, p. xv). This process was also begun with Neo-Dada artists such as Cage and Rauschenberg.

31. Alexander Alberro, "Reconsidering Conceptual Art, 1966-1977," in *Conceptual Art: A Critical Anthology*, edited by Alexander Alberro and Blake Stimson (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1999), p. xvii.

32. Conceptual artist Joseph Kosuth states, "I replaced the term 'work' for *art proposition*. Because a conceptual *work* of art in the traditional sense, is a contradiction in terms" (*The Sixth Investigation 1969 Proposition 14* [Cologne: Gerd De Vries/Paul Maenz, 1971], n.p.).

33. Joseph, *Beyond the Dream Syndicate*, p. 160. Buchloh asks, "Is Cage the figure that fuses the modernist and Duchampian traditions that laid the groundwork for Morris and Conceptual art?" (Benjamin Buchloh, Rosalind Krauss, Alexander Alberro, Thierry de Duve, Martha Buskirk, and Yve-Alain Bois, "Conceptual Art and the Reception of Duchamp," *October* 70 [1994]: p. 139).

34. Lippard and Chandler, "The Dematerialization of Art."

35. Alberro notes "the pursuit of larger audiences by the use of printed matter" in conceptual art ("Conceptual Art and the Reception of Duchamp," p. 143).

36. Buchloh states that "conceptual artists intervened with the means of language in the conventions of visuality" (Buchloh, "Conceptual Art and the Reception of Duchamp," p. 130). See also Liz Kotz's work on the art and language of this period, including *Words to Be Looked at: Language in 1960s Art* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2010).

37. Sutherland, "The World as Gallery," p. 86. Regarding process, LeWitt writes, "ideas can be works of art; they are in a chain of development that may eventually find some form. All ideas need not be made physical" (Sol LeWitt, "Sentences on Conceptual Art," first published in *0-9*, no. 5 [January 1969], then *Art-Language* [May 1969]: n.p.).

38. Lippard, *Six Years*, pp. xv-xx, 98 and 144. See Joseph, *Beyond the Dream Syndicate*, pp. 156-65 for earlier extreme examples from Henry Flynt, Tony Conrad, and La Monte Young.

39. Ivana Müller, *While We Were Holding It Together* (2006), accessed March 5, 2019, online: https://vimeo.com/23973875

40. William Forsythe, *Nowhere and Everywhere at the Same Time No. 2* (2013). Experienced by the author as part of the 20th *Biennale of Sydney*, Cockatoo Island, 2016.

41. Osborne, "Survey," p. 16. He also asks, "is not all contemporary art in some sense 'conceptual'? Is there, then, such a thing as a completely non-conceptual art?" (p. 15).

42. Osborne, "Survey," p. 18. See also Joseph's list of characteristics of "conceptualism" (Joseph, *Beyond the Dream Syndicate*, p. 168).

43. Lippard, *Six Years*, p. xix.

44. In her article excerpted from a 2005 conference panel, Cvejić takes a "pros and cons" approach to unravelling the appropriateness of conceptual dance as a moniker for the work of Le Roy et al. in relation to definitions of conceptual art. Based on self-reflexivity, the analytic propositions they present, and a concern with spectatorship, we might say "yes"; in terms of a linguistic bias in conceptual art, affiliations with the project of Modernism, and a resulting homogenous school, we might say "no" (Bojana Cvejić, "To End with Judgement by Way of Clarification," in *Danse: An Anthology*, edited by Noémie Solomon [Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2014], p. 149). André Lepecki also makes a comparison around this time in 2006: "[conceptual art's] critique of representation, its insistence on politics, its fusion of the visual with the linguistic, its drive for a dissolution of genres, its critique of authorship, its dispersion of the art-work, its privileging of the event, its critique of institutions, and its aesthetic emphasis on minimalism—all traits that are recurrent in many recent works in Europe" (André Lepecki, *Exhausting Dance: Performance and the Politics of Movement* [New York; London: Routledge, 2006], p. 135n2). And Burt acknowledges the proximity of this new trend in dance to conceptual trends in contemporary art, but never draws direct links between the two media. He speaks of their interest in "intangible properties and intensities of experience and knowledge" (Burt, *Ungoverning Dance*, p. 5).

45. See Henry Flynt, "Concept Art," in *An Anthology of Chance Operations*, edited by La Monte Young and Jackson Mac Low (New York: La Monte Young and Jackson Mac Low, 1963), n.p. Flynt wrote "Concept Art" in 1961 and it was not included in the first version of *An Anthology* (Joseph, *Beyond the Dream Syndicate*, p. 161). Bold and italics in original. It is interesting to note a reference by Forti to improvising with Flynt in 1960 as a meaningful experience (Simone Forti, "Letters from Forti to Halprin, 1960-1961," in *Radical Bodies*, p. 152).

46. Flynt, "Concept Art," n.p. Italics in original. Pushing at the limits of art itself, Flynt adds, "it is confusing to call things as irrelevant as the emotional enjoyment of (real) music, and the intellectual enjoyment of concepts, the same kind of enjoyment . . . perhaps it would be better to . . . recognize my activity as an independent, new activity, irrelevant to art (and knowledge)."

47. Henry Flynt, "Structure Art and Pure Mathematics (1960)," in *Henry Flynt: Fragments and Reconstructions from a Destroyed Oeuvre, 1959-1963* (New York: Backworks, 1982), accessed November 21, 2018, online: https://www.moma.org/collection/works/164814

48. Lippard and Chandler, "The Dematerialization of Art," p. 255. In this essay written in 1967-68, the authors refer to an importation of "performance attitudes into painting and sculpture—the so far unrealized intermedia revolution whose prophet is John Cage" (p. 259).

49. Lippard, *Six Years*, p. vii.

50. Cvejić, "Proceduralism," in *Parallel Slalom: A Lexicon of Non-Aligned Poetics*, edited by Bojana Cvejić and Goran Sergej Pristas (Belgrade; Zagreb: Walking Theory—TkH, 2013), p. 240.

51. Cvejić, *Choreographing Problems: Expressive Concepts in European Contemporary Dance and Performance* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), Chapter

1. Cvejić's definition of "concept" in dance is set against Deleuze's association of concepts with recognition (via Immanuel Kant and Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel) and his belief that they belong to philosophy and not art (pp. 56-57). Cvejić asserts a model of "expressive concepts" in relation to the specific dance practices she discusses which are non-representational concepts resulting from the "collaboration" between an art form and philosophy involving problems and experiments (p. 61).

52. Bojana Cvejić, "Can One Dance the Logical Scaffolding of Dance?" *Frakcija* 24/25 (2002), n.p.

53. Jonathan Burrows and Jan Ritsema, "Weak Dance Strong Questions," *Performance Research* 8, no. 2 (2003): p. 31 and Cvejić, *Choreographing Problems*, p. 143. Burrows sits, based on his own writing, in some tension with the conceptual dance moniker.

54. Lippard and Chandler, "The Dematerialization of Art," p. 270.

55. Alberro, "Reconsidering Conceptual Art, 1966-1977," pp. xx-xxi.

56. Jonathan Burrows and Jan Ritsema, *Weak Dance Strong Questions* (2001), accessed September 22, 2022, online: https://vimeo.com/38303727

57. LeWitt, "Paragraphs on Conceptual Art," pp. 79-83.

58. Cvejić, *Choreographing Problems*, p. 143.

59. Rebecca Hilton, Jonathan Sinatra, and Aimar Pérez Galí were the dancers in this Sydney iteration.

60. Marissa Perel, "Gimme Shelter | Talking with Sarah Michelson about 'Devotion Study #1' at the Whitney Biennial," *Arts 21 Magazine* (April 13, 2012), accessed March 30, 2019, online: http://magazine.art21.org/2012/04/13/gimme-shelter-talking-with-sarah-michelson-about-devotion-study-1-at-the-whitney-biennial/#.XC7r_c8zZE4

61. Lippard, *Six Years*, p. 5.

62. Lippard, *Six Years*, pp. viii-ix. Lippard and Chandler also put it this way: "They [LeWitt and Claes Oldenburg] open up art to the intellect without delivering it into any other cultural or transcultural area. Visual art is still visual even when it is invisible or visionary" (Lippard and Chandler, "The Dematerialization of Art," p. 270).

63. Buchloh, "Conceptual Art 1962-1969," p. 113. LeWitt's peer Dan Graham articulates this use of material/form as idea in LeWitt's work thus: "With the LeWitt ['latticed cubic frameworks (of 1966 and 1967)'] the 'form' reflects its own de facto (architectural) situation of enclosure, as logic-representation of this idea: mirroring the idea at all levels of language, logic, and fact. It's [sic] 'subject' 'matter' (spatial, conceptual, representational) is this self-relational logic" (Graham, *End Moments*, p. 18).

64. LeWitt, "Paragraphs on Conceptual Art," p. 80 and LeWitt, "Sentences on Conceptual Art," n.p.

65. Rauschenberg stated in 1964: "And I'm opposed to the whole idea of concept-execution—of getting an idea for a picture and then carrying it out. I've always felt as though . . . the method was always closer to a collaboration with materials than to any kind of conscious manipulation and control" (quoted in Calvin Tomkins, "Profiles: Moving Out," *New Yorker* 40, no. 2 (February 29, 1964): p. 59).

66. Osborne, "Survey," p. 26.

67. Flynt, "Structure Art and Pure Mathematics," n.p.

68. Robert Pincus-Witten, *Postminimalism* (London: Out of London Press, 1977), p. 198.

69. Goldberg, "Space as Praxis," p. 132. She does not discriminate between dance and performance in the article. See also fn19.

70. Jeroen Peeters, *Through the Back: Situating Vision between Moving Bodies* (Helsinki: Theatre Academy of the University of the Arts, Helsinki, 2014), p. 113. See Case Study 2 and Case Study 6 in the present volume for more on Peeters' discussion of the discursive body in relation to conceptual dance.

71. Peter Osborne, "Instruction, Performance, Documentation," in *Conceptual Art*, p. 197. Lippard also saw "art as action" as a direction emerging alongside "art as idea" (Lippard, *Six Years*, pp. viii-ix).

72. Osborne "Survey," p. 18. Osborne also notes the lack of attention to the links between the emergence of conceptual art and the rise of performance within the visual arts. See Josefine Wikström's *Practices of Relations in Task-Dance and the Event-Score: A Critique of Performance* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2021) for a clear case supporting the role of specific choreographic strategies such as "task-dance" and the "event-score" in the emergence of conceptual art practices. Wikström's frame is performance rather than dance and her examples are drawn from experimental music, performance, and dance. She engages with aesthetic philosophy rather than dance and performance studies throughout her project.

73. The most recent of these references Stéphane Mallarmé whose work on dance is central to this line of inquiry; Frédéric Pouillaude's *Unworking Choreography: The Notion of the Work in Dance*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 2017) and Anna Pakes's *Choreography Invisible: The Disappearing Work of Dance* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2020). See also Anna Pakes, "Can There Be A Conceptual Dance?"*Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 44, no. 1 (2019): pp. 195-212. In this article, Pakes undertakes a comparison between conceptual dance (primarily the work of Jérôme Bel) and conceptual art (mainly of the 1960s and 1970s) through philosophers Peter Goldie and Elisabeth Schellekens notion of "the idea idea." Pakes arrives at a conclusion similar to my own through this differing means; "If nothing else, it forces reflection on what is expected of the physical aspect of dance, and on how this physical aspect is related to the artistic utterance" (Pakes, "Can There Be Conceptual Dance," p. 10).

74. In Chapter 8 I will demonstrate how this changes in his following publications on the post-conceptual.

75. Lippard and Chandler, "The Dematerialization of Art," p. 256.

76. Cvejić, "To End with Judgement," pp. 148-49. "Composition" and "physical presence" were anathema for the conceptual artist (Lippard, *Six Years*, p. xv).

77. LeWitt, "Sentences on Conceptual Art," n.p.

Chapter 7

1. See the debates between New York dance critic Deborah Jowitt ("Beyond Description: Writing Beneath the Surface," in *Moving History /Dancing Cultures:*

A Dance History Reader, edited by Ann Dils and Ann Cooper Albright [Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press: 2001], pp. 7-11) and North American dance scholar Roger Copeland ("Dance Criticism and the Descriptive Bias," *Dance Theatre Journal* 10 no. 3 [1993]: pp. 26-32) and in the visual arts, "The Present Conditions of Art Criticism," *October* 100 (2002): pp. 200-228.

2. Peter Osborne, *The Postconceptual Condition: Critical Essays* (London: Verso, 2018), unpaginated.

3. Laurence Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, translated by Sally Gardner (Alton, Hampshire: Dance Books, 2010), pp. 55-56.

4. Kate Elswit, "Posts by Kate Elswit," accessed August 9, 2017, online: https://www.breathcatalogue.org/. Elswit is working with artist/scholar Megan Nicely, data scientist and interaction designer Ben Gimpert, and composer Daniel Thomas Davis. Their research experiments consider: "the way that breath might create choreographic structures or games"; "the ways in which manipulating breath changes the sensorial experience of the moving body"; and "building a theatrical environment based on magnifying and scaling the minutiae of breath experiences."

5. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 57.

6. Mary Wigman, *The Language of Dance*, translated by Walter Sorrell (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1966), p. 9. "For breath is the mysterious great master who reigns unknown and unnamed behind all and everything" Wigman, p. 11).

7. Aristotle, *On the Soul; Parva Naturalis; On Breath* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012), accessed August 8, 2017, online: https://www-loebclassics-com.wwwproxy1.library.unsw.edu.au/view/aristotle-breath/1957/pb_LCL288.517.xml/

8. Doris Humphrey, *The Art of Making Dances* (Hightstown, NJ: Princeton Book Company, 1987 [1959]), p. 66.

9. Humphrey, *The Art of Making Dances* pp. 66-67.

10. "How the Lungs and Respiratory System Work," *WebMD*, accessed August 8, 2017, online: http://www.webmd.com/lung/how-we-breathe/

11. Humphrey, *The Art of Making Dances*, pp. 67-68. One example of "bad phrasing" then would be the performance of circular breathing of a single note played on a flute at the beginning of Anne Teresa de Keersmaeker's *En Atendant* for around three minutes, a quality taken up by a singer then a dancer. The audience unease produced at the performance I saw at Carriageworks in Sydney (January 12, 2016) was palpable in the auditorium, indicating the affective force of irregular breath.

12. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 55. Nowhere is this clearer for Louppe than in the technique of Martha Graham which embodies "a new approach to physicality based on the process of respiration" (p. 58). The increasingly common extension of breath work in dance to vocalizations is described by Louppe in relation to Meredith Monk (Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, pp. 57-58).

13. Wigman, *The Language of Dance*, p. 11.

14. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 57. For example, Louppe traces the influence of yoga on Graham's technique via Ruth St. Denis (Louppe, *Poetics*

of Contemporary Dance). Somatic practices, both Eastern and Western, emphasize the function of breath. I thank Kate Elswit for drawing my attention to this special dimension of breath's relationship to dance practices.

15. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 55.

16. Hubert Godard and Suely Rolnik, "Blindsight," in *Peripheral Vision and Collective Body*, edited by Museion Bozen/Bolzano (Bolzano: Museion, 2008), pp. 198-99.

17. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 56.

18. Jeroen Peeters, *Through the Back: Situating Vision between Moving Bodies* (Helsinki: Theatre Academy of the University of the Arts, 2014), pp. 105-6. See also Myriam Gourfink, "Dance, Borrow, Create? From the Breath to Ideas, from Ideas to Gesture," accessed April 25, 2019, online: http://motionbank.org/sites/motionbank.org/files/mg_dusouffle_e_finb.pdf. She notes, "I have used breath as the basis of movement ever since my first solo *Beith* (1996), when I was inspired to research the internal necessity that produces movement," and makes connections to Eastern breathing techniques and beliefs.

19. Benoît Lachambre, *Ghost Telephone*, curated by Adrian Heathfield, *20th Biennale of Sydney*, Art Gallery of New South Wales, March 15-April 15, 2016.

20. Laban paraphrased by Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 64. Italics in original.

21. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 66.

22. Daniel Dobbels and Claude Rabant, "The Missing Gesture: An Interview with Hubert Godard," *Writings on Dance: The French Issue* 15 (Winter 1996): p. 42.

23. Laurence Louppe, "Singular, Moving Geographies: An Interview with Hubert Godard," *Writings on Dance: The French Issue 15 (Winter 1996):* p. 16.

24. Louppe, "Singular, Moving Geographies," pp. 18 and 20. In Brannigan, *Dancefilm*, I discuss this quote in relation to the importance of weight-related discoveries by dance artists such as Trisha Brown to the development of experimental film practices of the 1960s and 1970s. I repeat the Godard quote here as I believe this is so fundamental to what dance is and does.

25. Louppe, "Singular, Moving Geographies," p. 18.

26. Nancy Reynolds and Malcolm McCormick, *No Fixed Points: Dance in the Twentieth Century* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003), p. 159.

27. Paul Claudel, quoted and translated in Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 56 (from "Art Poétique," in *Œuvres complètes* [La Pléiade: Gallimard, 1957]). See Erin Brannigan, "Talking Back: What Dance Might Make of Badiou's Philosophical Project," *Performance Philosophy* 4, no. 2 (2019) for an account of the attachment to the "lightness" of dance in philosophy as a "metaphor for thought" (pp. 361-62).

28. Hubert Godard, "Gesture and Its Perception," translated by Sally Gardner, *Writings on Dance* 22 (Summer 2003-2004): p. 59.

29. Sally Gardner, "Choreography, or Framed Kinaesthetics," in *Framed Movements* (Melbourne: Australian Centre for Contemporary Art, 2014), n.p.

30. Andrea Mantell Seidel, *Isadora Duncan in the Twenty-first Century* (Jefferson, NC: MacFarland, 2016), p. 47.

31. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 77.

32. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, pp. 31-32.

33. Louppe writes of how the "proximal zones" of the body are considered "non-signifying," and describes the ground or floor as "the surface of rebound but also the surface that carries us and reinscribes in us the experience of being held" (*Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, pp. 72 and 66).

34. Aristotle, *On the Soul; Parva Naturalis; On Breath*, n.p.

35. Godard and Rolnick, "Blindsight," p. 213.

36. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 68.

37. Louppe credits Jaques-Dalcroze with being the first to acknowledge "the importance of changes in muscle tone" regarding expression (*Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 112).

38. Nalina Wait and Erin Brannigan, "Body-States and the Site of Authority: The Emancipated Dancer," in *Oxford Handbook of Dance and Competition*, edited by Sherril Dodds (New York: Oxford University Press, 2018), p. 297.

39. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 72.

40. Godard, "Gesture and Its Perception," p. 59.

41. Jonathan Burrows and Jan Ritsema, *Weak Dance Strong Questions* (2001), accessed September 22, 2022, online: https://vimeo.com/38303727; and Cvejić, *Choreographing Problems*, p. 143.

42. Godard, "Gesture and Its Perception," p. 59.

43. See, for example, Joan Skinner's Releasing Technique which uses image as "a metaphor for kinesthetic knowledge" so that the student "kinesthetically releases patterns of excess tension in order to realize principles of multidirectional alignment and balance" (Joan Skinner, Bridget Davis, Robert Davidson, Kris Wheeler, and Sally Metcalf, "Notes on the Skinner Releasing Technique," *Contact Quarterly* 5, no. 1 [1979]: pp. 8-12).

44. Brenda Dixon Gottschild, *Digging the Africanist Presence in American Performance: Dance and Other Contexts* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1996), p. 8.

45. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 119.

46. Jonathan Burrows, "Body Not Fit for Purpose," *Performance Research* 20, no. 5 (2015): p. 82.

47. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 66. Italics in original.

48. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 65.

49. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, pp. 115 and 117.

50. Louppe, "Singular, Moving Geographies," p. 16.

51. Wait and Brannigan, "Body-States and the Site of Authority," pp. 286-87. See this article for a longer discussion of muscle tone states in relation to dancer training and subject formation.

52. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 115. Louppe argues, after Laban, that it is accent as an element of flow or movement quality that has the most direct influence on the viewer's kinaesthesia (Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 121).

53. André Lepecki and Ric Allsopp, "On Choreography," *Performance Research* 13, no. 1 (2008): p. 1. Lepecki has also discussed the "loss of kinetic proficiency" in recent contemporary dance as a critique of "a choreographic system of obedience." This critique, he argues, "threatens the onto-aesthetic grounds of what is

usually referred to as dance" (André Lepecki, "Moving as Thing: Choreographic Critiques of the Object," *October* 140 [Spring 2012]: p. 82).

54. Carolyn Brown, *Chance and Circumstance: Twenty Years with Cage and Cunningham* (Evanstown, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2007), p. 173 (quoting Merce Cunningham in *Dance Magazine* [1957]: p. 22). Steve Paxton's *The Small Dance, The Stand* (1977) was documented in 1972 in *Magnesium: A Dance by Steve Paxton* (East Charleston, VT: Videoda: Contact Collaborations, 2006) and was transcribed into text by others in 1977. Sally Banes refers to it as "a warm-up" that she has seen occur at the beginning of a contact improvisation concert (Sally Banes, *Terpsichore in Sneakers: Post-modern Dance* [Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1980], p. 66). For my discussion of this work in relation to Cage (and Rauschenberg), see Erin Brannigan, "Interlude #1: Minimalism, Experience, and Experiment," in *Choreography, Visual Art and Experimental Composition 1950s-1970s* (London: Routledge, 2022), pp. 76-85.

55. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, pp. 78-86. She links pedestrian movements to atonality. Graphic or little movements belong to a specific period of French dance and refer to "a small fragmented motif without real functionality, mainly in the extremities" (pp. 83-84). Exponents include Daniel Larrieu and Dominique Bagouet.

56. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, pp. 71-74.

57. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, pp. 63-64.

58. Sally Gardner, "Notes on Choreography," *Performance Research* 13, no. 1 (2008): p. 56.

59. Vivian Sobchack, "Choreography for One, Two, and Three Legs (A Phenomenological Meditation in Movements)," *Topoi* 24 (2005): p. 57.

60. William Forsythe, "Choreographic Objects," in *William Forsythe and the Practice of Choreography: It Starts From Any Point*, edited by Steven Spier (London: Routledge, 2011), p. 90.

61. Erin Brannigan, "Interview with Adam Linder, April 20, 2021."

62. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 86.

63. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 74. "There is another definition that speaks to a self-consciousness regarding temporal unfolding and an equality regarding the various components of the phrase" (Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 83).

64. Lyn Hejinian, *The Language of Inquiry* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), p. 3.

65. Margaret H'Doubler, *Dance: A Creative Art Experience* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1998), p. 29.

66. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 74.

67. Wigman, *The Language of Dance*, p. 10. She continues: "it is the elemental and incontestable basis without which there would be no dance."

68. Kuba Dorabialski, *Invocation Trilogy #1: Floor Dance of Lenin's Resurrection* (2017). In relation to another work featuring dancing, *You Can't the Fire* (2016), Kuba states, "and as for the dancing . . . well, I just really like to dance" (Dorabialski, Kuba, "You Can't the Fire," accessed December 30, 2018, online: https://www.kubadorabialski.com/you-cant-the-fire/).

69. Erin Brannigan, "Conversation with Kuba Dorabialski, August 12, 2017, University of New South Wales (UNSW) Galleries, Art and Design, University of New South Wales, Sydney"; and Erin Brannigan, "Conversation with Kuba Dorabialski, UNSW, February 14, 2022."

70. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 80.

71. Yvonne Rainer, *Work 1961-73* (Halifax: The Press of the Nova Scotia College of Art and Design; and New York: New York University Press, 1974), p. 64.

72. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 85.

73. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 85.

74. Erin Brannigan, *Dancefilm: Choreography and the Moving Image* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), p. 126.

75. Louppe, "Singular, Moving Geographies," p. 17.

76. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 85.

77. Dee Reynolds, *Rhythmic Subjects: Uses of Energy in the Dance of Mary Wigman, Martha Graham and Merce Cunningham* (London: Dance Books, 2007), p. 1. Reynolds argues that interdisciplinarity had, in the early 2000s, led dance studies away from "formal and/or expressive" aspects of dance and in attending to the same, her work is part of the material lineage in dance studies.

78. Reynolds, *Rhythmic Subjects*, p. 3. She cites Felicia McCarren, *Dancing Machines: Choreographies of the Age of Mechanical Reproduction* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2003).

79. That is, if you purchase a Tino Sehgal, you have to pay labor wages above and beyond the cost price to have the work realized. In gallery terms this is the price of "activation" and can often stall collected works from being presented.

80. Émile Jaques-Dalcroze, *Rhythm, Music and Education* (London: The Dalcroze Society, 1973 [1921]), p. 10.

81. Jaques-Dalcroze, *Rhythm, Music and Education*, p. 39.

82. Reynolds, *Rhythmic Subjects*, p. 4.

83. Reynolds, *Rhythmic Subjects*, p. 2.

84. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, pp. 112-13.

85. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, pp. 114-15.

86. Daniel W. Smith, "Translator's Introduction," in *Francis Bacon: The Logic of Sensation*, translated by Daniel W. Smith (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003), pp. 18-19.

87. Gilles Deleuze, "Gilles Deleuze on Cinema: What is the Creative Act?," Lecture (FEMIS, 1987), accessed December 8, 2017, online: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=a_hifamdISs/

88. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 5.

89. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 109.

90. Mary Anne Santos Newhall, *Mary Wigman* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2008), p. 83. They cite Louis Horst who recognized this in Wigman's dancing.

91. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 129.

Case Study 8

1. This section is a development of Erin Brannigan, "Context, Discipline and Understanding: The Poetics of Shelley Lasica's Gallery-Based Work,"

Performance Paradigm 13 (2017): pp. 97-117 and other writing on Lasica noted throughout.

2. Shelley Lasica, *Describing the Perspective of Time, It Promises You Nothing* (1986), Reconnaissance Gallery, Melbourne. I have been watching Lasica dance since the early 1990s when I saw her at Performance Space in Sydney in works like *Square Dance Behaviour—Part 6/version 4* (1997) and *Situation Live: The Subject and Dress: A Costumed Performance* (1998).

3. *"Retrospective" by Xavier Le Roy*, Fundació Antoni Tàpies, Barcelona, February 24-April 22, 2012; Boris Charmatz, *If Tate Modern was Musée de la danse?*, "a proposition initiated by" Catherine Wood, Senior Curator, International Art (Performance), Tate Modern and Boris Charmatz, May 15-16, 2015, Tate Modern, London (*BMW TATE LIVE: If Tate Modern was Musée de la danse?* Accessed April 12, 2022, online: https://www.tate.org.uk/documents/998/if_tate_modern_musee_dela_danse_booklet.pdf); *Michael Clark: Cosmic Dancer*, Barbican, London, October 7, 2020—January 3, 2021.

4. Simone Forti began her career as a painter, took up dancing with Anna Halprin, presented her first professional choreographies in the art spaces of downtown New York, and was one of the first dance artists to be collected by the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA), New York, in 2015. For a comparison between Forti and Lasica see Erin Brannigan, "Shelley Lasica's Adventures with a Thing called Choreography," in *Shelley Lasica: When I'm Not There*, edited by Hannah Mathews (Melbourne: Monash University Press, 2022), pp. 39-61.

5. Erin Brannigan, "Shelley Lasica, interview May 19, 2017." And for Lasica it is specifically in solo performance where a physical practice is born, being for her "a research model and a discipline" (Erin Brannigan, "Shelley Lasica, interview, July 10, 2016").

6. Brannigan, "Shelley Lasica, interview May 19, 2017." Lasica believes we underestimate audiences' capacities to "read" dance: "I'm interested in the way that everyone has a capacity to read other bodies—we do it all the time, the way people walk and stand—but because it's not 'logocentric' it's a capacity that is undervalued" (Brannigan, "Shelley Lasica, interview May 19, 2017").

7. Zöe Sutherland, "The World as Gallery: Conceptualism and Global Neo-Avant-Garde," *New Left Review* 98 (March/April 2016): p. 83. For Lasica's self-acknowledged debt to artists connected with the mid-century North American second-wave dance avant-garde, see Brannigan, "Shelley Lasica's Adventures with a Thing called Choreography," p. 45.

8. Peter Osborne, "Survey," in *Conceptual Art*, edited by Peter Osborne (London: Phaidon Press Limited, 2002), p. 18. Italics in original.

9. *Choreography and the Gallery One-Day Salon*, part of the 20th Biennale of Sydney, AGNSW, April 27, 2016, facilitated by Erin Brannigan and part-funded by the Australian Research Council. Melissa Ratliff, Curator and Manager of Public Programs and Education, Biennale of Sydney, contributed to and supported this project.

10. Shelley Lasica, Deanne Butterworth, and Jo Lloyd, *How Choreography Works* (2015), West Space, Melbourne, October 2-November 7, 2015, accessed April 20, 2022, online: http://westspace.org.au/event/how-choreography-works/

11. Erin Brannigan, "Interview with Deanne Butterworth, Shelley Lasica, and Jo Lloyd, July 26, 2022."

12. Brannigan, "Shelley Lasica interview, May 19, 2017."

13. Erin Brannigan, "Agatha Gothe-Snape interview, March 27, 2019."

14. Lloyd quoted in Brannigan, "Interview with Deanne Butterworth, Shelley Lasica, and Jo Lloyd, July 26, 2022."

15. This was a phrase used by Lloyd in response to my explanation of the political impulse behind the Salon as a response to the lack of local dance artists in the program. As noted elsewhere, the 2016 Biennale of Sydney was curated by Stephanie Rosenthal and had a strong dance component with a keynote by Boris Charmatz.

16. Regarding the spoken elements in the performance, Lloyd notes, "there were many ongoing exchanges and an entanglement of information between the three of us to prepare the work for performance and during each performance" (Jo Lloyd, email correspondence with Erin Brannigan, May 22, 2022).

17. Brannigan, "Interview with Deanne Butterworth, Shelley Lasica, and Jo Lloyd, July 26, 2022." This description is taken from Erin Brannigan, "Positively Unassertive: Dancing in the Art Gallery of NSW," *Broadsheet Journal* 45, no. 2 (2016): pp. 26–29, accessed September 19, 2017, online: https://issuu.com/cacsabroadsheet/docs/ebsco_45.2

18. Butterworth, Lasica, and Lloyd's work was performed between Helen Grogan's "performative sculptural situation," *OBSTRUCTION DRIFT* (AGNSW) (2016), and Lizzie Thomson's dance titled *Tacet: Rhythmic Composition (After Roy De Maistre's Rhythmic Composition in Yellow Green Minor, 1919)* (2016).

19. Brannigan, "Shelley Lasica interview, July 10, 2016."

20. *Precarious Movements: Choreography and the Museum (2021-2024)* is a major research partnership between five public institutions from Australia and internationally: AGNSW, Monash University Museum of Art, the National Gallery of Victoria, Tate UK, and University of New South Wales Sydney. The research focuses on developing protocols, policies, and methodologies for both artists and museums in the exhibition, collection, and conservation of choreographic art (https://www.unsw.edu.au/arts-design-architecture/our-schools/arts-media/our-research/our-projects/precarious-movements-choreography-museum).

21. Shelley Lasica, *The Shape of Things to Come* (2017), in *Superposition of Three Types*, curated by Alexie Glass-Kantor and Talia Linz, Artspace, February 10–April 17, 2017. Lasica states, "well at Artspace people didn't seem to really see me . . . and I kind of like that. At the opening when there was 500 people there, people didn't even know I was doing anything and it was perfect" (Brannigan, "Shelley Lasica interview, May 19, 2017").

22. Lasica was listed in the public program of this exhibition, and, during our interviews, registered her frustration at this bracketing of choreography from visual art in such contexts. Interestingly, one review features an image of Lasica but fails to mention her work (Wes Hill, "Superposition of Three Types," *Frieze* April 6, 2017, accessed May 3, 2019, online: https://frieze.com/article/superposition-three-types).

23. Shelley Lasica, "Do You Do This Often?" *Performance Paradigm* 13 (2017), p. 206.

24. Brannigan, "Shelley Lasica interview, July 10, 2016."

25. Shelley Lasica, Jo Lloyd, and Deanne Butterworth, "Shelley Lasica in Conversation with Jo Lloyd and Deanne Butterworth," Catalogue for *How Choreography Works* (Melbourne: West Space, 2015), n.p. The "Live Sessions" were held on October 9, 10, 23, and 24 and November 6 and 7, 2015.

26. "Shelley Lasica in Conversation with Jo Lloyd and Deanne Butterworth." This text is based on a conversation at their last rehearsal together before the season—"before it starts unfolding." A longer version of this text is available as an audio recording: *How Choreography Works Discussion*, accessed October 16, 2017, online: https://soundcloud.com/west-space/how-choreography-works-discussion-soundcloud

27. Peter Osborne, *The Postconceptual Condition: Critical Essays* (London: Verso, 2018), p. 110.

Case Study 9

1. "Living sculptures" is the term used by curators Hans Ulrich Obrist and Klaus Biesenbach for work in a comparative mode ("Curator's Talk," *13 Rooms*, April 11, 2013, Pier 2/3, Sydney). Hassabi describes the condition of the performers in her works: "they move between being subject and object, dance and sculpture, live body and still image, the spectacular and the everyday" (Harry Thorne, "Maria Hassabi: Stillness is the Move," *Frieze* 195 (2018), accessed March 20, 2022, online: https://www.frieze.com/article/maria-hassabi-stillness-move).

2. Erin Brannigan, "Interview with Maria Hassabi, February 11, 2022."

3. "Maria Hassabi—Lights (2001)," accessed March 5, 2022, online: http://mariahassabi.com/work/lights-2001-48-minutes/.

4. Thorne, "Maria Hassabi: Stillness is the Move," n.p. Ana Janevski comments on *STAGING* as seen at the Walker Center: "the action seems endless. Continuously in progress" ("It Is Never Staged: Ana Janevski on Maria Hassabi," *Fourth Wall*, September 7, 2017, accessed January 18, 2022, online: https://walkerart.org/magazine/ana-janevski-maria-hassabi).

5. Thorne, "Maria Hassabi: Stillness is the Move," n.p.

6. Hassabi has acknowledged debts to Merce Cunningham, accepting a commission from Philip Bither to contribute to an exhibition on the senior artist at the Walker Art Center, *Merce Cunningham: Common Time*, in 2017.

7. Hassabi recalls, "when I moved to New York in 1994, I was more interested in my contemporaries, the people around me who were making work at the moment, much more so than previous generations. My friends were more visual artists, so I went to openings and followed art closely" (Christopher Bollen, "Maria Hassabi," *Interview*, February 26, 2016, accessed March 5, 2022, online: https://www.interviewmagazine.com/art/maria-hassabi).

8. Thorne, "Maria Hassabi: Stillness is the Move," n.p. Hassabi also notes that she does not refer to the choreographic instructions as "scores" as there is nothing improvised about her work (Brannigan, "Interview with Maria Hassabi, February 11, 2022").

9. Thorne, "Maria Hassabi: Stillness is the Move," n.p. Hassabi goes on to describe what is expected of her dancers: "the dancers I work with are incredible. Performing these kinds of works can be intensely demanding, and their commitment is irreplaceable . . . at any given moment, you can see the labour of the dancers, their concentration, even devotion." (The language here recalls Michelson's focus on this quality in trained dance artists in her work *Devotion Study #1—The American Dancer* [2012].)

10. Erin Brannigan, "Interview with Maria Hassabi, May 6, 2022."

11. Maria Hassabi, *INTERMISSION* (2013) viewed at *Framed Movements*, curated by Hannah Mathews, Australian Centre for Contemporary Art, Melbourne, October 10-November 23, 2014.

12. Thorne, "Maria Hassabi: Stillness is the Move," n.p. Hassabi's interest in image and stasis resonates with some concerns in Meg Stuart's work within visual arts contexts as seen in Chapter 3.

13. Brannigan, "Interview with Maria Hassabi, February 11, 2022."

14. Brannigan, "Interview with Maria Hassabi, February 11, 2022."

15. Hassabi quoted in Claudia La Rocco, "Time Traveller: Claudia La Rocco around the Time-Based Art Festival," *Artforum* September 30, 2010, accessed March 5, 2022, online: https://www.artforum.com/diary/claudia-la-rocco-around-the-time-based-art-festival-26518

16. See Erin Brannigan, "Chapter 3: Dance and Minimalism," in *Choreography, Visual Art and Experimental Composition 1950s-1970s* (London: Routledge, 2022) on the uses and limitations of the visual arts model of Minimalism for dance, and "Interlude #1: Minimalism, Experience, and Experiment" in the same book where I discuss Steve Paxton's *The Small Dance, The Stand* (1977) as an example of extreme minimalist reduction. While that book focused on the use of Minimalism in twentieth-century work, the ideas therein are also applicable to the contemporary examples in this book. Paxton's work has been referenced by dance theorist Victoria Gray in her discussion of Hassabi ("The Choreography of Anticipation in Maria Hassabi's 'PREMIERE'," *The Drama Review* 59, no. 3 [2015]: p.152). Elsewhere, Bollen compares her work to one of the main influences on Minimalism, Barnett Newman ("Maria Hassabi," n.p.).

17. Brannigan, "Interview with Maria Hassabi, February 11, 2022."

18. I draw a comparison with Marina Abramović here on two points by way of clarifying Hassabi's approach: the concept-material relationship and the interest in presence. Regarding the former, Abramović states: "I understood that . . . I could make art with everything . . . and the most important [thing] is the concept . . . And this was the beginning of my performance art. And the first time I put my body in front of [an] audience, I understood: this is my **media**" (https://www.moma.org/learn/moma_learning/marina-abramovic-marina-abramovic-the-artist-is-present-2010/). For Abramović, the material serves the concepts of her work which are not strictly dependent upon that medium, which is quite different to how Hassabi works from the body to concept. Regarding presence or being present, Hassabi's *Robert and Maria* (2010) premiered at Danspace Project, New York, at almost the same time as Abramović's *The Artist is Present* (2010) at the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) and is described by Hassabi as "an act of unconditional devotion" wherein Robert Steijn and Hassabi look at each other,

eye to eye ("Robert and Maria," accessed November 2, 2022, online: http://mariahassabi.com/work/robert-and-maria/). Hassabi's equal pairing is quite different to the power relation between Abramović and members of the general public who partner with her, and the conditions of spectating presence in *Robert and Maria* is not over-written with the star presence of the artist in the way Abramović's work is.

19. Brannigan, "Interview with Maria Hassabi, February 11, 2022."

20. Bollen, "Maria Hassabi," n.p. This quote has been edited by Hassabi, private correspondence May 5, 2022.

21. Laban paraphrased by Laurence Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, translated by Sally Gardner (Alton, Hampshire: Dance Books, 2010), p. 64, italics in original.

22. Thorne, "Maria Hassabi: Stillness is the Move," n.p. Harry Burke refers to this element in her work as "transivity" ("Portrait: Against Time: Maria Hassabi," *Spike Art Quarterly* 53 [2017]: p. 116, accessed March 5, 2022, online: http://mariahassabi.com/wp-content/uploads/Spike53_Portrait%20Hassabi_2-2.pdf). It is also echoed in her choice of places of transit with the gallery or museum as sites for the work, rather than putting her choreography into dialogue with other works of art in the space.

23. Maria Hassabi, "SoloShow Text," accessed March 4, 2022, online: http://mariahassabi.com/work/soloshownovember-2009/. Hassabi was "concerned with what the mind already knows by way of images that are disrupted by physicality, a striving for limits, and extended durations" (Hassabi, "SoloShow Text").

24. Thorne, "Maria Hassabi: Stillness is the Move," n.p.

25. Bollen, "Maria Hassabi," n.p. Italics in original.

26. Unidentified reviewer cited in Nancy Lee Chalfa Ruyter, *The Cultivation of Body and Mind in Nineteenth Century American Delsartism* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1999), p. 117.

27. Gilles Deleuze, *Cinema 1: The Movement-Image*, translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986), p. 4.

28. Thorne, "Maria Hassabi: Stillness is the Move," n.p. Burke describes how, "with her dancers, and their elegant, elongated revolutions, Hassabi makes a show of resistance as an elemental, physical force" (Burke, "Portrait: Against Time: Maria Hassabi," p. 116).

29. Louppe, *Poetics of Contemporary Dance*, p. 66. Hassabi notes, "Graham invented work with the floor" (Brannigan, "Interview with Maria Hassabi, February 11, 2022").

30. Thorne, "Maria Hassabi: Stillness is the Move," n.p.

31. Lizzie Thomson, *Fields of Ambiguity: Inside 17th Century Closets and 21st Century Dance Practices*, PhD thesis, University of New South Wales (nyp).

32. Brannigan, "Interview with Maria Hassabi, February 11, 2022."

33. Yvonne Rainer, "A Quasi Survey of Some 'Minimalist' Tendencies in the Quantitatively Minimal Dance Activity Amidst the Plethora, or an Analysis of *Trio A*," in *Minimal Art: A Critical Survey*, edited by Gregory Battcock (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995 [1968]), p. 271. Andrew Boynton, "A Dance of a Million Premières," *The New Yorker*, November 15 (2013), accessed March

5, 2022, online: https://www.newyorker.com/culture/culture-desk/a-dance-of-a-million-premires

34. Burke, "Portrait: Against Time: Maria Hassabi," p. 109.

35. The dancers maintained this focus even when a huge glass balcony wall fell and smashed beside them at MoMA (Brannigan, "Interview with Maria Hassabi, February 11, 2022").

36. Thorne, "Maria Hassabi: Stillness is the Move," n.p.

37. Thorne, "Maria Hassabi: Stillness is the Move," n.p.

38. Thorne, "Maria Hassabi: Stillness is the Move," n.p. Hassabi also talks about her attraction to mind-body or somatic forms of training such as Alexander Technique and Klein Technique during her training years ("Maria Hassabi Talks about *Plastic*," *Artforum*, accessed March 5, 2022, online: https://www.artforum.com/video/maria-hassabi-talks-about-plastic-58365).

39. Ralph Lemon, "Sarah Michelson," *BOMB* #114 (2010), accessed January 4, 2019, online: https://bombmagazine.org/articles/sarah-michelson/

40. Bollen, "Maria Hassabi," n.p.

41. Gray, "The Choreography of Anticipation," pp. 152–54.

42. Jeroen Peeters, *Through the Back: Situating Vision between Moving Bodies* (Helsinki: Theatre Academy of the University of the Arts, Helsinki, 2014), p. 113.

43. Bollen, "Maria Hassabi," n.p.

Case Study 10

1. Agatha Gothe-Snape, Amrita Hepi, Latai Taumoepeau, and Hannah Mathews, "Precarious Movements: Conversations #1," accessed May 20, 2022, online: https://vimeo.com/470384940

2. Gothe-Snape trained in performance at Australian Theatre for Young People and PACT, two youth performance organizations in Sydney; studied Performance at the Victorian College of Arts, BodyWeather techniques with Tess de Quincey, and physical training with Martin del Amo; and undertook a performance studies degree at Sydney University (BAHons) before turning to painting at Sydney College of the Arts (BA/MA) (Erin Brannigan, "Interview with Agatha Gothe-Snape, March 27, 2019," and Anneke Jaspers, "Passing Honey Between Hands," in *The Outcome is Certain*, edited by Hannah Mathews and Melissa Ratliff [Melbourne: Perimeter Editions and Monash University of Art, 2020], p. 118). Rauschenberg had formative experiences with theater in his Texas high school as stage manager and was imbedded in the Cage-Cunningham community.

3. "Agatha Gothe-Snape Artist Interview," accessed March 20, 2022, online: https://www.mca.com.au/stories-and-ideas/agatha-gothe-snape-artist-interview/. The title of her Monash University Museum of Art (MUMA) exhibition, *The Outcome is Certain* (2020), is a joking riff on the improvisatory element of her method.

4. Jennifer Lacey, "Jennifer Lacey in Conversation with Mathieu Copeland Gare de l'Est, Paris, 16 October 2010," in *Choreographing Exhibitions*, edited by Mathieu Copeland and Julie Pellegrin (Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2013), p. 127. I discuss Rauschenberg's attraction to the dance scene as "community" in Erin

Brannigan, *Choreography, Visual Art and Experimental Composition 1950s-1970s* (London: Routledge, 2022), and how this shaped his developing aesthetics (pp. 185-86).

5. Christophe Wavelet, Jérôme Bel, and Xavier Le Roy, "Which Body for Which Collective, Which Collective for Which Body?," in *Peripheral Vision and Collective Body*, edited by Museion Bozen/Bolzano (Bolzano: Museion, 2008), pp. 84 and 116.

6. Susan Best, *It's Not Personal: Post 60s Body Art and Performance* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2021), pp. 17-18.

7. Brannigan, "Interview with Agatha Gothe-Snape."

8. Jaspers, "Passing Honey Between Hands," p. 126. In this interview Gothe-Snape discusses working with Brian Fuata, Brooke Stamp, and Lizzie Thomson (choreographer/dancers), Ruark Lewis (spoken-work artist), Sarah Rodigari (performance artist), and Sonya Holowell (vocal artist) on *Five Columns* (2019, Wrong Solo) and the "steep narrative curve" of developing a collaborative practice (pp. 120 and 125).

9. Erik Jensen, "Notes on Yellow Paper," in *The Outcome is Certain*, p. 72.

10. Sol LeWitt, "Paragraphs on Conceptual Art," *Artforum* 5, no. 10 (1967): p. 80; and "Sentences on Conceptual Art," first published in *0-9* #5 (January 1969), then *Art-Language* (May 1969): n.p.

11. Brannigan, "Interview with Agathe Gothe-Snape."

12. "'Here, an Echo,' a Public Artwork by Agatha Gothe-Snape," accessed March 28, 2019, online: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JbTwR4Qptv0

13. Jaspers, "Passing Honey Between Hands," p. 128. Elsewhere Gothe-Snape describes the productive tension arising from this shift of performance-based works into the gallery as "trying to deal with the weirdness of the gallery for a performance . . . [my works] all have that in common" (Brannigan, "Interview with Agatha Gothe-Snape").

14. Gothe-Snape et al., "Precarious Movements: Conversations #1," n.p.

15. Brannigan, "Interview with Agatha Gothe-Snape." In the case of *Rhetorical Chorus*, Gothe-Snape describes how collaborators can railroad the controlling aspect of procedural methods when they introduce their own processes and practices: "I wanted to return some of that procedural specificity into the work which I have to say is often my obsession and might be to the detriment of work because I'm more obsessed with the procedure than I am with the outcome" (Brannigan, "Interview with Agatha Gothe-Snape").

16. Julie Ewington, "Situated Reading," in *The Outcome is Certain*, p. 32.

17. Hannah Mathews, "Emotional Data and Poetic Thresholds," in *The Outcome is Certain*, p. 7; and "Notations Produced for Workshops with Brooke Stamp in March 2016 for the Development of *Here, an Echo*, 2015-2017," in *The Outcome is Certain*, p. 16.

18. Jaspers, "Passing Honey Between Hands," p. 120.

19. Brannigan, "Interview with Agatha Gothe-Snape." This approach creates multiple and real challenges: "it irritates my dealer, it prevents me from having a financially sensical practice, it's very challenging for my family because I'm in relationships with so many people all the time . . . I have with this commu-

nity [with dancers] and I have many other communities also with sculptors and actual fine art artists so I'm managing these three worlds not just one" (Brannigan, "Interview with Agatha Gothe-Snape").

20. Robert Morris, "Some Notes on the Phenomenology of Making: The Search for the Motivated," *Artforum* 8, no. 8 (April 1970): p. 62.

21. *Rhetorical Chorus* (2017), Liveworks Festival, Performance Space, Carriageworks Sydney, October 19-22, 2017. Information on this work is derived from my viewing on October 19, 2017, an interview undertaken in March 2019, and Gothe-Snape "Prologue to Rhetorical Chorus" (text accompanying a presentation at the National Gallery of Australia as part of *Power and Imagination: Conceptual Art*, August 11, 2018-May 19, 2019), unpublished. An excerpt of the work is available at https://vimeo.com/339834376. An earlier version, *Rhetorical Chorus (LW)* (2015), was performed as part of *Performa 15*, New York.

22. Notations for other work with dancers such as *Inexhaustible Present* (2013) recall Robert Rauschenberg's scores for his choreographic works in the 1960s—lists of evocative directives such as "weight of the world," "yellow leg sharp," "pelvis fire unresolved" (Agatha Gothe-Snape, "Inexhaustible Present," in *The Outcome is Certain*, pp. 33-43)—which demonstrate the conceptual-material pairing mentioned previously. Rauschenberg's lists also included, for example, "tin can kneel walk," "leg rub," for *Spring Training* (1965) (Robert Rauschenberg, "Performance Notes—Various," Notebook, Rauschenberg Foundation Archives).

23. Jaspers, "Passing Honey Between Hands," p. 124.

24. Brannigan, "Interview with Agatha Gothe-Snape." See also Rachel Fuller, "A Conversation with Agatha Gothe-Snape," *Ocula*, 19 (October 2015), accessed March 14, 2019, online: https://ocula.com/magazine/conversations/agatha-gothe-snape/

25. Amelia Wallin, "Agatha Gothe-Snape at Performa 15," accessed March 20, 2022, online: https://ameliawallin.com/Agatha-Gothe-Snape-at-Performa15

26. Gothe-Snape, "Prologue to Rhetorical Chorus," n.p.

27. Gothe-Snape, "Prologue to Rhetorical Chorus," n.p.

28. Gothe-Snape quoting Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak in "*Here an Echo* Scores," unpublished.

29. Giorgio Agamben, *Means without End: Notes on Politics*, translated by Vincenzo Binetti and Cesare Casarino (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000). On the relevance of Agamben's understanding of gesture as mediality to choreographic practices, see Brannigan, *Dancefilm: Choreography and the Moving Image* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), "Chapter 3: Gesture-Dance," pp. 62-99. There I describe how gesture is often where dance and choreography meet the other arts, particularly dramatic performance in film, theater, and dance.

30. Shelley Lasica, Jo Lloyd, and Deanne Butterworth, "Shelley Lasica in Conversation with Jo Lloyd and Deanne Butterworth," Catalogue for *How Choreography Works* (Melbourne: West Space, 2015), n.p.

31. Brannigan, "Interview with Agatha Gothe-Snape." She stresses that this is not a good-bad judgement (falling out of flow is also fascinating). On links

between gesture and "trans" in the work of Lyotard, see Brannigan, "Chapter 7: Dancefilm as Gestural Exchange," in *Dancefilm*, pp. 172-96.

32. Jenn Joy, "Speculative Choreographies," in *The Outcome is Certain*, pp. 45-56.

33. LeWitt, "Paragraphs on Conceptual Art," p. 80; and Brannigan, "Interview with Agatha Gothe-Snape, March 27, 2019."

34. Brannigan, "Interview with Agatha Gothe-Snape, March 27, 2019" and Gothe-Snape, "*Three Ways to Enter and Exit* Poster," unpublished, n.p. *Three Ways to Enter and Exit* (2011), as part of *Rules of Play*, Tin Sheds Gallery, University of Sydney, September 9-October 1, 2011. The work, which has never been repeated, was presented as a poster in *Trace: Performance and Its Documents* (2014), curated by Bree Richards, Gallery of Modern Art (GOMA), Queensland Art Gallery, February 22-October 6, 2014. The video documentation of the three performances was also exhibited in the exhibition *Framed Movements*, curated by Hannah Mathews at Australian Centre for Contemporary Arts (ACCA), Melbourne, October 10-November 23, 2014. My understanding of this work is based on a video of Brooke Stamp's solo (accessed March 28, 2019, online: https://vimeo.com/41233961), and this literature.

35. Gothe-Snape, "*Three Ways to Enter and Exit* Poster," n.p. In a PowerPoint presentation to dance students involved in the project at GOMA, Gothe-Snape notes that "scores are the past, present and future—an archive, an event and a prediction all in one."

36. Brannigan, "Interview with Agatha Gothe-Snape."

37. "Interview with Agatha Gothe-Snape."

38. Peter Osborne, *The Postconceptual Condition: Critical Essays* (London: Verso, 2018), p. 109.

39. Gothe-Snape is frank about the complexity of working with dancers as one's materials as well as one's collaborators: "I've tried so hard to not be part of the problem but I still feel often because I am the only visual artist in the room I'm targeted . . . this [work] has come from . . . a shared ground but obviously as I've become more visible that shared ground has become more wobbly . . . it definitely can slide very quickly as soon as the power imbalances . . . it's very emotional for me; I go crazy" (Brannigan, "Interview with Agatha Gothe-Snape").

40. For more on Gothe-Snape's attention to art canons and her project *Every Artist Remembered*, see Ewington, "Situated Reading," pp. 22-25. Ewington sets Gothe-Snape within her familial aesthetic inheritances, including her mother Jacqueline Gothe's work in theories and practices of visual culture, and her father Michael Snape's place within Sydney sculpture of the 1970s.

41. "Wilful modesty" is a term used by Australian choreographer and theorist Lizzie Thomson to describe certain kinds of contemporary dance works (*Fields of Ambiguity: Poetic Motion Inside 17th Century Closets and 21st Century Dance Practices*, University of New South Wales PhD thesis, unpublished).

42. Brannigan, "Interview with Agatha Gothe-Snape."

43. Talei Luscia Mangioni, "Confronting Australian Apathy: Latai Taumoepeau and the Politics of Performance in Pacific Climate Stewardship," *The Contemporary Pacific* 33, no. 1 (2021): p. 39.

44. Robert Motherwell cited in Catherine Craft, *An Audience of Artists: Dada, Neo-Dada, and the Emergence of Abstract Expressionism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012), p. 102.

Chapter 8

1. This is a paraphrased summary of Peter Osborne, *Anywhere or Not at All: Philosophy of Contemporary Art* (London: Verso, 2013), p. 43. The dates Osborne gives for post-conceptualism across his writing on the subject are from the end of the 1990s to the present.

2. Danjel Andersson, "I Had a Dream," *Post-Dance*, edited by Danjel Andersson, Mette Edvardsen, and Mårten Spångberg (Stockholm: MDT, 2017), p. 13. I am dependent on the publication and a brief conversation with Andersson as I did not attend the conference itself. There was also a response, *Block Universe: POST-DANCE*, at Tate Modern, May 26, 2019 (accessed October 13, 2022, online: https://podcasts.apple.com/gb/podcast/post-dance-conference-by-block-universe-part-1/id1570747651?i=1000556430029).

3. Andersson, "I Had a Dream," p. 15.

4. Andersson, "I Had a Dream," p. 17.

5. Bojana Kunst, "Some Thoughts on the Labour of a Dancer," in *Post-Dance*, p. 128.

6. Bojana Cvejić, "Credo in Artem Imaginandi," in *Post-Dance*, pp. 105–6.

7. Mårten Spångberg, "Post-Dance, An Advocacy," in *Post-Dance*, pp. 366–70. He also describes dance as "pure affect," exceeding "the realm of the possible, imagination, and language," taking an essentialist position rejected by so much recent dance theory (pp. 372–73). There is also a free use of the term "conceptual dance" in his article.

8. Spångberg, "Post-Dance, An Advocacy," p. 350. He continues: "what we need to do is rescue dance from its historically anchored position, unchain it from its legacy" (pp. 351–52).

9. Spångberg, "Post-Dance, An Advocacy," p. 374.

10. Spångberg, "Post-Dance, An Advocacy," p. 391 and Mårten Spångberg, "Introduction," in *Post-Dance*, p. 27. He concludes that "[the 300 participants at the *POST-DANCE* conference] had almost nothing in common except one thing, and that we had a lot of and passionately, dance" (Spångberg, "Introduction," p. 27).

11. Kunst, "Some Thoughts on the Labour of a Dancer," p. 128.

12. Much of this writing informed the revision of dance elements in Chapter 2.

13. Robert Pincus-Witten, "Theatre of the Conceptual: Autobiography and Myth," in *Postminimalism* (London: Out of London Press, 1977), pp. 186–98. I thank Susan Best for drawing my attention to this text.

14. Pincus-Witten, "Theatre of the Conceptual," pp. 194–96. Shelley Lasica's *Behaviour* series was realized 1993–1997.

15. Pincus-Witten, "Theatre of the Conceptual," p. 196. He goes on to note that "post-minimalism as a movement has come full cycle—from species, to loss of species, to species regained" (p. 198). My rewrite of a similar passage in Peter

Osborne on the relationship between performance and dance and the expansion of the field of contemporary art in *The Postconceptual Condition*: *Critical Essays* (London: Verso, 2018), p. 113 can be found in Erin Brannigan, *Choreography, Visual Art and Experimental Composition 1950s-1970s* (London: Routledge, 2022), p. 228.

16. "Expanded dance" was the term used for the influential conference accompanying Xavier Le Roy's *Retrospective by Xavier Le Roy* (2012), *Expanded Choreography. Situations, Movements, Objects . . .*, at MACBA, Barcelona in 2012, and it has now replaced the term "contemporary dance" in some instances, for example the MA Expanded Dance Practice at London Contemporary Dance School (Martin Hargreaves, Tom Hastings, and Hilary Stainsby, "LCDS Live: What is Expanded Dance Practice?," accessed October 13, 2022, online: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Fp1aWe4r1x8).

17. Rebecca Hilton, "DANCERNESS," *Performance Paradigm* 13 (2017): p. 196. The attention to dancer expertise has emerged in parallel with international activity in dancer advocacy and organized political action. See *Life Long Burning, Towards A Sustainable Eco-System for Contemporary Dance in Europe* (accessed October 13, 2022, online: http://www.lifelongburning.eu/news.html), and the US-based *Dance Artists' National Collective* (DANC) (accessed October 13, 2022, online: https://danceartistsnationalcollective.org/).

18. Kunst, "Some Thoughts on the Labour of a Dancer," p. 124. In fact, the *Post-Dance* organizers followed up their conference in 2019 with the *Post-Dance-ing Conference* (MDT, Stockholm, October 23-25, 2019) and asked "what about the -ing? If we knew what Post-dance was/is (and we do, no?) what and where is the -ing? The do-ing, the post-dancing, the practice-ing if you will" (*Post-Dance-ing Conference*, accessed October 13, 2022, online: https://mdtsthlm.se/archive/6671/).

19. Kunst, "Some Thoughts on the Labour of a Dancer," pp. 124-27.

20. Sally Gardner, "Choreography, or Framed Kinaesthetics," *Framed Movements* (Melbourne: Australian Centre for Contemporary Art, 2014), n.p.

21. For details on this, see Erin Brannigan, "Chapter 4: Dance and the Neo-Avant-Garde: 3 Case Studies," in *Choreography, Visual Art and Experimental Composition 1950s-1970s*, pp. 132-69.

22. Branden Joseph, *Beyond the Dream Syndicate: Tony Conrad and the Arts after Cage (A "Minor" History)* (New York: Zone Books, 2011), p. 158. Joseph also uses the terms "self-canceling" and "self-problematizing" (p. 167).

23. Bojana Cvejić, *Choreographing Problems: Expressive Concepts in European Contemporary Dance and Performance* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015), p. 4.

24. Cvejić, *Choreographing Problems*, p. 28. Cvejić has worked with Meg Stuart, Anne Teresa de Keersmaeker, Xavier Le Roy, and many others.

25. Cvejić, *Choreographing Problems*, p. 37. Cvejić refers to "performance compositions" (pp. 43 and 55) and describes her method regarding composition on p. 62.

26. Cvejić, *Choreographing Problems*, pp. 114-26. Elsewhere I have described this piece as a working through the choreographic element of presence as its central concept (Erin Brannigan, "Choreography and the Gallery: Curation as Revision," *Dance Research Journal* 47, no. 1 [2015]: p. 18).

27. Cvejić, *Choreographing Problems*, p. 38.

28. Cvejić, *Choreographing Problems*, pp. 51 and 53.

29. Jean-Marc Adolphe and Gérard Mayen, "The 'Non-dance' Is Still Dancing," *Movement* 1 (May 2004), translation accessed December 28, 2017, online: http://sarma.be/docs/784

30. William Forsythe, "Choreographic Objects," in *William Forsythe and the Practice of Choreography: It Starts From Any Point*, edited by Steven Spier (London: Routledge, 2011), p. 92.

31. William Forsythe's *Nowhere and Everywhere at the Same Time No. 2* (2013). Experienced as part of the 20th Biennale of Sydney, 2016 at Cockatoo Island.

32. Mark Franko, "Museum Artifact Act," in *Danse: An Anthology*, edited by Noémie Solomon (Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2014), p. 258. Franko's case studies here are the work of Michael Clark at the Whitney Biennial 2012, *Who's Zoo?*, and Boris Charmatz's *Musée de la danse*, which has been so central to the discussions within this field.

33. Robert Rauschenberg quoted in John Gruen, "Painter Dancing in the Dark," *New York Herald Tribune Sunday Magazine*, January 2, 1966, p. 34.

34. Sara Wookey, "Catherine Wood," in *Who Cares? Dance in the Gallery and Museum*, edited by Sara Wookey (London: Siobhan Davies Dance, 2015), p. 30.

35. Jennifer Lacey, "Artist Statement," accessed March 29, 2019, online: https://www.foundationforcontemporaryarts.org/recipients/jennifer-lacey

36. Jonathan Burrows, "Keynote Address for the Postdance Conference in Stockholm," in *Post-Dance*, p. 91; and David Velasco, "Preface," in *Sarah Michelson*, edited by David Velasco (New York: MoMA Publications, 2017), p. 7.

37. Richard Serra, "Verb List (1967-68)," *Avalanche* 2 (Winter 1971): p. 20; and Lawrence Weiner's verb list published as *Tracce/Traces* (Torino: Sperone Editore, 1970).

38. Leland de la Durantaye, "Lost in Thought," *Artforum International* 52, no. 2 (October 2013): pp. 83-84.

39. In 2014 Osborne includes Xavier Le Roy's *Retrospective* (2012) in an article for a reader that was published in response to Le Roy's initial exhibition and forum. It should be noted, given my arguments in Chapters 4 and 5, that one of Osborne's main historical examples in *Anywhere or Not at All* is Sol LeWitt.

40. Rudi Laermans, *Moving Together: Theorizing and Making Contemporary Dance* (Amsterdam: Valiz, 2015), p. 200.

41. See also mapping work done on Minimalism and Neo-Dada across dance and visual art in Brannigan, *Choreography, Visual Art and Experimental Composition 1950s-1970s*.

42. Peter Osborne, "The Postconceptual Condition Or, the Cultural Logic of High Capitalism Today," *Radical Philosophy* 184 (March/April 2014): p. 25. He goes on: "postconceptual art is not a traditional art-historical or art-critical concept at the level of medium, aesthetic form, style or movement. It denotes an art premissed [sic] on the complex historical experience and critical legacy of conceptual art, broadly construed in such a way as to register the fundamental mutation of the ontology of the artwork carried by that legacy . . . It is a transdisciplinary ontology constructed in such a way as to cross the multiplicity of disciplinary and institutional discourses and practices necessary to the adequate constitution of the concept of art. 'Art' is a transdisciplinary concept, and it is

from this that the profound difficulties and paradoxes of the thinking of art's autonomy derive" (Osborne, "The Postconceptual Condition").

43. I have not addressed the pedagogical aspects of conceptual dance, but Boris Charmatz has engaged with the question of training models in sophisticated and provocative ways. See Charmatz's project *Bocal* (2002-2004), ("Bocal," accessed March 11, 2019, online: http://www.borischarmatz.org/?bocal-9), and the associated publication *Je Suis une École* (Paris: Les Prairies Ordinaires, 2009).

44. In Osborne's account of Le Roy's *Retrospective* (2012) he notes how Le Roy "transforms" the terms "dance," "art," and "exhibition" into each other while maintaining "the critical significance of medium as a historically received element or sedimentation within the work . . . this is a sign of the rigorously dialectical character of the internal structure of the work" ("Dialectical Ontology of Art: Xavier Le Roy's *Retrospective* in/as Contemporary Art," in *The Postconceptual Condition*, p. 111. This was originally published in *'Retrospective' by Xavier Le Roy*, edited by Bojana Cvejić [Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2014], pp. 103-12.)

45. Osborne, *Anywhere or Not at All*, p. 43.

46. Osborne, *The Postconceptual Condition: Critical Essays*, p. 110.

47. Lisa Trahair, "Lisa Trahair Reviews Peter Osborne's *Anywhere or Not at All*," *Critical Inquiry* (April 30, 2015), accessed March 26, 2019, online: https://criticalinquiry.uchicago.edu/lisa_trahair_reviews_peter_osbornes_anywhere_or_not_at_all/

48. Trahair, "Lisa Trahair Reviews Peter Osborne's *Anywhere or Not at All*."

49. Osborne elaborates: "in its informality, its proliferation of artistic materials and its inclusion of both preparatory and subsequent, documentary materials within its conception of the work, conceptual art demonstrated the radically distributive character of the unity of the work. That is to say, each work is distributed across a potentially unlimited, but nonetheless conceptually defined and in practice (at any one time) finite, totality of spatio-temporal sites of instantiation" (Osborne, *Anywhere or Not at All*, pp. 44-45).

50. See the work of Anna Halprin as an exemplar of movement-scoring and iterations exceeding an authorial version of a work discussed in Brannigan "Chapter 2.2. Anna Halprin—Dance as Experience-Experiment," in *Choreography, Visual Art and Experimental Composition 1950s-1970s*, pp. 39-47. Further, in terms of the dance-gallery genealogy, Merce Cunningham continued this tradition with his *Event* structure that was adapted to given circumstances, including galleries and other alternative spaces, and both Lasica and Hassabi continue this work with series and iterations. Doris Humphrey was one of the first modern dance artists to offer commentary on her work in *The Art of Making Dances* (Hightstown, NJ: Princeton Book Company, 1987 [1959]).

51. Gia Kourlas, "In Reverance to the American Spirit: Early Works by Sarah Michelson," in *Sarah Michelson* (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 2017), p. 31.

52. Erin Brannigan, *Moving Across Disciplines: Dance in the Twenty-First Century* (Platform Paper no. 25) (Sydney: Currency House, 2010), p. 5.

53. Sally Gardner, "Notes on Choreography," *Performance Research* 13, no. 1 (2008): p. 55.

54. Osborne, *Anywhere or Not at All*, p. 43. Laermans argues for the term

"reflexive-dance" instead of "conceptual dance," which I think relates to this understanding of the current situation (*Moving Together*, p. 208).

55. Osborne, *Anywhere or Not at All*, p. 43

56. Osborne, *Anywhere or Not at All*, p. 45.

57. Alain Badiou, *Handbook of Inaesthetics*, translated by Alberto Toscano (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2005), p. 13. Chiming with Badiou, Osborne states "the idea of a postconceptual condition is double-coded. It is determined at once as an artistic situation and that which conditions it . . . The idea of art is given through each work, but no individual work is adequate to this idea, however 'preponderant' that idea becomes" ("The Postconceptual Condition," p. 25).

58. Fabián Barba, "The Local Prejudice of Contemporary Dance," *Documenta: Contemporaneities* 2 (2016): pp. 46–63. Barba notes, "a dance education is a way of inscribing oneself within a dance culture" (p. 47).

59. Frederik Le Roy, "Contemporaneities. On the Entangled Now of Performance," *Documenta: Contemporaneities* 2 (2016): p. 19. I recommend Le Roy's edited issue of *Documenta* with essays by Rebecca Schneider, Fabián Barba, Timmy De Laet, and Daniel Blanga-Gubbay, among others.

Case Study 11

1. Latai Taumoepeau, *The Last Resort* (2020). Credits: Performer/Co-devisor: Taliu Aloua; Lighting Designer: Amber Silk; Soundtrack: James Brown; Costume: Anthony Aitch. *The Last Resort* is related to another work, *Stitching Up the Sea* (2014), which was devised for a theater context at Blacktown Arts Centre in Sydney, performed over two hours, and shared many of the components of this work. *The Last Resort* was presented as part of NIRIN: Biennale of Sydney, 2020, which is where I saw it in installation version. This was the first Biennale of Sydney with an Indigenous artistic director, Brooke Andrew.

"Aloua and Taumoepeau's relationship can be traced through their shared matrilineal genealogy." Latai notes, "this is an important relationship to observe in Tongan culture—particularly if you are the descendent of the female, being that it's a matriarchal society . . . this obligation between us is related to a concept called *Tauhivā*, which is the observance and the obligation of the space between us" (Taloi Havini, "The Last Resort: A Conversation, Latai Taumoepeau and Taloi Havini," *E-Flux Journal* 112 (2020), accessed March 20, 2022, online: https://www.e-flux.com/journal/112/353919/the-last-resort-a-conversation/).

2. Havini, "The Last Resort: A Conversation, Latai Taumoepeau and Taloi Havini," n.p.

3. Latai Taumoepeau, *The Last Resort* (2020), dual-screen video for installation. A single screen version is available on vimeo, accessed March 20, 2022, online: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=B1zWC1bn34Q&t=53s

4. Havini, "The Last Resort: A Conversation, Latai Taumoepeau and Taloi Havini," n.p. Taumoepeau explains that she engaged lighting designer Amber Silk to "stage" the work with light to make the glass shine and glisten to evoke

the idealized landscapes of Pacific Island holiday resorts (Erin Brannigan, "Interview with Latai Taumoepeau, March 27, 2022").

5. Taumoepeau describes her Tongan ancestory: "Ha'a Fisi mo Ha'amoa (paternal) and Ha'a Havea (maternal) are the clans I spawn from, that guide my existence" (quoted in Talei Luscia Mangioni, "Confronting Australian Apathy: Latai Taumoepeau and the Politics of Performance in Pacific Climate Stewardship," *The Contemporary Pacific* 33, no. 1 [2021]: p. 35).

6. "Latai Taumoepeau," accessed March 5, 2022, online: https://www.intimatespectacle.com.au/artists/latai-taumoepeau/; "Latai Taumoepeau ABCTV feature," accessed March 10, 2022, online: https://vimeo.com/335773936; and Latai Taumoepeau, "Disaffected: Body Centered Performance and Protest," *Water Futures—05*, Arts Centre Melbourne, February 23, 2017, accessed March 10, 2022, online: https://vimeo.com/209104881

Taumoepeau goes on to explain her use of the term *punake*: "it's a term from my language and that language is Tongan and I find that because my practise [sic] exists within a Western framework, I like to be identified by my community wherever it's necessary. I also don't mind the idea that it doesn't necessarily mean 'dancer' which is where my training is; it's more relevant to my [multi-media] practice" ("Latai Taumoepeau ABCTV feature," n.p.). Mangioni explains, via Okusitino Māhina, that "it is only the exceptional punake, who serve as important repositories of knowledge, who understand traditional Tongan history through creative arts endowed with the ecology-centered philosophy of tala-e-fonua, or the care relations between humans and the environment (1992, 16)" (Mangioni, "Confronting Australian Apathy," p. 35). Taumoepeau has since removed the title from her biography as it has become contested regarding its application to contemporary artists (Brannigan, "Interview with Latai Taumoepeau").

7. "Latai Taumoepeau ABCTV feature," n.p.

8. Mangioni, "Confronting Australian Apathy," p. 36; and Latai Taumoepeau, "#NAVAideas—Risk Taking—Latai Taumoepeau, Part 2," accessed April 4, 2022, online: https://vimeo.com/145775430.

9. Leya Reid, "Latai Taumoepeau," NAVA interview March 30, 2021, accessed April 4, 2022, online: https://visualarts.net.au/artist-files/2021/latai-taumoepeau/. She has also said that "when I used to refer to myself as a dancer I felt like a little bit of a fraud," hence her use of the term *punake* ("Latai Taumoepeau ABCTV feature," n.p.).

10. Taumoepeau, "Disaffected: Body Centered Performance and Protest," n.p.

11. You can see excerpts of the screen version of *Repatriate* (2015) in a documentary, "Latai Taumoepeau, ABCTV Feature," accessed May 16, 2022, online: https://vimeo.com/335773936

12. Taumoepeau quoted in Mangioni, "Confronting Australian Apathy," pp. 43–44.

13. These concepts are taken from Taumoepeau, "NIRIN Artist Interview | Latai Taumoepeau," accessed March 20, 2022, online: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=USdCAUXbFGE. Taumoepeau shared that she was recovering from a

serious injury when this work was mounted, so some of her fragile appearance is related to this (Brannigan, "Interview with Latai Taumoepeau, March 27, 2022").

14. One of her first works, *Kumi Fonua aka Portality 39* (2010 in consultation with Professor Hufanga Dr. Okusitino Mahina), was a short, live performance incorporating a sculptural set. *i-Land X-isle* (2012, with Garth Knight) was a site-based durational work with a screen-installation version created with video-artist Miriana Marusic. *Stitching Up the Sea* (2014) was a two-hour-long, durational theater-based action. *Ocean Island, Mine!* (2015) was a site-based durational work. *Dark Continent* (2015) was a gallery-based durational work with a photographic version in 2018. *Repatriate* (2015) was a site-based durational work preceded by a five-channel screen-installation work, *Repatriate* (2015, with Elias Nohra). *War Dance of the Final Frontier* (2018) was a live performance and video work with collaborator-composer Lonelyspeck. Taumoepeau has also made collaborative work, for example, a theater piece, *Disaffected* (2016, director Kym Vercoe, with performers Valerie Berry and Ryuichi Fujimura), and a video work, *Side Show* (2011, with videographer Cindy Rodriguez and performer Katherine Cogill). She also works as a curator, including on *Archipela_GO . . . This is Not a Drill* (2017) and *Monumental (working title)* co-curated by Taumoepeau and Brian Fuata, at the Art Gallery of New South Wales, April 9-10, 2022.

15. Peter Osborne, "The Postconceptual Condition Or, the Cultural Logic of High Capitalism Today," *Radical Philosophy* 184 (Mar/Apr 2014): p. 25. He links this to the transdisciplinary nature of the post-conceptual: "'Art' is a transdisciplinary concept, and it is from this that the profound difficulties and paradoxes of the thinking of art's autonomy derive" (Osborne, "The Postconceptual Condition").

16. Peter Osborne, *Anywhere or Not at All: Philosophy of Contemporary Art* (London: Verso, 2013), p. 43.

17. *Body of Art* (2013, directed by Iona Reto), accessed March 20, 2022, online: https://vimeo.com/60363446

18. Taumoepeau explains that three to four generations of her family have been coming to Australia for education purposes, but hers was the first generation born in the country.

19. "Cockatoo Island / Our Story / First Nations," accessed March 20, 2022, online: https://www.cockatooisland.gov.au/en/our-story/first-nations./. Representing the political rights of Aboriginal Australians, the "Aboriginal Tent Embassy" has occupied land outside Old Parliament House in Canberra since 1972.

20. Mangioni, "Confronting Australian Apathy," p. 36. Mangioni and Taumoepeau are part of a collective, Reading Oceania, which "began as a direct response to the diasporic needs of Indigenous Oceanic Australian artists, creatives and community to share Oceanic cosmology intimately and in meaningful ways" ("Reading Oceania," NIRIN: Biennale of Sydney 2020, accessed September 30, 2022, online: https://www.biennaleofsydney.art/participants/reading-oceania/).

21. *Body of Art*, n.p.

22. "Pacific-Australia Climate Change Science and Adaptation Planning Program" (2014), accessed March 2022, online: https://www.pacificclimatechange

science.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/PACCSAP-factsheet_Sea-Level-Rise.pdf

23. "Sea Level Rise Projection Map—Tonga," accessed November 4, 2022, online: https://earth.org/data_visualization/sea-level-rise-by-2100-tonga/

24. Havini, "The Last Resort: A Conversation, Latai Taumoepeau and Taloi Havini," n.p.

25. "Latai Taumoepeau ABCTV feature," n.p.

26. Mangioni, "Confronting Australian Apathy," pp. 33-34. Mangioni refers specifically to Australia's Pacific "Step-Up" policy, which was contradicted by the nation's "ultimate failure to budge on coal in the [Pacific Islands Forum, 2019] final communiqué and its reluctance to meet international climate targets" (p. 33). Taumoepeau's position as a Tongan-Australian is even more complex, as Mangioni notes: "Pacific communities who have made the trans-Indigenous leap into Australia must reconcile their privilege in relation to the Indigenous peoples there and the stolen lands on which they live and work" (p. 37).

27. Mangioni, "Confronting Australian Apathy," pp. 36 and 34.

28. André Lepecki, "Concept and Presence: The Contemporary European Dance Scene," in *Rethinking Dance History: A Reader*, edited by Alexandra Carter (London: Routledge, 2004), p. 170.

29. Taumoepeau quoted in Mangioni, "Confronting Australian Apathy," p. 37. Here she is paraphrasing Richard Bell from his work, *Scientia E Metaphysica (Bell's Theorem)* or *Aboriginal Art—It's a White Thing* (2002-2003). See Terry Smith on the colonizing history of contemporary art (*What Is Contemporary Art?* [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009], pp. 260-61).

30. "Latai Taumoepeau ABCTV feature," n.p.

31. Susan Best, "Conceptual Art and After: The Rise of the Interesting," *Art Monthly* 311 (October 2018): p.27.

32. Osborne, *Anywhere or Not at All*, p. 43.

33. Osborne, *Anywhere or Not at All*, p. 43.

34. Taumoepeau quoted in Mangioni, "Confronting Australian Apathy," p. 37, italics in original.

35. "Confronting Australian Apathy," p. 36.

36. "Confronting Australian Apathy," p. 34. The work seems to also affect audiences internationally; Taumoepeau describes her work being well received in the United Kingdom ("Disaffected: Body Centered Performance and Protest," n.p.).

37. *Body of Art*, n.p.

38. Katerina Teaiwa, "No Distant Future: Climate Change as an Existential Threat," *Australian Foreign Affairs* 6 (2019): p. 55.

39. Maria White, PhD.

40. Havini, "The Last Resort: A Conversation, Latai Taumoepeau and Taloi Havini," n.p.

41. *Judson Dance Theater: The Work is Never Done*, curated by Ana Janevski, Thomas J. Lax, and Martha Joseph, the Museum of Modern Art, New York, September 16, 2018-February 3, 2019.

42. David Velasco, "Preface," in *Sarah Michelson*, edited by David Velasco (New York: MoMA Publications, 2017), p. 7.

43. Pamela Zeplin, "The Liquid Continent," in *Re-Imagining the City*, edited by Elizabeth Grierson and Kristen Sharp (Bristol: Intellect, 2013), p. 52.

Conclusion

1. Jonathan Burrows, "Keynote Address for the Postdance Conference in Stockholm," in *Post-Dance*, edited by Danjel Andersson, Mette Edvardsen, and Mårten Spångberg (Stockholm: MDT, 2017), p. 91. Format from original text.

2. Xavier Le Roy, "Notes on Exhibition Works Involving Live Human Actions Performed in Public," in *Is the Living Body the Last Thing Left Alive? The New Performance Turn, Its Histories and Its Institutions*, edited by Cosmin Costinas and Ana Janevski (Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2017), pp. 79–80.

3. Erin Brannigan, "Interview with Maria Hassabi, February 11, 2022."

4. Mark Franko, "Museum Artifact Act," in *Danse: An Anthology*, edited by Noémie Solomon (Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2014), pp. 254–55.

5. Bojana Cvejić notes the power imbalance and asks the important question about commissioning and developing such work: "how can museums also be places for producing instead of harvesting (or even worse, co-opting) the most experimental and excellent contemporary dance, produced on the poor margins of theater production [?]" ("European Contemporary Dance, Before Its Recent Arrival in the Museum," in *Is the Living Body the Last Thing Left Alive?*, edited by Cosmin Costinas and Ana Janevski (Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2017), p. 33.

6. Rosi Braidotti, "Discontinuous Becomings. Deleuze on the Becoming-Woman of Philosophy," *Journal of the British Society of Phenomenology* 24, no. 1 (1993): p. 44.

7. Steve Paxton quoted in David Velasco, "The Year in Dance," *Artforum International* 51, no. 4 (2012): p. 302.

8. Erin Brannigan, "Interview with Maria Hassabi, May 6, 2022."

9. This format owes much to Yvonne Rainer's influential "'No' to Spectacle . . ." sometimes referred to as her "No Manifesto," which is part of a longer article, "Some Retrospective Notes on a Dance for 10 People and 12 Mattresses Called *Parts of Some Sextets*, Performed at the Wadsworth Atheneum, Hartford, Connecticut, and Judson Memorial Church, New York, in March, 1965," *Tulane Drama Review* 10, no. 2 (1965): pp. 168–78). Xavier Le Roy has attempted a definition of a more inclusive field distinguishing three distinct ways of presenting dance in the gallery that overlap with those included and excluded from mine: (1) "a work originally produced for theatre . . . presented in an exhibition space"; (2) "a performance with a beginning and end . . . specially developed for an exhibition space"; and "a performance work without a beginning, end, or fixed duration . . . developed for an exhibition space" (Le Roy, "Notes on Exhibition Works," p. 79).

10. Erin Brannigan, *Choreography, Visual Art and Experimental Composition 1950s-1970s* (London: Routledge, 2022).

11. Hal Foster, Rosalind Krauss, Yve-Alain Bois, and Benjamin Buchloh, "Roundtable: The Predicament of Contemporary Art," in *Art Since 1900: Modernism, Anti-Modernism, Postmodernism*, edited by Hal Foster, Rosalind Krauss, Yve-Alain Bois, and Benjamin Buchloh (London: Thames & Hudson, 2004), p. 679.

12. *Precarious Movements: Choreography and the Museum* (2021-2024) (https://www.unsw.edu.au/arts-design-architecture/our-schools/arts-media/our-research/our-projects/precarious-movements-choreography-museum). Other such projects include *Performance: Conservation, Materiality, Knowledge* (https://performanceconservationmaterialityknowledge.com/) and *Dancing Museums* (https://www.dancingmuseums.com/). On the landmark acquisition of Simone Forti's *Dance Constructions* into MoMA's collection in 2015 see Megan Metcalf, "Making the Museum Dance: Simone Forti's *Huddle* (1961) and Its Acquisition by the Museum of Modern Art," *Dance Chronicle* 45, no. 1 (2022): pp. 30-56.

13. Burrows, "Keynote Address for the Postdance Conference in Stockholm," p. 91.

14. Franko, "Museum Artifact Act," p. 255 and Burrows, "Keynote Address for the Postdance Conference in Stockholm," p. 91.

Bibliography

"20 Dancers for the Twentieth Century." Accessed April 5, 2019, online: http://www.borischarmatz.org/?20-danseurs-pour-le-xxe-siecle-157

Block Universe: POST-DANCE, at Tate Modern, May 26, 2019. Accessed October 13, 2022, online: https://podcasts.apple.com/gb/podcast/post-dance-conference-by-block-universe-part-1/id1570747651?i=1000556430029

Choreographic Devices, June 10–12, 2022, Institute of Contemporary Arts, London. Accessed October 13, 2022, online: https://www.ica.art/media/06238.pdf

"Cockatoo Island / Our Story / First Nations." Accessed March 20, 2022, online: https://www.cockatooisland.gov.au/en/our-story/first-nations./

Dance Artists' National Collective (DANC). Accessed October 13, 2022, online: https://danceartistsnationalcollective.org/

Everybodys Toolbox. Accessed May 4, 2022, online: http://www.everybodystoolbox.net/

"Ghost Telephone: A Month-Long Chain Performance," room notes, unpublished.

"Ghost Telephone: A One-Month-Long Chain Performance, Curated by Adrian Heathfield." In *The Guide: 20th Biennale of Sydney* (Sydney: Biennale of Sydney, 2016), pp. 128–29.

"'Here, an Echo,' a public artwork by Agatha Gothe-Snape." Accessed March 28, 2019, online: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JbTwR4Qptv0

"How the Lungs and Respiratory System Work." *WebMD*. Accessed August 8, 2017, online: http://www.webmd.com/lung/how-we-breathe/

"*knots and then*." Accessed February 23, 2023, online: https://www. damagedgoods.be/en/knots-and-then

"Latai Taumoepeau." Accessed March 5, 2022, online: https://www.intimatespectacle.com.au/artists/latai-taumoepeau/

"Latai Taumoepeau ABCTV feature." Accessed March 10, 2022, online: https://vimeo.com/335773936

"LE CLUBDES5, PARIS, Spring 2009." In *Everybodys Group Self-Interviews*, edited by Alice Chauchat and Mette Ingvartsen, pp. 45–59. Everybodys Publications, 2009.

Life Long Burning, Towards A Sustainable Eco-System for Contemporary Dance in Europe. Accessed October 13, 2022, online: http://www.lifelongburning.eu/news.html

"Maria Hassabi—Lights (2001)." Accessed March 5, 2022, online: http://mariahassabi.com/work/lights-2001-48-minutes/

"Maria Hassabi—Biography." Accessed March 5, 2022, online: http://mariahassabi.com/bio/

"Mathieu Copeland This Week at MoMA." Accessed April 7, 2019, online: https://www.moma.org/explore/inside_out/2013/04/16/mathieu-copeland-this-week-at-moma

"MoMA Collects: Simone Forti's *Dance Constructions*." Accessed March 30, 2019, online: https://www.moma.org/explore/inside_out/2016/01/27/moma-collects-simone-fortis-dance-constructions/

Motion Bank. Accessed April 24, 2019, online: http://motionbank.org/

"Pacific-Australia Climate Change Science and Adaptation Planning Program" (2014). Accessed March 2022, online: https://www.pacificclimatechangescience.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/PACCSAP-factsheet_Sea-Level-Rise.pdf

Post-Dance-ing Conference. Accessed October 13, 2022, online: https://mdtsthlm.se/archive/6671/

Precarious Movements: Choreography and the Museum (2021-2024). Accessed November 4, 2022, online: https://www.unsw.edu.au/arts-design-architecture/our-schools/arts-media/our-research/our-projects/precarious-movements-choreography-museum

"Reading Oceania." NIRIN: Biennale of Sydney 2020. Accessed September 30, 2022, online: https://www.biennaleofsydney.art/participants/reading-oceania/

"Robert and Maria." Accessed November 2, 2022, online: http://mariahassabi.com/work/robert-and-maria/

"Sarah Michelson in Conversation with Curator Philip Bither, 2011." Walker Art Center, Minneapolis. Accessed March 30, 2019, online: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rzdw_0YzXRU

"Sea Level Rise Projection Map—Tonga." Accessed November 4, 2022, online: https://earth.org/data_visualization/sea-level-rise-by-2100-tonga/

"*Spatial Confessions (On the question of instituting the public)*." Accessed April 10, 2022, online: https://www.tate.org.uk/research/publications/performance-at-tate/case-studies/bojana-cvejic

"The Dancer as Agent." The Dancer as Agent Conference website, November 23-24, 2013. Accessed April 30, 2019, online: http://oralsite.be/pages/Dancer_As_Agent_About/

"This Is the Show and the Show Is Many Things." Accessed December 4, 2018, online: http://www.damagedgoods.be/this-is-the-show-and-the-show-is-many-things

"*To Do/To Make*." Accessed March 20, 2022, online: https://vimeo.com/305287149

Watching Dance: Kinaesthetic Empathy research project. Accessed November 2, 2022, online: https://gtr.ukri.org/projects?ref=AH%2FF011229%2F1#/tabOverview

"Whitney Museum Unveils Design by Renzo Piano for New Downtown Build-

ing." Accessed March 30, 2019, online: https://whitney.org/www/email_images/pemail9.html

"Whitney Stories: Sarah Michelson." Accessed January 4, 2019, online: https://vimeo.com/116592122

Adolphe, Jean-Marc. "Introduction: Emancipated Dance File." Accessed December 28, 2017, online: http://sarma.be/docs/784

Adolphe, Jean-Marc, and Gérard Mayen. "The 'Non-dance' is Still Dancing." *Movement* 1 (May 2004). Translation accessed December 28, 2018, online: http://sarma.be/docs/784

Agamben, Giorgio. *Means without End: Notes on Politics.* Translated by Vincenzo Binetti and Cesare Casarino. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000.

Alberro, Alexander. "Reconsidering Conceptual Art, 1966-1977." In *Conceptual Art: A Critical Anthology*, edited by Alexander Alberro and Blake Stimson, pp. xvi-xxvii. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1999.

Alberro, Alexander. "Introduction: The Way Out is the Way In." In *Art After Conceptual Art*, edited by Sabeth Buchmann and Alexander Alberro, pp. 13-26. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2006.

Amalvi, Gilles. "More or Less Dance: A Multifaceted Portrait of Boris Charmatz." In *Boris Charmatz*, edited by Ana Janevski, pp. 121-35. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 2017.

Anderson, Heather. "Histories of the New School." Accessed April 17, 2020, online: http://newschoolhistories.org/people/john-cage/

Andersson, Danjel. "I Had a Dream." In *Post-Dance*, edited by Danjel Andersson, Mette Edvardsen, and Mårten Spångberg, pp. 13-17. Stockholm: MDT, 2017.

Andersson, Danjel, Mette Edvardsen, and Mårten Spångberg, eds. *Post-Dance*. Stockholm: MDT, 2017.

Aran, Uri. "'I Wanted to Teach the White Cube How to Take Theatricality': An Interview with Adam Linder." *Spike Magazine,* November 1, 2017. Accessed April 12, 2022, online: https://www.spikeartmagazine.com/?q=articles/i-wanted-teach-white-cube-how-take-theatricality

Aristotle. *On the Soul; Parva Naturalis; On Breath*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2012. Accessed August 8, 2017, online: https://www-loebclassics-com.wwwproxy1.library.unsw.edu.au/view/aristotle-breath/1957/pb_LCL288.517.xml/

Badiou, Alain. *The Handbook of Inaesthetics.* Translated by Alberto Toscano. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2005.

Badiou, Alain. "Cinema and Philosophy." Masterclass, University of New South Wales, Sydney, November 27, 2014.

Banes, Sally. *Terpsichore in Sneakers: Post-modern Dance*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1980.

Banes, Sally. *Democracy's Body: Judson Dance Theater, 1962-1964*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1993.

Banes, Sally. *Greenwich Village 1963: Avant-Garde Performance and the Effervescent Body*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1993.

Banes, Sally, and Susan Manning. "Terpsichore in Combat Boots." *Tulane Drama Review* 33, no. 1 (Spring 1989): pp. 13-16.

Barba, Fabián. "The Local Prejudice of Contemporary Dance." *Documenta: Contemporaneities* 2 (2016): pp. 46-63.

Bard, Joellen. *Tenth Street Days: The Co-ops of the 50s*. New York: Education, Art & Service, Inc., 1977.

Baudelot, Alexandra. *Jennifer Lacey and Nadia Lauro: Dispositifs Chorégraphiques*. Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2007.

Baudelot, Alexandra. "Jennifer Lacey and Nadia Lauro: Choreographic Dispositifs." In *Danse: An Anthology*, edited by Noémie Solomon, pp. 177-85. Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2014.

Bauer, Eleanor, and Juliette Mapp. "Edition #1: How Dance Thinks, March 13, 2018." Accessed May 5, 2022, online: https://www.uniarts.se/english/about-uniarts/department-of-dance/how-dance-thinks

Bel, Jérôme, and Boris Charmatz. "Jérôme Bel and Boris Charmatz: Emails 2009-2010." In *Danse: An Anthology*, edited by Noémie Solomon, pp. 241-50. Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2014.

Bennahum, Ninotchka, Wendy Perron, and Bruce Robertson. *Radical Bodies: Anna Halprin, Simone Forti, and Yvonne Rainer in California and New York, 1955-1972*. Santa Barbara, CA: Art, Design and Architecture Museum, 2017.

Best, Susan. *Visualizing Feeling: Affect and the Feminine Avant-Garde*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2014.

Best, Susan. "Conceptual Art and After: The Rise of the Interesting." *Art Monthly* 311 (October 2018): pp. 26-27.

Best, Susan. *It's Not Personal: Post 60s Body Art and Performance*. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2021.

Bianchi, Pamela. "Choreographed Exhibition/Exhibited Choreography." *Re.bus* 9 (2020): pp. 109-29.

Bishop, Claire. *Artificial Hells: Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship*. London: Verso, 2012.

Bishop, Claire. *Radical Museology: or, What's 'Contemporary' in Museums of Contemporary Art?* London: Koenig Books, 2013.

Bishop, Claire. "The Perils and Possibilities of Dance in the Museum: Tate, MoMA and Whitney." *Dance Research Journal* 46, no. 3 (2014): pp. 62-76.

Bishop, Claire. "Black Box, White Cube, Gray Zone: Dance Exhibitions and Audience Attention." *The Drama Review* 62, no. 2 (Summer 2018): pp. 22-42.

Bishop, Claire, and Terry Smith. "Museum Models, Radical Spectatorship." In *Talking Contemporary Curating*, edited by Terry Smith, pp. 139-61. New York: Independent Curators International, 2015.

Bollen, Christopher. "Maria Hassabi." Interview, February 26, 2016. Accessed March 5, 2022, online: https://www.interviewmagazine.com/art/maria-hassabi

Bourriaud, Nicolas. *Relational Aesthetics*. Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2002.

Boynton, Andrew. "A Dance of a Million Premières." *The New Yorker*, November 15 (2013). Accessed March 5, 2022, online: https://www.newyorker.com/culture/culture-desk/a-dance-of-a-million-premires

Bradley, Karen K. *Rudolf Laban*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2008.

Braidotti, Rosi. "Discontinuous Becomings. Deleuze on the Becoming-Woman of

Philosophy." *Journal of the British Society of Phenomenology* 24, no. 1 (1993): pp. 44-55.
Brannigan, Erin. "Shelley Lasica Interview, July 10, 2016."
Brannigan, Erin. "Shelley Lasica Interview, May 19, 2017."
Brannigan, Erin. "Agatha Gothe-Snape Interview, March 27, 2019."
Brannigan, Erin. "Interview with Adam Linder, April 20, 2021."
Brannigan, Erin. "Interview with Maria Hassabi, February 11, 2022."
Brannigan, Erin. "Conversation with Kuba Dorabialski, UNSW, February 14, 2022."
Brannigan, Erin. "Interview with Maria Hassabi, May 6, 2022."
Brannigan, Erin. "Interview with Latai Taumoepeau, March 27, 2022."
Brannigan, Erin. "Interview with Zoe Theodore and Shelley Lasica, April 4, 2022."
Brannigan, Erin. "Interview with Deanne Butterworth, Shelley Lasica, and Jo Lloyd, July 26, 2022."
Brannigan, Erin "Conversation with Kuba Dorabialski, August 12, 2017."
Brannigan, Erin. *Moving Across Disciplines: Dance in the Twenty-First Century* (Platform Paper no. 25). Sydney: Currency House, 2010.
Brannigan, Erin. *Dancefilm: Choreography and the Moving Image*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
Brannigan, Erin. "Choreography and the Gallery: Curation as Revision." *Dance Research Journal* 47, no. 1 (2015): pp. 5-25.
Brannigan, Erin. "Positively Unassertive: Dancing in the Art Gallery of NSW." *Broadsheet* 45, no. 2 (2016): pp. 26-29.
Brannigan, Erin. "Context, Discipline and Understanding: The Poetics of Shelley Lasica's Gallery-Based Work." *Performance Paradigm* 13 (2017): pp. 97-117.
Brannigan, Erin. "Whatever Happened to Dance Criticism?" In *Routledge Companion to Dance Studies*, edited by Helen Thomas and Stacey Prickett, pp. 207-20. Abingdon: Routledge, 2018.
Brannigan, Erin. "Talking Back: What Dance Might Make of Badiou's Philosophical Project." *Performance Philosophy* 4, no. 2 (2019): pp. 354-73.
Brannigan, Erin. "Choreography as Concept, Dancing as Material." *Performance Research ON (UN)KNOWNS* 26, no. 2 (2021): pp. 24-31.
Brannigan, Erin. *Choreography, Visual Art and Experimental Composition 1950s-1970s*. London: Routledge, 2022.
Brannigan, Erin, and Rhiannon Newton. "Propositions for Doing Dancing." *Runway* 36 (2018). Accessed April 30, 2019, online: http://runway.org.au/propositions-dancing/
Brannigan, Erin, and Nalina Wait. "Non-Competitive Body States: Corporeal Freedom and Innovation in Contemporary Dance." In *The Oxford Handbook of Dance and Competition*, edited by Sherril Dodds, pp. 283-304. New York: Oxford University Press, 2018.
Breitwieser, Sabine, ed. *Simone Forti: Thinking with the Body*. Catalogue. Salzburg: Museum der Moderne Salzburg, 2014.
Brown, Carolyn. *Chance and Circumstance: Twenty Years with Cage and Cunningham*. Evanstown, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2007.
Brun, Dominique, Anne Collod, Simon Hecquet, and Christophe Wavelet. "Le

Quatuor Albrecht Knust." In *Danse: An Anthology*, edited by Noémie Solomon, pp. 27-39. Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2014.
Bryan-Wilson, Julia, and Olivia Ardui, eds. *Histórias da Dança / Histories of Dance, Vol. 2: Anthology*. São Paulo: MASP, Museu de Arte de São Paulo Assis Chateaubriand, 2020.
Buchloh, Benjamin. "Conceptual Art 1962-1969: From the Aesthetic of Administration to the Critique of Institutions." *October* 55 (1990): pp. 105-43.
Buchloh, Benjamin. "Rock Paper Scissors." *Artforum* (Sept 2017), n.p. Accessed April 20, 2022, online: https://www.artforum.com/print/201707/benjamin-h-d-buchloh-on-some-means-and-ends-of-sculpture-at-venice-muenster-and-documenta-70461
Buchloh, Benjamin, Rosalind Krauss, Alexander Alberro, Thierry de Duve, Martha Buskirk, and Yve-Alain Bois. "Conceptual Art and the Reception of Duchamp." *October* 70 (1994): pp. 126-46.
Buchmann, Sabeth, and Alexander Alberro. *Art After Conceptual Art*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2006.
Buren, Daniel. "Exhibition of an Exhibition." In *Documenta 5*. Catalogue, Section 17, p. 9. Kassell: Germany, Documenta GmbH, 1972.
Buren, Daniel. "The Function of the Studio." *October* 10 (1979): pp. 51-58.
Buren, Daniel. "Where are the Artists?" In *The Next Documenta Should be Curated by an Artist*, edited by Jens Hoffmann. Frankfurt: E-Flux/Revolver, 2004. Accessed November 2, 2022, online: http://projects.e-flux.com/next_doc/d_buren_printable.html
Bürger, Peter. *Theory of the Avant-Garde.* Translated by Michael Shaw. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.
Burke, Harry. "Portrait: Against Time: Maria Hassabi." *Spike Art Quarterly* 53 (2017): pp. 107-17. Accessed March 5, 2022, online: http://mariahassabi.com/wp-content/uploads/Spike53_Portrait%20Hassabi_2-2.pdf
Burrows, Jonathan. *A Choreographer's Handbook*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2010.
Burrows, Jonathan. "Rebelling Against Limit." In *Danse: An Anthology*, edited by Noémie Solomon, pp. 81-87. Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2014.
Burrows, Jonathan. "Body Not Fit for Purpose." *Performance Research* 20, no. 5 (2015): pp. 81-86.
Burrows, Jonathan. "Keynote Address for the Postdance Conference in Stockholm." In *Post-Dance*, edited by Danjel Andersson, Mette Edvardsen, and Mårten Spångberg, pp. 83-100. Stockholm: MDT, 2017.
Burrows, Jonathan, and Jan Ritsema. "Weak Dance Strong Questions." *Performance Research* 8, no. 2 (2003): pp. 28-33.
Burt, Ramsay. *Judson Dance Theater: Performative Traces*. London: Routledge, 2006.
Burt, Ramsay. *Ungoverning Dance*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2017.
Butterworth, Jo, and Liesbeth Wildschut. *Contemporary Choreography: A Critical Reader*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2018.
Cage, John. *Silence: Lectures and Writings* (50th anniversary edition). Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2011.
Camnitzer, Luis, Jane Farver, and Rachel Weiss. "Foreword." In *Global Conceptu-*

alism: Points of Origin, 1950s-1980s, edited by Philomena Mariani, pp. vii-xi. New York: Queens Museum of Art, 1999.
Chaignaud, François. Artist's Talk, University of New South Wales, October 2, 2015.
Chalfa Ruyter, Nancy. *The Cultivation of Body and Mind in Nineteenth Century American Delsartism*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1999.
Chapuis, Yvane. "Toward a Critical Reading of Contemporary Dance." In *Danse: An Anthology*, edited by Noémie Solomon, pp. 133-43. Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2014.
Charmatz, Boris. *Je Suis une École*. Paris: Les Prairies Ordinaires, 2009.
Charmatz, Boris. "Manifesto for a National Choreographic Centre." *Dance Research Journal* special issue, *Dance in the Museum* 46, no. 3 (2014): pp. 45-48.
Charmatz, Boris. "Boris Charmatz in Conversation with Mathieu Copeland, Paris, 28 October 2011." In *Danse: An Anthology*, edited by Noémie Solomon, pp. 105-12. Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2014.
Charmatz, Boris. "Manifesto for Dancing Museum." Accessed March 29, 2019, online: https://www.moma.org/momaorg/shared/pdfs/docs/calendar/manifesto_dancing_museum.pdf
Charmatz, Boris. "Speech, Boris Charmatz Press Conference, 21 October 2021." Accessed April 12, 2022, online: https://www.pinabausch.de/fileadmin/user_upload/Speech_Boris_Charmatz.pdf
Charmatz, Boris, and Mark Franko. "Interview with Boris Charmatz." *Dance Research Journal* special issue, *Dance in the Museum* 46, no. 3 (2014): pp. 49-52.
Charmatz, Boris, and Isabelle Launay. *Undertraining: On a Contemporary Dance*, translated by Anna Preger. Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2011.
Clarke, Paul, Simon Jones, Nick Kaye, and Johanna Linsley, eds. *Artists in the Archive: Creative and Curatorial Engagements with Documents of Art and Performance*. London: Routledge, 2018.
Claudel, Paul. "Art Poétique." In *Œuvres complètes*. La Pléiade: Gallimard, 1957.
Copeland, Mathieu. "Choreographing Exhibitions: An Exhibition Happening Everywhere, at all times, with and for Everyone." In *Choreographing Exhibitions*, edited by Mathieu Copeland and Julie Pellegrin, pp. 21-24. Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2013.
Copeland, Mathieu. "Jérôme Bel in Conversation with Mathieu Copeland, London, 22 November 2011." In *Choreographing Exhibitions*, edited by Mathieu Copeland and Julie Pellegrin, pp. 49-54. Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2013.
Copeland, Mathieu. "Hans Ulrich Obrist in Conversation with Mathieu Copeland: The Fragility of Exhibitions, Stroll in Hyde Park, London, 31 October 2011." In *Choreographing Exhibitions*, edited by Mathieu Copeland and Julie Pellegrin, pp. 167-73. Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2013.
Copeland, Mathieu. "A Choreographed Exhibition—Kunsthalle St. Gallen, 1/12/07-13/01/08." Accessed February 20, 2014, online: www.mathieucopeland.net
Copeland, Mathieu, and Julie Pellegrin, eds. *Choreographing Exhibitions*. Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2013.

Copeland, Roger. "Dance Criticism and the Descriptive Bias." *Dance Theatre Journal* 10, no. 3 (1993): pp. 26–32.

Copeland, Roger, and Marshall Cohen, eds. *What Is Dance?* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.

Costinas, Cosmin, and Ana Janevski, eds. *Is the Living Body the Last Thing Left Alive? The New Performance Turn, Its Histories and Its Institutions*. Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2017.

Craft, Catherine. *An Audience of Artists: Dada, Neo-Dada, and the Emergence of Abstract Expressionism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2012.

Cramer, Anton. "Dance as Artifact: Transformations of the Immaterial." *Dance Research Journal* special issue, *Dance in the Museum* 46, no. 3 (2014): pp. 24–31.

Cvejić, Bojana. "Can One Dance the Logical Scaffolding of Dance?" *Frakcija* 24/25 (2002): unpaginated.

Cvejić, Bojana. "The Passion for Proceduralism." *Maska* 19, nos. 84/85 (2004): pp. 32–34.

Cvejić, Bojana. "Xavier Le Roy: The Dissenting Choreography of One Frenchman Less." In *Contemporary French Theatre and Performance*, edited by Clare Finburgh and Carl Lavery, pp. 188–99. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.

Cvejić, Bojana. "Proceduralism." In *Parallel Slalom: A Lexicon of Non-Aligned Poetics*, edited by Bojana Cvejić and Goran Sergej Pristas, pp. 239–40. Belgrade and Zagreb: Walking Theory—TkH, 2013.

Cvejić, Bojana, ed. *'Retrospective' by Xavier Le Roy*. Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2014.

Cvejić, Bojana. "Xavier Le Roy's *'Retrospective'*: Choreographing a Problem, and a Mode of Production." In *'Retrospective' by Xavier Le Roy*, edited by Bojana Cvejić, pp. 9–18. Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2014.

Cvejić, Bojana. "To End with Judgement by Way of Clarification." In *Danse: An Anthology*, edited by Noémie Solomon, pp. 145–57. Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2014.

Cvejić, Bojana. *Choreographing Problems: Expressive Concepts in European Contemporary Dance and Performance*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.

Cvejić, Bojana. "Credo in Artem Imaginandi." In *Post-Dance*, edited by Danjel Andersson, Mette Edvardsen, and Mårten Spångberg, pp. 101–15. Stockholm: MDT, 2017.

Cvejić, Bojana. "The Vertiginous Invasion of a Tribe Called Dance: Boris Charmatz's *Héâtre-élévision (Pseudo Performance)*." In *Boris Charmatz*, edited by Ana Janevski, pp. 53–62. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 2017.

Cvejić, Bojana. "European Contemporary Dance, before Its Recent Arrival in the Museum." In *Is the Living Body the Last Thing Left Alive? The New Performance Turn, Its Histories and Its Institutions*, edited by Cosmin Costinas and Ana Janevski, pp. 29–33. Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2017.

Cvejić, Bojana, and Ana Vujanović. *Public Sphere for Performance*. B_Books, 2015. Accessed April 10, 2022, online: https://issuu.com/katalogija/docs/____public_sphere_web-single

Cvejić, Bojana, and Ana Vujanović. *Toward a Transindividual Self*. Oslo: Oslo National Academy of the Arts, 2022.

Damman, Catherine. "Presence at the Creation." *Artforum International* 57, no. 1 (September 2018). Accessed March 12, 2019, online: https://www.artforum.com/print/201807/catherine-damman-on-judson-dance-theater-76332

Davida, Dena, Jane Gabriels, Véronique Hudon, and Marc Pronovost. *Curating Live Arts: Critical Perspectives, Essays, and Conversations on Theory and Practice*. New York: Berghahn Books, 2019.

De Baere, Bart, and Charles Esche. "Exhibitions Histories Talk: Bart De Baere." *Afterall Online*. Accessed December 4, 2018, online: https://www.afterall.org/online/exhibition-histories-talks-bart-de-baere-video-online#.XAXXVRMzaAx

De Duve, Thierry. *Kant after Duchamp*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1996.

DeFrantz, Thomas F. "Identifying the Endgame." *Theater* 47, no. 1 (2017): pp. 2–15.

DeFrantz, Thomas F. "Dancing the Museum." In *Curating Live Arts: Critical Perspectives, Essays, and Conversations on Theory and Practice*, edited by Dena Davida, Jane Gabriels, Véronique Hudon, and Marc Pronovost, pp. 217–43. New York: Berghahn Books, 2019.

DeFrantz, Thomas F. "Dancing the Museum Black: Activist Animations of the Social." In *Moving Spaces Enacting Dance, Performance, and the Digital in the Museum*, edited by Susanne Franco and Gabriella Giannachi, pp. 101–14. Venice: Venezia Edizioni Ca' Foscari, 2021.

De La Barra, Pablo Leon. "'A Choreographed Exhibition' by Mathieu Copeland, *Centre for Aesthetic Revolution*, November 30 (2007)." Accessed March 30, 2021, online: http://centrefortheaestheticrevolution.blogspot.com/2007/11/choreographed-exhibition-by-mathieu.html

De la Durantaye, Leland. "Lost in Thought." *Artforum International* 52, no. 2 (Oct 2013): pp. 83–84.

Deleuze, Gilles. *Cinema 1: The Movement-Image*, translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Barbara Habberjam. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986.

Deleuze, Gilles. *Cinema 2: The Time-Image*, translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Robert Galeta. London: Continuum, 2005.

Deleuze, Gilles. "Gilles Deleuze on Cinema: What is the Creative Act?" Lecture (FEMIS, 1987). Accessed December 8, 2017, online: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=a_hifamdISs/

Desmond, Jane, ed. *Meaning in Motion*. Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press, 1997.

Diserens, Corinne. Mail correspondence with the author, August 27, 2013.

Dixon Gottschild, Brenda. *Digging the Africanist Presence in American Performance: Dance and Other Contexts*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1996.

Dobbels, Daniel, and Claude Rabant. "The Missing Gesture: An Interview with Hubert Godard." *Writings on Dance: The French Issue*, no. 15 (Winter 1996): pp. 38–47.

Dorabialski, Kuba. "You Can't the Fire." Accessed December 30, 2018, online: https://www.kubadorabialski.com/you-cant-the-fire/

Edvardsen, Mette. "The Picture of a Stone." In *Post-Dance*, edited by Danjel Andersson, Mette Edvardsen, and Mårten Spångberg, pp. 216–21. Stockholm: MDT, 2017.

Elswit, Kate. "Posts by Kate Elswit." Accessed August 9, 2017, online: https://www.breathcatalogue.org/

Etchells, Tim. "Go Slowly, Go: Some Thoughts on Boris Charmatz's *expo rom* and *brouillon*." In *Boris Charmatz*, edited by Ana Janevski. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 2017.

Ewington, Julie. "Situated Reading." In *Agatha Gothe-Snape: The Outcome is Certain*, edited by Hannah Mathews and Melissa Ratliff, pp. 21-32. Melbourne: Monash University Museum of Art and Perimeter Editions, 2020.

Flynt, Henry. "Concept Art." In *An Anthology of Chance Operations*, edited by La Monte Young and Jackson Mac Low, unpaginated. New York: La Monte Young and Jackson Mac Low, 1963.

Flynt, Henry. "Structure Art and Pure Mathematics," 1960. In *Henry Flynt: Fragments and Reconstructions from a Destroyed Oeuvre, 1959-1963*. New York: Backworks, 1982. Accessed November 21, 2018, online: https://www.moma.org/collection/works/164814

Forsythe, William. "Choreographic Objects." In *William Forsythe and the Practice of Choreography: It Starts rom Any Point*, edited by Steven Spier, pp. 90-92. London: Routledge, 2011.

Forti, Simone. *Handbook in Motion*. New York: New York University Press, 1974.

Forti, Simone. "Letters from Forti to Halprin, 1960-1961." In *Radical Bodies: Anna Halprin, Simone Forti, and Yvonne Rainer in California and New York, 1955-1972*, edited by Ninotchka Bennahum, Wendy Perron, and Bruce Robertson, pp. 148-57. Santa Barbara, CA: Art, Design and Architecture Museum, 2017.

Foster, Hal. *Bad New Days: Art, Criticism, Emergency*. Brooklyn: Verso, 2015.

Foster, Hal. "Made Out of the Real World: Lessons from the Fulton Street Studio." In *Robert Rauschenberg*, edited by David Frankel, pp. 88-97. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 2016.

Foster, Hal, Rosalind Krauss, Yve-Alain Bois, and Benjamin Buchloh. "Roundtable: The Predicament of Contemporary Art." In *Art Since 1900: Modernism, Anti-Modernism, Postmodernism*, edited by Hal Foster, Rosalind Krauss, Yve-Alain Bois, and Benjamin Buchloh, pp. 670-79. London: Thames & Hudson, 2004.

Foster, Susan Leigh. *Reading Dancing: Bodies and Subjects in Contemporary American Dance*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986.

Foster, Susan Leigh. *Choreographing Empathy: Kinaesthesia in Performance*. London: Routledge, 2009.

Foucault, Michel. "Utopian Body." In *Sensorium: Embodied Experience, Technology, and Contemporary Art*. Translated by Lucia Allais and edited by Caroline Jones, pp. 229-34. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2006.

Franko, Mark. "Archaeological Choreographic Practices: Foucault and Forsythe." *History of the Human Sciences* 24, no. 4 (2011): pp. 97-112.

Franko, Mark. "Museum Artifact Act." In *Danse: An Anthology*, edited by Noémie Solomon, pp. 251-59. Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2014.

Franko, Mark, and André Lepecki. "Editor's Note: Dance in the Museum." *Dance Research Journal* 46, no. 3 (2014): pp. 1-4.

Fuller, Rachel. "A Conversation with Agatha Gothe-Snape." *Ocula*, 19 (October

2015). Accessed March 14, 2019, online: https://ocula.com/magazine/conversations/agatha-gothe-snape/
Gardner, Sally. "Notes on Choreography." *Performance Research* 13, no. 1 (2008): pp. 55-60.
Gardner, Sally. "Practising Research, Researching Practice." *Cultural Studies Review* 18, no. 1 (2012): pp. 138-51.
Gardner, Sally. "Choreography, or Framed Kinaesthetics." In *Framed Movements*, unpaginated. Melbourne: Australian Centre for Contemporary Art, 2014.
Gehmacher, Philipp. "Biography." Accessed April 10, 2022, online: http://www.philippgehmacher.net/assets/documents/2020e-09-10_CV%20Philipp%20Gehmacher%20long_en%20(SL-MacBook-Air.locals%20in%20Konflikt%20stehende%20Kopie%202020-10-25).pdf
Giersdorf, Jens Richard, and Yutian Wong, eds. *The Routledge Dance Studies Reader*. London: Routledge, 2018.
Gil, José. "Paradoxical Body." In *Planes of Composition: Dance, Theory and the Global*, edited by André Lepecki and Jenn Joy, pp. 85-106. London, New York, and Calcutta: Seagull Press, 2009.
Ginot, Isabelle. "Dis-identifying: Dancing Bodies and Analysing Eyes at Work." *Discourses in Dance* 2, no. 1 (2004), unpaginated. Accessed March 31, 2019, online: http://sarma.be/docs/602
Ginot, Isabelle. "From Shusterman's Somaesthetics to a Radical Epistemology of Somatics." *Dance Research Journal* 42, no. 1 (2010): pp. 12-29.
Ginot, Isabelle. "A Common Place." In *Danse: An Anthology*, edited by Noémie Solomon, pp. 159-74. Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2014.
Godard, Hubert. "Gesture and Its Perception." Translated by Sally Gardner. *Writings on Dance* 22 (Summer 2003-2004): pp. 57-61.
Godard, Hubert, and Suely Rolnik. "Blindsight." In *Peripheral Vision and Collective Body*, edited by Museion Bozen/Bolzano, pp. 177-219. Bolzano: Museion, 2008.
Goldberg, RoseLee. "Space as Praxis." *Studio International* 190, no. 977 (September-October 1975), pp. 130-35.
Goodall, Jane. "Knowing What You're Doing." *The Performance Space Quarterly*, no. 14 (Winter 1997): pp. 20-23.
Gothe-Snape, Agatha. "*Here, an Echo* Scores," unpublished.
Gothe-Snape, Agatha. "*Three Ways to Enter and Exit* Poster," unpublished.
Gothe-Snape, Agatha. "Prologue to Rhetorical Chorus" (text accompanying a presentation at the National Gallery of Australia as part of *Power and Imagination: Conceptual Art*, 11 August 2018-19 May 2019), unpublished.
Gothe-Snape, Agatha. "Notations Produced for Workshops with Brooke Stamp in March 2016 for the Development of *Here, an Echo*, 2015-2017." In *Agatha Gothe-Snape: The Outcome is Certain*, edited by Hannah Mathews and Melissa Ratliff, pp. 9-19. Melbourne: Monash University Museum of Art and Perimeter Editions, 2020.
Gothe-Snape, Agatha. "Inexhaustible Present." In *Agatha Gothe-Snape: The Outcome is Certain*, edited by Hannah Mathews and Melissa Ratliff, pp. 33-43. Melbourne: Monash University Museum of Art and Perimeter Editions, 2020.

Gothe-Snape, Agatha, Amrita Hepi, Latai Taumoepeau, and Hannah Mathews. "Precarious Movements: Conversations #1." Accessed May 20, 2022, online: https://vimeo.com/470384940

Gourfink, Myriam. "Dance, Borrow, Create? From the Breath to Ideas, from Ideas to Gesture." Accessed April 25, 2019, online: http://motionbank.org/sites/motionbank.org/files/mg_dusouffle_e_finb.pdf

Graham, Dan. "Subject Matter." In *End Moments*. New York: Self-published, 1969.

Gray, Victoria. "The Choreography of Anticipation in Maria Hassabi's 'PREMIERE'." *The Drama Review* 59, no. 3 (2015): pp. 150–57.

Grounau, Barbara, Matthias von Hartz, and Carolin Hochleichter, eds. *How to Frame: On the Threshold of Performing and Visual Arts*. Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2016.

Groys, Boris. "Exhibitions, Installations, and Nostalgia." In *Talking Contemporary Curating*, edited by Terry Smith, pp. 60–84. New York: Independent Curators International, 2015.

Gruen, John. "Painter Dancing in the Dark." *New York Herald Tribune Sunday Magazine*, January 2, 1966.

Gutierrez, Miguel. "Does Abstraction Belong to White People?" *BOMB* November 7, 2018. Accessed April 15, 2019, online: https://bombmagazine.org/articles/miguel-gutierrez-1/

H'Doubler, Margaret. *Dance: A Creative Art Experience*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1998.

Halbriech, Kathy. "Shall We Dance at MoMA? An Introduction." In *Sarah Michelson*, edited by David Velasco, pp. 10–16. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 2017.

Hardy, Camille. "Contemporary Views from Vienna." *Dance Chronicle* 32 (2009): pp. 164–68.

Hargreaves, Martin, Tom Hastings, and Hilary Stainsby. "LCDS Live: What is Expanded Dance Practice?" Accessed October 13, 2022, online: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Fp1aWe4r1x8

Harrell, Trajal. "Trajal Harrell Interviews Himself as Alexandre Roccoli On SHOWPONY June 2008." In *Everybodys Self-Interviews*, edited by Mette Ingvartsen and Alice Chauchat, pp. 46–50. Everybodys Publications, 2008.

Hassabi, Maria. "Maria Hassabi Talks about *Plastic*." *Artforum*. Accessed March 5, 2022, online: https://www.artforum.com/video/maria-hassabi-talks-about-plastic-58365

Hassabi, Maria. "SoloShow Text." Accessed March 4, 2022, online: http://mariahassabi.com/work/soloshownovember-2009/

Havilah, Lisa. "[untitled]." In *What I Think About When I Think About Dancing*, edited by Lisa Havilah, Emma Saunders, and Susan Gibb, pp. 19–22. Campbelltown: Campbelltown Arts Centre, 2009.

Havilah, Lisa, Emma Saunders, and Susan Gibb. *What I Think About When I Think About Dancing*. Campbelltown: Campbelltown Arts Centre, 2009.

Havini, Taloi. "The Last Resort: A Conversation, Latai Taumoepeau and Taloi Havini." *E-Flux Journal* 112 (2020). Accessed March 20, 2022, online: https://www.e-flux.com/journal/112/353919/the-last-resort-a-conversation/

Heathfield, Adrian. *Out of Now: The Lifeworks of Tehching Hsieh*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2009.

Heathfield, Adrian. "Ghost Telephone." Accessed April 10, 2022, online: https://www.adrianheathfield.net/project/ghost-telephone

Hejinian, Lyn. *The Language of Inquiry*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.

Helland, Michael, and Chrysa Parkinson. *Curating Your Moves: Michael Helland in Conversation with Chrysa Parkinson*. Stockholm: DOCH School of Dance and Circus, Stockholm University of the Arts, 2014.

Higgins, Dick. *Horizons: The Poetics and Theory of the Intermedia*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1984.

Hill, Wes. "Superposition of Three Types." *Frieze* April 6, 2017. Accessed May 3, 2019, online: https://frieze.com/article/superposition-three-types

Hilton, Rebecca. "DANCERNESS." *Performance Paradigm* #13 (2017): pp. 196-200.

Hochmuth, Martina, Krassimira Kruschkova, and Georg Schöllhammer, eds. *It Takes Place When It Doesn't. On Dance and Performance*. Frankfurt am Main: Revolver-Archiv für Aktuelle Kunst, 2006.

Horwitz, Andy. "The Economics of Ephemerality." *Culturebot* (October 11, 2012). Accessed October 13, 2022, online: https://www.culturebot.org/2012/10/14762/panel-as-performance-deconstructing-the-performa-event/

Howe, David Everitt. "Dance in the Ruins: Trajal Harrell, Adam Linder and Alexandra Bachzetsis on Their Work, Its Institutionalization, and the Art World." *Mousse* 50, October-November (2015): pp. 76-89.

Humphrey, Doris. *The Art of Making Dances*. Hightstown, NJ: Princeton Book Company, 1987 (1959).

Hussie-Taylor, Judy. "Curation as Choreography: A Dialogue between Judy Hussie-Taylor and Ralph Lemon." *Theater* 44, no. 2 (2014): pp. 99-113.

Ingvartsen, Mette. "EVERYBODYS BERLIN, November 2009." In *Everybodys Group Self-Interviews*, pp. 1-10. Everybodys Publications, 2009.

Ingvartsen, Mette, ed. *6 Months 1 Location (6M1L)*. Everybodys Publications, 2009.

Ingvartsen, Mette, and Alice Chauchat, eds. *Everybodys Self-Interviews*. Everybodys Publications, 2008.

Ingvartsen, Mette, and Alice Chauchat, eds. *Everybodys Group Self-Interviews*. Everybodys Publications, 2009.

Jackson, Naomi M. "Curatorial Discourse and Equity Tensions in Contemporary Dance Presenting in the United States." In *Curating Live Arts: Critical Perspectives, Essays, and Conversations on Theory and Practice*, edited by Dena Davida, Jane Gabriels, Véronique Hudon, and Marc Pronovost, pp. 244-72. New York: Berghahn Books, 2019.

Jackson, Naomi M. *Dance and Ethics: Moving Towards a More Humane Dance Culture*. Bristol: Intellect Books, 2022.

Jaques-Dalcroze, Émile. *Rhythm, Music and Education.* Translated by Harold F. Rubinstein. London: The Dalcroze Society, 1973 (1921).Janevski, Ana. "It Is Never Staged: Ana Janevski on Maria Hassabi." *Fourth Wall*, September 7, 2017. Accessed January 18, 2022, online: https://walkerart.org/magazine/ana-janevski-maria-hassabi

Janevski, Ana. "The First Move is to Let the Hand Circle." In *Boris Charmatz*, edited by Ana Janevski, pp. 19-36. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 2017.

Janevski, Ana, ed. *Boris Charmatz*. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 2017.

Jaspers, Anneke. "Passing Honey Between Hands." In *Agatha Gothe-Snape: The Outcome is Certain*, edited by Hannah Mathews and Melissa Ratliff, pp. 117-28. Melbourne: Monash University Museum of Art and Perimeter Editions, 2020.

Jensen, Erik. "Notes on Yellow Paper." In *The Outcome is Certain*, edited by Hannah Mathews and Melissa Ratliff, pp. 69-80. Melbourne: Perimeter Editions and Monash University of Art, 2020.

Johnston, Jill. "Dance Journal." *The Village Voice.* July 25, (1968): p. 6.

Jones, Amelia. *Body Art: Performing the Subject*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1998.

Joseph, Branden. *Beyond the Dream Syndicate: Tony Conrad and the Arts after Cage (A "Minor" History)*. New York: Zone Books, 2011.

Jowitt, Deborah. "Beyond Description: Writing Beneath the Surface." In *Moving History /Dancing Cultures: A Dance History Reader*, edited by Ann Dils and Ann Cooper Albright, pp. 7-11. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2001.

Jowitt, Deborah. "Walking Backward in Devotion." *DanceBeat* March 2, 2012. Accessed January 1, 2019, online: https://www.artsjournal.com/dancebeat/2012/03/walking-backward-in-devotion/

Joy, Jenn. *The Choreographic*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2014.

Joy, Jenn. "Speculative Choreographies." In *The Outcome is Certain: Agatha Gothe-Snape*, edited by Hannah Mathews and Melissa Ratliff, pp. 45-56. Melbourne: Perimeter Editions & Monash Museum University Museum of Art, 2020.

King, Peter. "Body and Soul." In *The Oxford Handbook of Medieval Philosophy*, edited by John Marenbon, pp. 505-24. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Kosuth, Joseph. "After Philosophy." In *Conceptual Art*, edited by Peter Osborne, pp. 232-34. London: Phaidon Press Limited, 2002.

Kotz, Liz. "Language between Performance and Photography." *October* 111 (2005): pp. 3-21.

Kotz, Liz. *Words to Be Looked at: Language in 1960s Art*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2010.

Kourlas, Gia. "Q&A: Sarah Michelson Talks about Her Latest Premiere." *Time Out* January 16, 2014. Accessed March 22, 2019, online: https://www.timeout.com/newyork/dance/q-a-sarah-michelson-talks-about-her-latest-premiere

Kourlas, Gia. "In Reverance to the American Spirit: Early Works by Sarah Michelson." In *Sarah Michelson*, edited by David Velasco, pp. 23-31. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 2017.

Krauss, Rosalind E. *The Originality of the Avant-Garde and Other Modernist Myths*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1986.

Krauss, Rosalind. *A Voyage on the North Sea: Art in the Age of the Post-Medium Condition*. New York: Thames & Hudson, 1999.

Kroeber, Gavin, and Tom Sellar. "Economies of Experience." *Theater* 44, no. 2 (2014): pp. 125-41.

Kunst, Bojana. "Subversion and the Dancing Body: Autonomy on Display." *Performance Research: A Journal of the Performing Arts* 8, no. 2 (2003): pp. 61-68.

Kunst, Bojana. "Some Thoughts on the Labour of the Dancer." In *Post-Dance*, edited by Danjel Andersson, Mette Edvardsen, and Mårten Spångberg, pp. 116-45. Stockholm: MDT, 2017.

La Rocco, Claudia. "Time Traveller: Claudia La Rocco around the Time-Based Art Festival." *Artforum* September 30, 2010. Accessed March 5, 2022, online: https://www.artforum.com/diary/claudia-la-rocco-around-the-time-based-art-festival-26518

Laban, Rudolf von. *The Mastery of Movement*. Third edition. Boston: Play Inc., 1971 (1950).

Lacey, Jennifer. "Jennifer Lacey in Conversation with Mathieu Copeland Gare de l'Est, Paris, 16 October 2010." In *Choreographing Exhibitions*, edited by Mathieu Copeland and Julie Pellegrin, pp. 123-28. Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2013.

Lacey, Jennifer. "Artist Statement." Accessed March 29, 2019, online: https://www.foundationforcontemporaryarts.org/recipients/jennifer-lacey

Laermans, Rudi. *Moving Together: Theorizing and Making Contemporary Dance*. Amsterdam: Valiz, 2015.

Lambert, Carrie. "Moving Still: Mediating Yvonne Rainer's *Trio A*." *October* 89 (1999): pp. 87-112.

Lambert-Beatty, Carrie. *Being Watched: Yvonne Rainer and the 1960s*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2008.

Lasica, Shelley. "Writing the Past Dance Ideologies." *Writings on Dance* 2 (1987): pp. 23-26.

Lasica, Shelley. "Do You Do This Often?" *Performance Paradigm* 13 (2017): pp. 205-12.

Lasica, Shelley, Jo Lloyd, and Deanne Butterworth. "Shelley Lasica in Conversation with Jo Lloyd and Deanne Butterworth." In *How Choreography Works*. Catalogue. Melbourne: West Space, 2015, unpaginated.

Lasica, Shelley, Jo Lloyd, and Deanne Butterworth. *How Choreography Works Discussion Soundcloud*. Accessed October 16, 2017, online: https://soundcloud.com/west-space/how-choreography-works-discussion-soundcloud

Lax, Thomas, ed. *Ralph Lemon*. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 2016.

Le Clubdes5. "LE CLUBDES5, PARIS, Spring 2009." In *Everybodys Group Self-Interviews*, edited by Alice Chauchat and Mette Ingvartsen, pp. 45-59. Everybodys Publications, 2009.

Lehmann, Hans-Thies. *Postdramatic Theatre.* Translated by Karen Jurs-Munby. London; New York: Routledge (2006) (originally published in German, 1999).

Lemon, Ralph. "Sarah Michelson." *BOMB* 114 (2010): pp. 88-95. Accessed January 4, 2019, online: https://bombmagazine.org/articles/sarah-michelson/

Lemon, Ralph. *Come Home Charley Patton*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2013.

Lemon, Ralph. "The Artist's Artists." *Artforum International* 55, no. 4 (December 2016): pp. 92-96, 99-100, 103-4, 107-8, 111-12.

Lemon, Ralph. "B-Sides." In *Sarah Michelson*, edited by David Velasco, pp. 43-54. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 2017.

Lepecki, André. "Crystallisation: Unmaking American Dance by Tradition." *Dance Theatre Journal* (February 1999): pp. 26-27.

Lepecki, André. "Concept and Presence: The Contemporary European Dance Scene." In *Rethinking Dance History: A Reader*, edited by Alexandra Carter, pp. 170-81. London: Routledge, 2004.

Lepecki, André. *Exhausting Dance: Performance and the Politics of Movement*. New York and London: Routledge, 2006.

Lepecki, André. "Dramaturging: A Quasi-objective Gaze on Anti-memory [1992-98]." In *Are We Here Yet? Damaged Goods and Meg Stuart*, edited by Jeroen Peeters, pp. 64-71. Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2010.

Lepecki, André. "Zones of Resonance: Mutual Formations in Dance and the Visual Arts Since the 1960s." In *Move. Choreographing You: Art and Dance Since the 1960s*, edited by Stephanie Rosenthal, pp. 152-63. Manchester: Cornerhouse Publications, 2011.

Lepecki, André. "Moving as Thing: Choreographic Critiques of the Object." *October* 140 (Spring 2012): pp. 75-90.

Lepecki, André. "Choreopolice and Choreopolitics: Or, the Task of the Dancer." *TDR: The Drama Review* 57, no. 4 (Winter 2013): pp. 13-27.

Lepecki, André. "9 Variations on Things and Performance." In *Danse: An Anthology*, edited by Noémie Solomon, pp. 295-303. Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2014.

Lepecki, André. *Singularities: Dance in the Age of Performance*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2016.

Lepecki, André. "Dance, Choreography, and the Visual: Elements for a Contemporary Imagination." In *Is the Living Body the Last Thing Left Alive? The New Performance Turn, Its Histories and Its Institutions*, edited by Cosmin Costinas and Ana Janevski, pp. 12-19. Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2017.

Lepecki, André. "Decolonizing the Curatorial." *Theater* 47, no. 1 (2017): pp. 101-15.

Lepecki, André, and Ric Allsopp. "On Choreography." *Performance Research* 13, no. 1 (2008): pp. 1-6.

Le Roy, Frederik. "Contemporaneities. On the Entangled Now of Performance." *Documenta: Contemporaneities* 2 (2016): pp. 2-27.

Le Roy, Xavier. "Notes on Exhibition Works Involving Live Human Actions Performed in Public." In *Is the Living Body the Last Thing Left Alive? The New Performance Turn, Its Histories and Its Institutions*, edited by Cosmin Costinas and Ana Janevski, pp. 77-78. Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2017.

Le Roy, Xavier, Jonathan Burrows, and Felix Ruckert. "Meeting of Minds." *Dance Theatre Journal* 20 (2004): pp. 9-13.

Lesterlin, Hélène. "Dance and the Museum: Helene Lesterlin Responds." *Critical Correspondence* (May 5, 2014). Accessed October 13, 2022, online: https://movementresearch.org/publications/critical-correspondence/dance-and-the-museum-helene-lesterlin-responds

Levine, Abigail. "Being a Thing: The Work of Performing in the Museum." *Women & Performance: A Journal of Feminist Theory* 23, no. 2 (2013): pp. 291-303.

LeWitt, Sol. "Paragraphs on Conceptual Art." *Artforum* 5, no. 10 (1967): pp. 79-83.

LeWitt, Sol. "Sentences on Conceptual Art." First published in *0-9* #5 (January 1969), then *Art-Language* (May 1969), unpaginated.

Linder, Adam. "Life in Performance: Dressing Up, Ballet, Music Videos and Mutant Dance." *Frieze* 174 (October 2015): pp. 43-44.

Lippard, Lucy. *Six Years: The Dematerialization of the Art Object from 1966 to 1972*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997.

Lippard, Lucy, and John Chandler. "The Dematerialization of Art." In Lucy Lippard, *Changing: Essays in Art Criticism*, pp. 255-76. New York: E.P. Dutton, 1971.

Lista, Marcella. "Dance is Hard to See. Introduction." In *A Different Way to Move: Minimalismes, New York, 1960-1980*, edited by Marcella Lista, pp. 16-23. Berlin: Hatje Cantz, 2017.

Lista, Marcella. "Play Dead: Dance, Museums, and the 'Time-Based Arts.'" *Dance Research Journal* 46, no. 3 (2014): pp. 6-23.

Livet, Anne. *Contemporary Dance: An Anthology of Lectures, Interviews and Essays with Many of the Most Important Contemporary American Choreographers, Scholars and Critics*. New York: Abbeville Press, 1978.

Lloyd, Jo. "Email correspondence with Erin Brannigan, May 22, 2022."

Loichinger, Hannes, and Adam Linder. "Service in Exchange." In *Provence: Report AW 18/19*, edited by Tobias Kaspar and Hannes Loichinger, pp. 66-71. London: Spector Books.

Long, Julie-Anne. "Sometimes a Seam, Sometimes a Disconnect." *RealTime* #119, Feb-March (2014): p. 24.

Louppe, Laurence. "Singular, Moving Geographies: An Interview with Hubert Godard." *Writings on Dance: The French Issue*, no. 15 (Winter 1996): pp. 12-21.

Louppe, Laurence. *Poetics of Contemporary Dance.* Translated by Sally Gardner. Alton, Hampshire: Dance Books, 2010.

Lyotard, Jean-François. "Can Thought Go On Without A Body?" Translated by Bruce Boone and Lee Hildreth. *Discourse* 11, no. 1 (Fall-Winter 1988-89): pp. 74-87.

Maar, Kirsten. "Exhibiting Choreography." In *Assign and Arrange: Methodologies of Presentation in Art and Dance*, edited by Maren Butte, Kirsten Maar, Fiona McGovern, Marie-France Rafael, and Jörn Schafaff, pp. 93-111. Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2014.

Manchev, Boyan, Xavier Le Roy, and Franz Anton Cramer. "Dance, the Metamorphosis of the Body." In *Danse: An Anthology*, edited by Noémie Solomon, pp. 117-29. Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2014.

Mangioni, Talei Luscia. "Confronting Australian Apathy: Latai Taumoepeau and the Politics of Performance in Pacific Climate Stewardship." *The Contemporary Pacific* 33, no. 1 (2021): pp. 32-62.

Manning, Erin. *Always More Than One: Individuation's Dance*. Durham, NC and London: Duke University Press, 2013.

Manning, Erin, and Brian Massumi. *Thought in the Act: Passages in the Ecology of Experience*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014.

Manning, Susan. "Modernist Dogma and Post-Modern Rhetoric: A Response to Sally Banes' 'Terpsichore in Sneakers'." *Tulane Drama Review* 32, no. 4 (1988): pp. 32-39.

Martin, John. "Dance as a Means of Communication." In *What Is Dance?*, edited by Roger Copeland and Marshall Cohen, pp. 22–23. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.

Martin, Stewart. "The Absolute Artwork Meets the Absolute Commodity." *Radical Philosophy* 146 (2007): pp. 17–25.

Martin, Stewart. "The Subsumption of Art under Capital." In *Aesthetics and Contemporary Art*, edited by Armen Avanessian and Luke Skrebowski, pp. 146–57. Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2011.

Mathews, Hannah, ed. *Framed Movements*. Melbourne: Australian Centre for Contemporary Art, 2014.

Mathews, Hannah, and Melissa Ratliff. *Agatha Gothe-Snape: The Outcome Is Certain*. Melbourne: Monash University Museum of Art and Perimeter Editions, 2020.

McCarren, Felicia. *Dancing Machines: Choreographies of the Age of Mechanical Reproduction*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2003.

McCarren, Felicia. "The 'Symptomatic Act' Circa 1900: Hysteria, Hypnosis, Electricity, Dance." *Critical Inquiry*, no. 21 (Summer 1995): pp. 748–74.

McClure, William. "Beheaded." *The Performance Space Quarterly*, no. 14 (Winter 1997): pp. 24–26.

McCormack, Derek P. *Refrains for Moving Bodies: Experience and Experiment in Affective Spaces*. Durham, NC, and London: Duke University Press, 2013.

Melrose, Susan. "Expert-intuitive and Deliberative Processes: Struggles in (the Wording of) Creative Decision-Making in 'Dance.'" In *Contemporary Choreography: A Critical Reader*, edited by Jo Butterworth and Liesbeth Wildschut, pp. 25–40. London: Routledge, 2018.

Metcalf, Megan. "Making the Museum Dance: Simone Forti's *Huddle* (1961) and Its Acquisition by the Museum of Modern Art." *Dance Chronicle* 45, no. 1 (2022): pp. 30–56.

Michelson, Annette. "Yvonne Rainer, Part One: The Dancer and the Dance." *Artforum* January (1974): pp. 57–63.

Molesworth, Helen. "*Dance/Draw*, An Introduction." In *Dance/Draw*, edited by Helen Molesworth, pp. 11–17. Boston: Institute of Contemporary Art, 2011.

Moreno, Inés. "Opening Hours." *Dance Research Journal* 46, no. 3 (2014): pp. 77–88.

Morris, Robert. "Some Notes on the Phenomenology of Making: The Search for the Motivated." *Artforum* 8, no. 8 (April 1970): pp. 62–66.

Morse, Meredith. "Simone Forti's Huddle and Minimalist Performance." *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Art* 14, no. 1 (2014): pp. 30–41.

Morse, Meredith. *Soft is Fast: Simone Forti in the 1960s and After*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2016.

Motherwell, Robert. *The Dada Painters and Poets*. San Francisco, CA: Wittenborn Art Books, 1951.

Muecke, Stephen. "Motorcycles, Snails, Latour: Criticism without Judgment." *Cultural Studies Review* 18, no. 1 (2012): pp. 40–58.

Newhall, Mary Anne Santos. *Mary Wigman*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2008.

Newton, Rhiannon. *Doing Dancing*. Sydney: First Draft Gallery, August 2–25, 2017.

Nicely, Megan V. "Dancer Walks Away Unscathed: Or, How to Survive a Dance." *PAJ* 38, no. 3 (2016): pp. 66-76.

Nicifero, Alessandra. "OCCUPY MoMA: The (Risks and) Potentials of a Musée de la danse!" *Dance Research Journal* 46, no. 3 (December 2014): pp. 32-44.

Obrist, Hans Ulrich, and Klaus Biesenbach, "Curator's Talk." *13 Rooms*, April 11, 2013, Pier 2/3, Sydney.

Olesen, Henrik. "Pre Post: Speaking Backwards." In *Art After Conceptual Art*, edited by Sabeth Buchmann and Alexander Alberro, pp. 213-30. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2006.

Osborne, Peter. "Survey." In *Conceptual Art*, edited by Peter Osborne, pp. 12-51. London: Phaidon Press Limited, 2002.

Osborne, Peter. "Instruction, Performance, Documentation." In *Conceptual Art*, edited by Peter Osborne, pp. 197-207. London: Phaidon Press Limited, 2002.

Osborne, Peter. *Anywhere or Not at All: Philosophy of Contemporary Art*. London: Verso, 2013.

Osborne, Peter. "The Postconceptual Condition Or, the Cultural Logic of High Capitalism Today." *Radical Philosophy* 184 (Mar/Apr 2014): pp. 19-27.

Osborne, Peter. "Dialectical Ontology of Art: Xavier Le Roy's *Retrospective* in/as Contemporary Art." In *'Retrospective' by Xavier Le Roy*, edited by Bojana Cvejić, pp.103-12. Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2014.

Osborne, Peter. *The Postconceptual Condition: Critical Essays*. London: Verso, 2018.

Osborne, Peter. "Dialectical Ontology of Art: Xavier Le Roy's *Retrospective* in/as Contemporary Art." In *The Postconceptual Condition: Critical Essays*. London: Verso, 2018.

Pakes, Anna. "Can There Be A Conceptual Dance?" *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 44, no. 1 (2019): pp. 195-212.

Pakes, Anna. *Choreography Invisible: The Disappearing Work of Dance*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2020.

Palmer, Daniel. "Beside the White Cube." In *Material from Another Medium*, np. Melbourne: Centre for Contemporary Photography, 2001.

Pape, Toni, Noémie Solomon, and Alanna Thain, "Welcome to *This Situation*: Tino Sehgal's Impersonal Ethics." *Dance Research Journal* 46, no. 3 (2014): pp. 89-100.

Parkinson, Chrysa. "Reflecting on Practice." In *6 Months 1 Location (6M1L)*, edited by Mette Ingvartsen, pp. 24-33. Everybodys Publications, 2009.

Parkinson, Chrysa. "We Make up What Matters to Us." The Dancer as Agent Conference website, November 23, 2013. Accessed April 20, 2022, online: http://oralsite.be/pages/Dancer_As_Agent_About/

Pedrosa, Adriano, Julia Bryan-Wilson, and Olivia Ardui, eds. *Histórias da Dança / Histories of Dance, Vol. 1: Catalogue*. São Paulo: MASP, Museu de Arte de São Paulo Assis Chateaubriand, 2020.

Peeters, Jeroen, ed. *Are We Here Yet? Damaged Goods and Meg Stuart*. Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2010.

Peeters, Jeroen. *Through the Back: Situating Vision between Moving Bodies*. Helsinki: Theatre Academy of the University of the Arts, Helsinki, 2014.

Pellegrin, Julie. "This is not a Catalogue." In *Choreographing Exhibitions*, edited

by Mathieu Copeland and Julie Pellegrin, pp. 17–18. Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2013.

Perel, Marissa. "Gimme Shelter | Talking with Sarah Michelson about 'Devotion Study #1' at the Whitney Biennial." *Arts 21 Magazine* (April 13, 2012). Accessed March 30, 2019, online: http://magazine.art21.org/2012/04/13/gimme-shelter-talking-with-sarah-michelson-about-devotion-study-1-at-the-whitney-biennial/#.XC7r_c8zZE4

Perrin, Julie. "Loose Association: Emmanuelle Huynh and Trisha Brown." In *Danse: An Anthology*, edited by Noémie Solomon, pp. 187–202. Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2014.

Perron, Wendy. "Simone Forti: bodynatureartmovementbody." In *Radical Bodies: Anna Halprin, Simone Forti, and Yvonne Rainer in California and New York, 1955–1972*, edited by Ninotchka Bennahum, Wendy Perron, and Bruce Robertson, pp. 88–119. Santa Barbara, CA: Art, Design and Architecture Museum, 2017.

Perron, Wendy. *The Grand Union: Accidental Anarchists of Downtown Dance, 1970–1976*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2020.

Phelippeau, Mickaël, Virginie Thomas, Carole Perdereau, and Maeva Cunci, "LeClubdes5." In *Choreographing Exhibitions*, edited by Mathieu Copeland and Julie Pellegrin, pp. 181–86. Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2013.

Pincus-Witten, Robert. "Theatre of the Conceptual: Autobiography and Myth." In *Postminimalism*. London: Out of London Press, 1977.

Ploebst, Helmut. *No Wind No Word: New Choreography in the Society of the Spectacle*. Munich: K. Kieser Verlag, 2001.

Ploebst, Helmut. "A Desired Room in Grey." *Der Standard Online* November 19, (2013). Accessed April 10, 2022, online: https://www.derstandard.at/story/1381373848857/ein-wunschraum-in-grau

Pouillaude, Frédéric. "*Scène* and Contemporaneity." Translated by Noémie Solomon, *TDR: The Drama Review* 51, no. 2 (2007): pp. 124–35.

Pouillaude, Frédéric. *Unworking Choreography: The Notion of the Work in Dance*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2017.

Praznik, Katja. "What About 'Post Contemporary' Dance?" *Maska* 19, nos 84–85 (2004): p. 19.

Prynne, Jeremy. "Poetic Thought." *Textual Practice* 24, no. 4 (2010): pp. 595–606.

Rachleff, Melissa. *Inventing Downtown: Artist-Run Galleries in New York City 1952–1965*. New York: Grey Art Gallery, New York University, 2017.

Rainer, Yvonne. "Some Retrospective Notes on a Dance for 10 People and 12 Mattresses Called *Parts of Some Sextets*, Performed at the Wadsworth Atheneum, Hartford, Connecticut, and Judson Memorial Church, New York, in March, 1965." *Tulane Drama Review* 10, no. 2 (1965): pp. 168–78.

Rainer, Yvonne. *Work 1961–73*. Halifax: The Press of the Nova Scotia College of Art and Design; and New York: New York University Press, 1974.

Rainer, Yvonne. "Looking Myself in the Mouth." *October* 17 (Summer 1981), pp. 65–76.

Rainer, Yvonne. "A Quasi Survey of Some 'Minimalist' Tendencies in the Quantitatively Minimal Dance Activity Amidst the Plethora, or an Analysis of *Trio A*." In *Minimal Art: A Critical Survey*, edited by Gregory Battcock, pp. 263–73. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995 (1968).

Rainer, Yvonne. *A Woman Who . . . Essays, Interviews, Scripts*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999.

Rainer, Yvonne. "Interview by the Camera Obscura Collective." In *A Woman Who . . . Essays, Interviews, Scripts*, pp. 141–68. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999 (1976).

Rainer, Yvonne. "Some Random Ruminations on Value," MoMA. Accessed August 10, 2015, online: https://www.moma.org/d/pdfs/W1siZiIsIjIwMTUvMTAvMzAvYnlqZnJmNmRuX1lSVmFsdWVTdGFoZW1lbnQucGRmIl1d/YRValueStatement.pdf?sha=2c5003c925c62e45

Rainer, Yvonne. "Responses: 4." In *BMW TATE LIVE: If Tate Modern was Musée de la danse?* Accessed April 12, 2022, online: https://www.tate.org.uk/documents/998/if_tate_modern_musee_dela_danse_booklet.pdf

Rauschenberg, Robert. "Performance Notes—Various." Notebook, Rauschenberg Foundation Archives.

Reason, Matthew, and Dee Reynolds. *Watching Dance: Kinaesthetic Empathy (2008–2011)*. Accessed May 20, 2022, online: https://matthewreason.com/portfolio/watching-dance-kinesthetic-empathy/

Reid, Leya. "Latai Taumoepeau." NAVA interview March 30, 2021. Accessed April 4, 2022, online: https://visualarts.net.au/artist-files/2021/latai-taumoepeau/

Reynolds, Dee. *Rhythmic Subjects: Uses of Energy in the Dance of Mary Wigman, Martha Graham and Merce Cunningham*. London: Dance Books, 2007.

Reynolds, Nancy, and Malcolm McCormick. *No Fixed Points: Dance in the Twentieth Century*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2003.

Richards, Bree. "Boris Charmatz." *The Guide: 20th Biennale of Sydney*. Sydney: Biennale of Sydney, 2016, p. 245.

Robinson, Julia. "John Cage and Investiture: Unmanning the System." In *The Anarchy of Silence: John Cage and Experimental Art*, edited by Julia Robinson, pp. 54–111. Barcelona: Museu d'Art Contemporani de Barcelona, 2009.

Robinson, Julia. "From Abstraction to Model: George Brecht's Events and the Conceptual Turn in Art of the 1960s." *October* 127 (2009): pp. 77–108.

Rolnik, Suely. "The Knowing-Body Compass in Curatorial Practices." *Theater* 47, no. 1 (2017): pp. 116–36.

Rosenberg, Harold. "The American Action Painters." *Art News* 51, no. 8 (1952): pp. 22–23, 48–50.

Rosenberg, Susan. *Trisha Brown: Choreography as Visual Art*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2017.

Rosenthal, Stephanie. "Prologue: Embassy of Spirits." In *20th Biennale of Sydney: The Future is Already Here—It's Just Not Evenly Distributed*, pp. 196–97. Sydney: Biennale of Sydney, 2016.

Sabisch, Petra. *Choreographing Relations*. Munich: epodium, 2011.

Sayre, Henry M. "Chapter 3: Tracing Dance: Collaboration and the New *Gesamtkunstwerk*." In *The Object of Performance: The American Avant-Garde since 1970*, pp. 101–44. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1989.

Schmid, Christina. "Bojana Cvejić." *The Third Rail Quarterly* 11 (2017). Accessed April 7, 2021, online: http://thirdrailquarterly.org/bojana-cvejic/

Schmidt, Eva, ed. *Tanzen, Sehen*. Catalogue. Frankfurt am Main: Revolver-Archiv für Aktuelle Kunst, 2007.

Schmidt, Theron. "What Kind of Work Is This? Performance and Materialisms in the Gallery." *Performance Paradigm* 13 (2017): pp. 7–28.

Schmitz, Edgar. "Choreographic and Free Indirect Speech." Accessed October 13, 2022, online: https://art.gold.ac.uk/choreographic/?page_id=225

Seibert, Brian. "Artwork on Foot Attracts New Vantage Points." *The New York Times* (October 20, 2013): p. C3.

Seidel, Andrea Mantell. *Isadora Duncan in the Twenty-first Century*. Jefferson, NC: MacFarland, 2016.

Serra, Richard. *Verb List* (1967–68). *Avalanche* 2 (Winter 1971): p. 20.

Siegmund, Gerald. *Jérôme Bel: Dance, Theatre, and the Subject*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2017.

Skinner, Joan, Bridget Davis, Robert Davidson, Kris Wheeler, and Sally Metcalf. "Notes on the Skinner Releasing Technique." *Contact Quarterly* 5, no. 1 (1979): pp. 8–12.

Smith, Daniel W. "Translator's Introduction." In *Francis Bacon: The Logic of Sensation*, translated by Daniel W. Smith, pp. vii–xxvii. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003.

Smith, Terry. *What Is Contemporary Art?* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009.

Smith, Terry, ed. *Talking Contemporary Curating*. New York: Independent Curators International, 2015.

Smyth, Mary M. "Kinesthetic Communication in Dance." *Dance Research Journal* 16, no. 2 (1984): pp. 19–22.

Sobchack, Vivian. "Choreography for One, Two, and Three Legs (A Phenomenological Meditation in Movements)." *Topoi* 24 (2005): pp. 55–66.

Solomon, Noémie. "Introduction." In *Danse: An Anthology*, edited by Noémie Solomon, pp. 19–21. Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2014.

Solomon, Noémie. *Danse: A Catalogue*. Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2015.

Solomon, Noémie. "Choreography Unstill: Experimental Imaginaries in Boris Charamtz's *Flip Book*." In *Boris Charmatz*, edited by Ana Janevski, pp. 71–84. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 2017.

Spångberg, Mårten. "Something Like a Phenomenon." *Frakcija* 24/25 (2002): unpaginated.

Spångberg, Mårten. "Introduction." In *Post*-Dance, edited by Danjel Andersson, Mette Edvardsen, and Mårten Spångberg, pp. 18–27. Stockholm: MDT, 2017.

Spångberg, Mårten, "Post-Dance, An Advocacy." In *Post-Dance*, edited by Danjel Andersson, Mette Edvardsen, and Mårten Spångberg, pp. 349–93. Stockholm: MDT, 2017.

Stuart, Meg. "Dear Ann Hamilton." In *Are We Here Yet? Damaged Goods and Meg Stuart*, edited by Jeroen Peeters, p. 81. Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2010.

Stuart, Meg. "In Pieces." In *Are We Here Yet? Damaged Goods and Meg Stuart*, edited by Jeroen Peeters, pp. 116–25. Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2010.

Stuart, Meg. "Meeting Foreign Languages." In *Are We Here Yet? Damaged Goods and Meg Stuart*, edited by Jeroen Peeters, pp. 82–85. Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2010.

Sutherland, Zöe. "The World as Gallery: Conceptualism and Global Neo-Avant-Garde." *New Left Review* 98 (March/April 2016): pp. 81–111.

Taumoepeau, Latai. "Disaffected: Body Centered Performance and Protest." *Water Futures—05*, Arts Centre Melbourne, February 23, 2017. Accessed March 10, 2022, online: https://vimeo.com/209104881

Taumoepeau, Latai. "NIRIN Artist Interview | Latai Taumoepeau." Accessed March 20, 2022, online: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=USdCAUXbFGE

Teaiwa, Katerina. "No Distant Future: Climate Change as an Existential Threat." *Australian Foreign Affairs* 6 (2019): pp. 51–70.

Teicher, Hendel, ed. *Trisha Brown: Dance and Art in Dialogue*. Andover, MA: Addison Gallery of American Art, 2002.

Terry, Walter. "The Avant-Garde Dance Becomes Non-Dance with Rauschenberg," *New York Herald Tribune*, January 11, 1966.

Thomson, Lizzie. *Fields of Ambiguity: Inside 17th Century Closets and 21st Century Dance Practices*, unpublished PhD thesis. Sydney: University of New South Wales.

Thorne, Harry. "Maria Hassabi: Stillness is the Move." *Frieze*, 195 (2018). Accessed March 20, 2022, online: https://www.frieze.com/article/maria-hassabi-stillness-move

Todd, Mabel Elsworth. *The Thinking Body: A Study of the Balancing Forces of Dynamic Man*. Gouldsboro, ME: The Gestalt Journal Press, 2008 (1937).

Tomkins, Calvin. "Profiles: Moving Out." *New Yorker* 40, no. 2 (1964): pp. 39–105.

Trahair, Lisa. "Lisa Trahair Reviews Peter Osborne's *Anywhere or Not at All*." *Critical Inquiry* (April 30, 2015). Accessed March 26, 2019, online: https://criticalinquiry.uchicago.edu/lisa_trahair_reviews_peter_osbornes_anywhere_or_not_at_all/

Ugelvig, Jeppe. "Choreographer ADAM LINDER Dances for Hire and Disrupts Contemporary Creative Economies." *032c* (November 12, 2015). Accessed April 20, 2022, online: https://032c.com/magazine/choreographer-adam-linder-dances-for-hire-and-disrupts-contemporary-creative-economies

van Dinther, Jefta. "Changing (One's Mind)." In *6 Months 1 Location (6M1L)*, edited by Mette Ingvartsen, pp. 48–53. Everybodys Publications, 2009.

Van Imschoot, Myriam. "Rests in Pieces: On Scores, Notations and the Trace in Dance." In *Danse: An Anthology*, edited by Noémie Solomon, pp. 41–54. Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2014.

Velasco, David. "1000 Words." *Artforum International* 47, no. 9 (2009): pp. 215–16.

Velasco, David. "Motion Capture." *Artforum International* 51, no. 1 (2012): pp. 199–200.

Velasco, David. "A Room of Their Own." *Artforum International* 50, no. 9 (2012): pp. 271–79.

Velasco, David. "The Year in Dance." *Artforum International* 51, no. 4 (2012): pp. 99 and 302.

Velasco, David. "I'll Be Your Mirror." *Artforum International* 52, no. 5 (2014): pp. 170, 172–79.

Velasco, David. "Split City." In *Sarah Michelson*, edited by David Velasco, pp. 57–102. New York: MoMA Publications, 2017.

Velasco, David. "Preface." In *Sarah Michelson*, edited by David Velasco, pp. 7–9. New York: MoMA Publications, 2017.

Von Hantelmann, Dorothea. "When You Mix Something, It's Good to Know Your Ingredients: Modes of Addressing and Economies of Attention in the Visual and Performing Arts." In *How to Frame: On the Threshold of Performing and Visual Arts*, edited by Barbara Gronau, Matthias von Hartz and Carolin Hochleichter, pp. 49-53. Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2016.

Wait, Nalina. *Improvised Dance: (In)Corporeal Knowledges*. London: Routledge, 2023.

Wait, Nalina, and Erin Brannigan. "Body-States and the Site of Authority: The Emancipated Dancer." In *Oxford Handbook of Dance and Competition*, edited by Sherril Dodds, pp. 283-304. New York: Oxford University Press, 2018.

Wallin, Amelia. "Agatha Gothe-Snape at Performa 15." Accessed March 20, 2022, online: https://ameliawallin.com/Agatha-Gothe-Snape-at-Performa15

Wark, Jayne. "Conceptual Art and Feminism: Martha Rosler, Adrian Piper, Eleanor Antin, and Martha Wilson." *Woman's Art Journal* 22, no. 1 (Spring-Summer 2001): pp. 44-50.

Watts, Jonathan P., with Adam Linder. "S, s, s, s sommme p, p,p,p,proxim, im, im, ity." *un* 9, no. 2 (2015): n.p. Accessed April 20, 2022, online: https://unprojects.org.au/article/s-s-s-s-sommme-p-pppproxim-im-im-ity/

Wavelet, Christophe, Jérôme Bel, and Xavier Le Roy. "Which Body for Which Collective, Which Collective for Which Body?," translated by Melissa Thackway. In *Peripheral Vision and Collective Body*, edited by Museion Bozen/Bolzano, pp. 83-116. Bolzano: Museion, 2008.

Wavelet, Christophe, and Ana Janevski. "How to Write a Counter-History: A Conversation." In *Boris Charmatz*, edited by Ana Janevski, pp. 37-52. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 2017.

Weiner, Lawrence. *Tracce/Traces*. Torino: Sperone Editore, 1970.

Werner, Katja. "Various—Katja Werner." Accessed December 12, 2018, online: http://www.Jérômebel.fr/index.php?p=5&cid=195

Westerman, Jonah, and Catherine Wood. "From the Institution of Performance to the Performance of Institutions." In *The Methuen Drama Companion to Performance Art*, edited by Bertie Ferdman and Jovana Stokic, pp. 220-46. London: Bloomsbury, 2020.

Wigman, Mary. *The Language of Dance.* Translated by Walter Sorrell. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1966.

Wikström, Josefine. *Practices of Relations in Task-Dance and the Event-Score: A Critique of Performance*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2021.

Wood, Catherine. "The Year in Performance." *Artforum International* 54, no. 4 (2015): pp. 129-30.

Wood, Catherine. "Boris Charmatz: An Architecture of Attention (Revisited)." In *Boris Charmatz*, edited by Ana Janevski, pp. 85-96. New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 2017.

Wood, Catherine. "Interview: Catherine Wood and Boris Charmatz." In *BMW TATE LIVE: If Tate Modern was Musée de la danse?* Accessed April 12, 2022, online: https://www.tate.org.uk/documents/998/if_tate_modern_musee_de la_danse_booklet.pdf

Wookey, Sara. "Catherine Wood." In *Who Cares? Dance in the Gallery and Museum*, edited by Sara Wookey, pp. 26–35. London: Siobhan Davies Dance, 2015.

Yee, Lydia. "All Work, All Play." In *Laurie Anderson, Trisha Brown, Gordon Matta-Clark: Pioneers of the Downtown Scene New York 1970s*, edited by Lydia Yee, pp. 69–91. Munich: Prestel Verlag, 2011.

Yokel, Nathalie, and Céline Roux. "The Turn of the 90s: A New Aesthetic and Political Positioning." *Visages de la Danse* (November 30, 2011). Accessed November 14, 2018, online: https://www.journal-laterrasse.fr/hors-serie/le-virage-des-annees-90-un-nouveau-positionnement-esthetique-et-politique/

Zeplin, Pamela. "The Liquid Continent." In *Re-Imagining the City*, edited by Elizabeth Grierson and Kristen Sharp, pp. 133–52. Bristol: Intellect, 2013.

Index

Note: Page numbers in italics indicate figures.