**WRITING ABOUT CONTEMPORARY ARTISTS: CHALLENGES, PRACTICES, AND COMPLEXITIES**

*University of Surrey, 20–22 October 2017*

**DAY 1: FRIDAY 20 OCTOBER 2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:30-10:30am</td>
<td>Registration and Coffee (PATS Lower Foyer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30-11am</td>
<td><strong>Welcome</strong> (PATS Studio 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speakers: Christopher Wiley (University of Surrey), Ian Pace (City, University of London)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11am-1pm</td>
<td><strong>Parallel paper session 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constructing the Artist</strong> (TB20A)</td>
<td>Chair: Lucy Ella Rose (University of Surrey)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Dickinson (Manchester Metropolitan University), ‘Entelechy in Writing and Contemporary Art’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vered Engelhard (Columbia University), ‘Becoming the Arena: Perspectives on the Artist-Philosopher and the Question of Autonomy’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hywel Dix (Bournemouth University), ‘Career Construction Theory, Authorship and the Late-Career Stage’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elisabeth van Treeck (Ruhr University, Germany), ‘Deconstructing self-commentary: Olga Neuwirth’s compositions and writings’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uncovering ‘hidden’ lives</strong> (TB20B)</td>
<td>Chair: Tom Armstrong (University of Surrey)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jill Brown (University of Queensland), ‘Writing about ballerinas: a case study of researching two concealers’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inge Engelbrecht (Stellenbosch University, South Africa), ‘Williams, Apolles, and Ulster: Aspirants or composers in their own right?’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Federica Marsico (University of Pavia, Italy), ‘Writing about a Homosexual Contemporary Composer: The Challenges of Hans Werner Henze’s Music’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2pm</td>
<td><strong>Buffet Lunch</strong> (PATS Lower Foyer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3pm</td>
<td><strong>IAS International Keynote Address</strong> (PATS Studio 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The Artist is Present”: Ethical Liveliness and the Academic Study of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contemporary Artists’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professor Lorraine York (McMaster University)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair: Christopher Wiley (University of Surrey)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3pm-3:30pm</td>
<td><strong>Tea break</strong> (PATS Lower Foyer)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30-5pm</td>
<td><strong>Parallel paper session 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Autobiography and self-narration</strong> (TB20A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair: Björn Heile (University of Glasgow)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles Wilson (Cardiff University), ‘The autobiography in works:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Memorializing and forgetting in Hans Werner Henze’s Ein Werkverzeichnis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1946–1996’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Julija Pesic (University of Toronto), ‘The Aesthetics of Self-Narration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in the Biographical Documentary Marina Abramovic on Belgrade Culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and Her Roots (2012)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Photography and Autobiography in Howard Barker’s fictional worlds’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Meta-discourses on methodology</strong> (TB20B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair: Annika Forkert (University of Bristol)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karina Zybina (University Mozarteum Salzburg; Eliette and Herbert von</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Karajan Institute), ‘A conductor in focus: A musicological approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to Nikolaus Harnoncourt’s life and works’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Martin Dixon (University of Glasgow), ‘The Weight of Dead Generations’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(presented by Sasha Valeri Millwood)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fernando Machado Silva (Centro de Filosofia das Ciências da Universidade</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>de Lisboa [CFCUL], University of Lisbon), ‘For an art of living: On João</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fiadeiro and Fernanda Eugénio’s Question Game and AND_Lab artistic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>research project’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6:30-10pm  **Concert** (PATS Studio 1)


Nancy Ruffer, flute  
Ian Pace, piano/celeste

*Incorporating dance improvisation from student dance company  
Actual Size (University of Surrey)*
## DAY 2: SATURDAY 21 OCTOBER 2017

### 10-11am **Keynote Address** (PATS Studio Theatre)

‘From Practice to Publication: Playing in Minefields’

Professor Paul Allain (University of Kent)
Chair: Patrick Duggan (University of Surrey)

### 11-11:30am **Coffee break** (PATS Lower Foyer)

### 11:30am-1pm **Parallel paper session 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Biographical methods</strong> (TB06)</th>
<th><strong>Reciprocal relationships: The self as subject and object</strong> (TB10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair: Christopher Wiley (University of Surrey)</td>
<td>Chair: Patrick Duggan (University of Surrey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esther Cavett (King’s College London), ‘Simply Skempton: The pleasures and perils of co-creating a life in music’</td>
<td>Karen Malpede (John Jay College of Criminal Justice, City University of New York), ‘Writing about writing and being written about: Negotiating a personal (ecofeminist, pacifist) aesthetic in <em>Plays in Time</em> (2017)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc Röntsch (Stellenbosch University, South Africa), ‘Writing the untold: The Christopher James biographical project’</td>
<td>Billy Cowan (Edge Hill University), ‘Dig if U will the Picture: writing about the self or writing about Prince?’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvia M. Lazo (University of Texas, Rio Grande Valley), ‘Sounding the Boricuan Jukebox: Pueblerino Sonorities, Agency, and Style in the Works of Roberto Sierra: Reflections on Research and Writing on a Living Composer’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1-1:45pm **Buffet Lunch** (PATS Lower Foyer)

### 1:45-2:45pm **Roundtable 1** (PATS Studio 1)

‘Creative Practice as Research and Self-Reflexive Research around Practice: Equitability and parity’
Speakers: Kirk Woolford (University of Surrey), Shantel Ehrenberg (University of Surrey), Seth Josel (Orpheus Institute, Ghent), Rosalie Wahlfrid (University of Surrey), Joanne “Bob” Whalley (Plymouth University), other speakers TBC.

Chair: Ian Pace (City, University of London)

*Featuring a dance demonstration by Shantel Ehrenberg and Rosalie Wahlfrid (University of Surrey)*

### 2:45-3:10pm

**Tea break (PATS Lower Foyer)**

### 3:10-4:10pm

#### Parallel paper session 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-definition and self-reflexivity (TB06)</th>
<th>Radical paradigms for writing on artists (TB10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair: Patrick Duggan (University of Surrey)</td>
<td>Chair: tbc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majeed Mohammed Midhin and Maysaa J.A. Al-Abas (University of Essex), 'The Artist as a Character in Contemporary British Theatre’</td>
<td>Dimitris Exarchos (Goldsmiths, University of London), 'Roger Redgate’s Compositional Thinking and the Limits of Writing’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrei Sora (University of Surrey), ‘Freak Show Excess’: Steve Vai and his self-presentation in the media’</td>
<td>Ian Pace (City, University of London), ‘When Ethnography Becomes Hagiography: Uncritical Musical Perspectives’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4:15-5:15pm

**Book Launch and Wine Reception (PATS Studio Theatre)**

A wine reception and networking opportunity, hosted by the Institute of Performance (University of Surrey) will be followed by the launch of Karen Malpede, *Plays in Time: The Beekeeper’s Daughter, Prophecy, Another Life and Extreme Whether* (Intellect, 2017)

[https://www.intellectbooks.co.uk/books/view-Book,id=5275/](https://www.intellectbooks.co.uk/books/view-Book,id=5275/)
Readings from the plays with actress Alia Butt and author Karen Malpede (City University of New York), introduced by Patrick Duggan (University of Surrey), series editor of Intellect’s *Playtexts*. With Q&A session.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5:30-7pm | **Keynote Concert and Dialogue** (PATS Studio 1) by MusicArt London | Annie Yim, piano (Founder, MusicArt London)  
Christopher Le Brun, painter (President of The Royal Academy of Arts) in conversation with Christopher Wiley (University of Surrey)  
*Featuring a specially commissioned work by Richard Birchall (2015, performed in the presence of the composer) as well as music by Scriabin, Rachmaninov, Schoenberg, and Debussy.* |
| 7:15pm | **Conference Dinner** (The Weyside, Guildford) | Transport departs from outside PATS building at 7:30pm |
### DAY 3: SUNDAY 22 OCTOBER 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-11:30am</td>
<td><strong>Parallel paper session 5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Bearing witness</strong> (TB06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair: Björn Heile (University of Glasgow)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mimi Mitchell (University of Amsterdam), 'Reflections from a Subjective Interviewer: Writing about the Baroque Violin Pioneers’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kathryn S. Kelley (Texas Tech University), 'Psycholinguistic computational analysis: Artists’ writing as a regulatory mechanism’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Julia M. Ritter (Mason Gross School of the Arts, Rutgers University), 'Writing and Rendering Dance Through Fandom: The Creative Practices of Spectators Impact Analyses and Interpretations of Punchdrunk’s <em>Sleep No More</em>’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Artistic Collaborations</strong> (TB10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair: Tom Armstrong (University of Surrey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sasha Valeri Millwood (University of Glasgow; British Library, London), ‘Affirming the composer’s prerogative: case studies from Thea Musgrave’s workshops with performers’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adam J. Ledger (University of Birmingham), 'In the room: Bearing witness to theatre rehearsal and directing’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seth Josel (Orpheus Institute, Belgium) and Luk Vaes (Orpheus Institute, Belgium), ‘HIPEX and the case of <em>Salut für Caudwell</em>’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30am-12pm</td>
<td><strong>Coffee break</strong> (PATS Lower Foyer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-1pm</td>
<td><strong>Roundtable 2</strong> (PATS Studio 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘The composer’s voice in contemporary music scholarship’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Speakers: Karin de Fleyt (University of York), Christopher Leedham (Leeds College of Music), Martin Scheuregger (University of Lincoln)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chair: Martin Scheuregger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-1:45pm</td>
<td><strong>Buffet Lunch</strong> (PATS Lower Foyer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45-2:45pm</td>
<td><strong>Keynote Address</strong> (PATS Studio 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
‘Between “the disease of admiration” and the “hermeneutics of suspicion”: working on living composers and musicians’

Professor Björn Heile (University of Glasgow)
Chair: Ian Pace (City, University of London)

2:45-3:15pm  
**Tea break** (PATS Lower Foyer)

3:15-4:15pm  
**Parallel paper session 6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Modes and idioms of writing (TB06)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Demythologisation and recovering truths (TB10)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair: Lucy Ella Rose (University of Surrey) – tbc</td>
<td>Chair: Annika Forkert (University of Bristol)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attila Antal (University of Theatre and Film, Budapest), ‘The Questions of Interpretation and Context Considering the Work of András Urbán’</td>
<td>Ikuko Inoguchi (City, University of London), ‘Are We Telling the Truth?: John Cage’s Writings, Biographies, and his Created Image’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miriam Cabell (Rhode Island School of Design) and Phoebe Stubbs (Journal for Artistic Research, London), ‘Artfrom/Arton’</td>
<td>Joel Baldwin (St Hilda’s College, University of Oxford), ‘How to look good naked: undeifying contemporary composers and exposing their true identities’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4:15-5:15pm  
**Roundtable 3** (PATS Studio 1)

‘Contemporary artists, contemporary writing: Internet and social media’

Laura-Jane Foley (University of Cambridge), Ian Pace (City, University of London), Katie Beswick (University of Exeter), Björn Heile (University of Glasgow), other speakers tbc.

Chair: Christopher Wiley (University of Surrey)

5:15pm  
**Conference Close**
Abstracts (Keynotes and Roundtables)

Professor Lorraine York (McMaster University)
IAS International Keynote Speaker

“‘The Artist is Present’: Ethical Liveliness and the Academic Study of Contemporary Artists’

In this keynote paper, I will muse on this conference’s capacious subtitle, ‘Challenges, Practices, and Complexities’, from the perspective of a scholar whose career has remained steadfastly devoted to the contemporary, while meandering across genres, disciplines, borders, media. The welcome positivity of those three words reminds me that we have surpassed the conception of contemporary studies as posing difficulties, and the terms ‘challenges, practices and complexities’ invite us to think, rather, about the opportunities that the contemporary offers us: what I am going to call an ethical liveliness fostered by an engagement with the living – culture as it inhales and exhales. In so doing, I don’t mean to suggest for a minute that other historical periods and their cultural products are, by comparison, moribund, or that they somehow ask less of us, for they too call out in us a lively ethical questioning. But as my examples will, I hope, make clear, the timetable for critical response in the contemporary moment is pressing, and our responses bear immediate ramifications for others. In the first part of the paper, I will survey some of the disciplinary histories of suspicion of the contemporary, as well as what I believe are some of the best-practice methodologies modelled by thinkers whose work with the living artist or the contemporary moment has inspired me. In the second part of my paper, I share three contemporary events – crises, really, in my discipline – that moved me, even if dilatorily, to consider what the present moment in my own fields of celebrity studies and Canadian literature is asking of me. For we also need to acknowledge that this liveliness, this condition of our subjects of study being intimately proximate, can call forth painful ethical work on our part. And in turn, that pain may, if we let it, imbue our work with a visceral, close-to-the-bone political awareness.

Professor Paul Allain (University of Kent)

Keynote Speaker

‘From Practice to Publication: Playing in Minefields’

We are now all familiar with practice as research models where the student/practitioner reflects on their own process. This is hard enough: making, reflecting, writing. But what is at stake when the practice observed is initiated and led by others? What role does the academic have then? If some practitioners do actually want academics involved or engaged in their practice, to what end might this be? And who sets the terms of their involvement and subsequent publications?

This talk will reflect on how this relationship could and perhaps should work, drawing on case studies from my experience participating in and writing about Japanese and Polish theatre. As more and more scholars engage in practice in myriad modes, what are the pitfalls and challenges, and how might we avoid them? And in such processes, how far do the scholar’s responsibilities to the practice observed or engaged with extend?
Professor Björn Heile (University of Glasgow)

Keynote Speaker

‘Between “the disease of admiration” and the “hermeneutics of suspicion”: working on living composers and musicians and the problem of advocacy’

In his ‘Writing on Music or Axes to Grind: Road Rage and Musical Community’, Nicholas Cook critiques the tendency for musicology to provide advocacy. The worst culprits, according to Cook, are biographies and ‘writers on contemporary “art” music – what they [the writers] often call “new” music’. Having written a monograph on a composer of contemporary art music (with or without inverted commas), a good deal of my work falls into the intersection of all the practices Cook abhors – and I’ve even edited a book with the subtitle Essays on New Music (in which I outline why I prefer that term to seemingly neutral ones such as ‘contemporary classical music’)! What better reason, then, to test some of Cook’s ideas?

There can be little doubt that many scholars writing on living composers have been infected by the ‘lues Boswelliana’ – the disease of admiration, as Thomas Macaulay called it – and have acted as little more than spokespersons ‘explaining’ the master’s work in the latter’s own terms (the gendered language is sadly unavoidable). More recently, notably in the wake of the ‘new musicology’, a contrary tendency towards the ‘hermeneutics of suspicion’ (Ricoeur) has manifested itself, whereby composers are primarily attacked for their supposed failings. In my contribution, I will seek to outline ways in which we can foster an enlightened public discourse about new music and its creators that subjects their work to critical scrutiny while at the same time demonstrating respect for the creative achievements of gifted artists.

Martin Scheuregger (University of Lincoln, chair), Christopher Leedham (Leeds College of Music), Karin de Fleyt (University of York)

Roundtable

‘The composer’s voice in contemporary music scholarship’

This roundtable discussion brings together three scholar-practitioners engaged in contemporary music research encompassing musicology, analysis, performance and composition. Each panel member outlines a distinct but related position before coming together to discuss the place of the composer’s voice in the investigation of this music.

Martin Scheuregger presents a case for analyses that embrace approaches and understanding not apparent from the biographical details of a composer and their work, as well as considering the place of the composer’s voice in the study of their music. If a composer identifies their work as belonging to one school, for example, can we usefully apply the context of another?

Christopher Leedham presents a survey of the written elements of composition PhDs – the de facto ‘apprenticeship’ for many aspiring composers in the UK – and suggests that the ‘scholarisation’ of composition presents challenges and can create unhelpful
aesthetic expectations. Has the requirement for PhD composers to write about their own work fetishised quantifiable compositional procedures in some music?

Karin de Fleyt will discuss issues of collaboration between composer and performer in her current work. Issues of communication between performer and composer will be discussed – through notation, and the written and spoken word – and the manner in which collaborative decision making is enabled between the performer and the composer. Is a composer’s voice most honest when addressing the pragmatic realities of performance?

When writing about – as well as composing and performing – contemporary music, the voice of the composer can be seen as unquestionable or negotiable, inconsequential or essential. The different perspectives presented will establish the case for these distinct positions, leading to a discussion that attempts to establish common ground.
Abstracts (Papers)

Attila Antal (University of Theatre and Film, Budapest)

‘The Questions of Interpretation and Context Considering the Work of András Urbán’

In theatre in South-Eastern Europe, where there has not been established a tradition of high-quality video recordings of performances that would allow the interested audience to view certain productions that they could not see live, the best way to preserve and distribute theatre works is still through writing. When not writing about theatre institutions (or authors that are already ‘institutions’ in their own right), but works of contemporary artists, whose works are alive or could still be in the collective memory of a community, two questions arise: that of the interpretation and of the context. Does it help when one has a certain theoretic discourse in which to analyse an oeuvre, or does it limit the objectivity of the description and ends up in proving one’s intellectual point, rather than describing the work of a given artist? On the other hand, how does the specific position of the artist’s work in their social context determine the ways of interpretation? Through the analysis of the cycle of performances that address different levels of self-awareness of the human being, devised and directed by one the former-Yugoslavian region’s leading theatre practitioners, András Urbán, we can try to answer both of these questions. Analysing his work in the theoretical discourse of the ‘political’ in the post-dramatic theatre, we can see the advantages and the pitfalls of a specific theoretical placement. Although, Urbán is a member of the Hungarian national minority living in Serbia, and despite the fact that the majority of his works are produced in Hungarian, he is considered to be one of the leading theatre directors in Serbia. This can be a good starting point for the analysis of the influence of the specific social context in writing about his work, too.

Joel Baldwin (St Hilda’s College, University of Oxford)

‘How to look good naked: undeifying contemporary composers and exposing their true identities’

‘I think my music deserves to be considered as a whole’ – Igor Stravinsky

Well-known contemporary composers are often viewed in the light of their most popular pieces or, more generally, by their publisher’s press releases and concert promoter’s efforts to reach a wider audience through various media channels and social networks. By continually presenting a composer’s most mainstream aesthetic ideas and works, skewed personality cults are created, which are then perpetuated by evangelistic reviewers and academics who present writing that is heavy on admiration and light on musical analysis. So often, the only critical engagement with a subject’s works and related works occurs when it supports the deification, or sensationalisation, of the artist in question. Such hagiographies do not address adequately the wider musical, cultural, political, philosophical and personal circumstances surrounding today’s composers. If we fail to explore these aspects of contemporary music in a more critical and nuanced way, we will fail to accurately archive for future generations the

1 ‘Political’ in the sense of theatre’s ability to produce a simultaneous, active presence of the performers and the audience in the shared moment of the theatrical action (see e.g. Hans-Thies Lehmann’s ‘Post-dramatic Theatre’).
uniqueness of individual composers’ personal artistic development and the wider influences they have.

This paper considers how, despite some of the missing benefits of more considerable hindsight, we can meaningfully research living and recently-deceased composers and their work through writing and other more unconventional forms of discourse. Using Louis Andriessen’s and Elmer Schönberger’s monograph on Stravinsky, *The Apollonian Clockwork*, as a starting point, I turn the mirror back on Andriessen and explore the various ways in which writers can seriously engage with a popular contemporary composer; how writing critically about this living artist and analysing his music can cut through established public opinion, musicological cults and narrowly-defined associations shaped by concert promoters and publicity material. Using my own work as an example, I will also demonstrate how one can express other contemporary composers’ identities through poly-interpretable music theatre and dance that appropriates historical texts and music.

**Jill Brown (University of Queensland)**

‘Writing about ballerinas: a case study of researching two concealers’

A cast-iron rule of biography, according to the biographer Ian Hamilton, is that ‘There are revealers and there are concealers.’ Biography rests on fact and the biographer relies on accurate sources for her facts. But good sources can be hard to come by when famous subjects are alive and determined to conceal themselves. How does the biographer honour the imperative for accuracy in such circumstances? In this paper I present a case study of two great dancers—Sylvie Guillem and Misty Copeland—who conceal themselves in contrasting ways from my research efforts for a combined biography on them. I interrogate what this tells us both about their individual qualities and about shifting notions of fame in the world of classical ballet. Sylvie was always ambivalent about the attention she received when she was a dancer. Her only official biography is a 1500 word essay in a book of photographs. In the paper I show how I craft a representation of her from secondary sources: images, reviews, other biographies, program notes, documentaries and YouTube videos. I argue that sources such as interviews often allow for her unmediated voice to be heard, and a growth into maturity and humility to be traced over time. Misty provides the opposite challenge. She has professional management who develops and promotes her brand identity. There exists a sizeable corpus of sources about her including her autobiography, self-produced documentary and social media channels. Nevertheless, I argue that, paradoxically, she hides behind the self-promotion. There are no personal revelations beyond the established narrative. I describe my strategies for building a picture of her developing artistry with American Ballet Theatre, an aspect of ‘Misty Copeland’ that the well-crafted branding plays down.

**Miriam Cabell (Rhode Island School of Design) and Phoebe Stubbs (Journal for Artistic Research, London)**

‘Artfrom/Arton’

Contributors Inc. is a collaborative archive-based artistic research project with a very specific focus: What can working only with the information from the contents pages of magazines of art and culture reveal about art’s critical history and canon? We initially established the project because this information so obviously highlighted the gender
imbalance in the contributors of art magazines. After the publication of our recent project in *Cabinet* however, our remit broadened as we realized the potential of this information to communicate the shifting commercial and political concerns in art over time in relation to its limited constitution and obvious bias. While the text on these pages is freely available, our aim is to move beyond surface explorations and use this information to make visible the hidden structures of the canon. We ask: Whose concerns and editorial decisions are reflected? How often does a single reviewer write? How often does a single artist get reviewed? What shape does this give to the magazine’s references? How does this affect art’s critical archive?

For ‘Writing About Contemporary Artists: Challenges, Practices and Complexities’, we propose to present a paper called Artfrom/Arton that uses the specific case study of *Artforum*. Using its contents pages we will visualise its critics, their voices’ frequency in the magazine over time, and the breadth of artists they review. We will discuss what this information looks like as patterns, drawing out the voices and themes that have dominated the magazine and constitute its authority in the western art canon. Together we will then discuss what we can do as writers and researchers to acknowledge these structures as we work. As Andrea Fraser notes in a recent interview, ‘You can only change what is present in the here and now of your engagement with it’.

**Esther Cavett (King’s College London)**

**‘Simply Skempton: The pleasures and perils of co-creating a life in music’**

The author of this paper is editor of and contributor to a book to be published by Boydell & Brewer about contemporary composer Howard Skempton, consisting of a series of interviews of Skempton on his life, music, and teaching of composition, each followed by reflections on those interviews by different, expert contributors.

There are many examples of ‘composers in conversation’, such as those between Lutoslawski and Nikolska, Maxwell Davies and Griffiths, Cage and Kostelanetz, or Copland and Dickinson, as well as of composers writing about themselves and their music, including by Stockhausen and Tippett. This book was conceived quite innocently, against the backdrop of such studies, as an example of collaborative, reflective practice. During the course of its creation, however, I was drawn to explore not only its pleasures, but also its perils. I needed to consider, for example, whether Skempton can really give informed consent to the project when he cannot anticipate what the contributors might uncover about his history, and what happens if he inadvertently offends people to whom he refers. Further, is this book a biography, or an autobiography, or fiction of a kind, and, if so, whose: Skempton’s alone, or largely the fiction of those who write about him? What if, when the manuscript is complete, the composer were to disown the result overall, and wanted to veto publication?

I consulted the obvious sources relevant to this project, that is on (auto)biography in literary studies, broadly defined, including Eakin (on making stories from our lives) and Griffin (on interviewing and methodology), but my search expanded through sociology (for example, Oakely), pedagogy and education (Goodson, on narrative construction) and psychology (Bamburg, on narratology), to areas in which I have professional expertise, that is in musicology, law, and coaching.

The paper traces that process, as a ‘lived example’ of the challenges faced when co-creating an ethical account of a life in music.
Billy Cowan (Edge Hill University)
‘Dig if U will the Picture: writing about the self or writing about Prince?’

Earlier this year, the University of Salford called for creative writing contributions to a conference on the legacy of the pop icon, Prince. They sought work in any genre that responded to his legacy, impact and meaning through ‘re-writing, writing in response to, reminiscing, reflecting, celebrating, mourning, exploring, provoking, speculating or otherwise engaging with Prince’s influence and lasting appeal’. This paper will consist of a reading of my creative response Dig if U Will the Picture which has been selected for the subsequent anthology, Purple Reign. The piece will show how a creative writer approached the challenge; how reflecting upon a contemporary artist like Prince inspired a personal piece of writing that attempts to reveal not only aspects of the artist but aspects of the writer. Inherently, the story also raises questions about the legitimacy, relevance and truth of such a piece; does the story actually tell us anything about the artist and their work or just the writer? How do we view such a piece – fiction, non-fiction, journalism, autobiography, and how does this affect its legitimacy or relevance as cultural, historical artefact? Does the story add new knowledge to the artist’s life and work? What is the value and impact of such writing? It is hoped the story will create discussion around some of these questions and maybe inspire someone else to write about a contemporary artist from a personal viewpoint.

Robert Dickinson (Manchester Metropolitan University)
‘Entelechy in Writing and Contemporary Art’

My PhD research into the relationship between critical writing and contemporary art examines the importance of ‘entelechy’, or actualisation of potential, emerging from the complex networks connecting writers and artists. Specific relationships that have evolved between writers and artists can over a period of time continue to be creative as well as mutually beneficial, but they can also become subject to tensions and ambiguities, as my paper illustrates.

I will refer directly to, and reflect on, some of my own writing for the art press, as well as collaborative work done with artists. In particular the paper will concentrate on three contemporary artists who have engaged with the possibilities of what writing can do, and approached me to become involved in collaboration. In the case of the performance artist Agnes Nedregard, my writing about her work as a focus for laughter led to me becoming involved in the politically-oriented collaborative work, The Shield of Achilles, with the collective, Alt Gar Bra, in Bergen. The Taiwanese artist Yu-Chen Wang, by contrast, commissioned a work of fiction that led to a performance piece and a film, A Splash and a Last Drop, and later collaborations. Finally, the Greek performance artist Evangelia Basdekis has drawn forth a much looser set of pieces of writing on the artist’s evolving approaches to what she does. Slides will illustrate various verbal and visual aspects of these projects and relationships.

In each case, questions arose as to the relationship between writer and subject, as well as that between artist and writing. These questions may indicate a profound gap in understanding between writer and artist, but may also contain the key to unlock the processes of entelechy.
Hywel Dix (Bournemouth University)

‘Career Construction Theory, Authorship and the Late-Career Stage’

A particular challenge when thinking about contemporary writers is that their later works often suffer through critical comparison to their own earlier work. In many cases this has the effect that the writer in question becomes commonly associated with one or two specific works that were produced years – or even decades – earlier, in a way that hinders a positive reception of the later work. This situation raises an unanswered theoretical question about how we define the contemporary; and another about the mechanics of canonization more generally. Moreover, until recently the concept of a literary career, with certain material properties of its own, had received inadequate critical scholarly attention.

This paper argues that our thinking about these issues has the potential to be enhanced by career construction theory, a body of work jointly rooted in social psychology and fictional practice. Career constructionism employs a dialogic method for constructing a narrative trajectory of the career of a given individual through a synthesis of two distinct timeframes. One of these emphasises continuity and commonality across all the phases of a given career; the other identifies discernible stages within it and then considers the distinct properties of each. In other words, by applying career construction theory to a discussion of the late stage of certain contemporary authorial careers, the paper will construct a framework for considering what is specific to such works when compared with works produced during earlier stages, to avoid the negative comparison mentioned above. This means that while attempting to re-evaluate the critically neglected works produced during the latter career stages of certain contemporary authors, the paper simultaneously presents career construction as a new theory of authorship. It also has the potential to be applied to discussion of different career stages of artists in different media and art forms.

Martin Dixon (University of Glasgow)

‘The Weight of Dead Generations’

In this paper I will try to give the practice of ‘writing about’ something a more precise articulation. This is undertaken with a view to discerning and describing the differences between writing about living artists and writing about those who are ‘no longer with us’. The argument is as follows:

(1) The aboutness of writing, the fact that it is occupied with a subject matter and a concern, organises the economy of our attention, our ‘intuitions’, those things which are to be placed ‘in view’.

(2) Writing-about entails predication and judgement-making, and thus intuitions are provided with discursive content. I will interpret these practices in line with the terminology of Wilfrid Sellars and say that they are *entry points* into a ‘language game’. E.g. volunteering the judgements brings artists into a space of critical reasoning and evaluation. If these kinds of claims can be upheld and vindicated, we end up with knowledge.

(3) Every language game implies a ‘meta-game’, a sense of what rules govern the playing of the game, what it is to play a particular game well and successfully. These meta-games Lyotard calls *genres*.
(4) Technically speaking, the variety and internal abundance of language games is indeterminately vast, constructed as they are from multiple micrological moves. By contrast, the patterns and strategies of the genres themselves are relatively limited. We are familiar, for example, with genres of ‘criticism’ and ‘analysis’.

(5) My proposal is that the over-bearing stability of these genres, the accumulated weight of ‘dead generations’ (Marx), can be usefully disrupted by restoring a role and a voice to a living subject; a subject that answers back, that misrepresents, that forgets, that moves on.

(6) I will let my friend, the composer James Olsen, ruin the genre of apologia.

Vered Engelhard (Columbia University)

‘Becoming the Arena: Perspectives on the Artist-Philosopher and the Question of Autonomy’

In his collection of essays Art After Philosophy, Joseph Kosuth referred to his practice as a ‘total signifying activity’. Referring to one’s own practice as a ‘total signifying activity’ presupposes agency at a very particular place of tension; where the individual is in charge of expression in so far as he/she contains the signified. This tension is fully expressed in a movement towards the isolation of the subject; in this version of practice, all artistic objects are like phantom limbs, body – living labor and dead labor – as a ‘total signifying activity’; essentially, body as constellation.

Autonomy of practice is a well-known ethos in the history of art. It is often characterized as a battle of agencies, where the aim is to own as many rules as possible; the strategy is to anticipate these rules before they happen, to always be at the front of the platoon. The strange tension that this statement brings can also be informed by Kosuth’s own involvement with early Conceptual Art. Their version of autonomy of practice is contingent in a conceptual containment of the rules by which their practice operates. More specifically, autonomy of practice is reached not by a conceptual sheltering of expression (which would be ‘ideological’) but rather an elemental correspondence between expression and the structure of consciousness.

Conceived in this way, the business of art starts sounding a lot like metaphysics. And we would, in fact, need a conception of the structure of consciousness in order for our practice to function as a ‘total signifying activity’. I want to look at Adrian Piper’s practice through this relationship between art and philosophy. Understand how, over the years, she has reached a very particular kind of correspondence. Which I believe that, currently, is contingent both on her status as a minoritarian subject and on her relationship to the philosophical work of Immanuel Kant. As a philosopher, she has written extensively on Kant, particularly in the second volume of her two-volume series, Rationality and Constructions of the Self, subtitled A Kantian Conception. I want to argue that her artistic work, when regarding this book, takes her reading of the Kantian self as a matrix, of which functions, operate as her criteria for performance. I want to trace the steps of this specific relationship as something developing over time, and perhaps inquire into the deeper concerns regarding the relation of art to philosophy in the general form. With the increasing prominence of the ‘artist-philosopher’ in contemporary art theoretical discourse, Piper stands as an avant-
garde; hence, I believe that a proper understanding of her practice will enable us to look at this contemporary phenomenon in a more systematic light.

Inge Engelbrecht (Stellenbosch University, South Africa)
‘Williams, Apolles, and Ulster: Aspirants or composers in their own right?’

Sacks Williams, Dan Apolles and Dan Ulster have been hailed and celebrated as composers by their respective Cape communities, but have never been acknowledged as such by the broader Western art music establishment in South Africa. Classified by the apartheid government as ‘coloured’, Williams, Apolles and Ulster were effectively placed on the periphery of South Africa’s apartheid centre, a centre that included the practice of the Western art music traditions. Despite severe political proscriptions, these musicians composed original works in a style associated with an establishment from which they had been excluded, but to which they nevertheless felt themselves drawn.

This paper probes several challenges and complexities I encountered in writing about the life and works of these musicians. Firstly, as a person who comes from a comparable background (art musician and coloured woman) but two generations after Williams, Apolles and Ulster, I found myself traversing certain boundaries erected by the establishment that denied these musicians access but welcomed me into its traditions in ways that was not possible for Apolles, Ulster and Williams. Secondly, the challenge of writing their lives, recognising that it cannot be disentangled from the political context in which it played out. And lastly, the issue of language. I chose Afrikaans, the first language of the musicians, as the language of their biographies. However, as the work started to debate critical perspectives, I shifted to my academic language, English – a switch that again excluded these musicians.

The lives and music of Williams, Apolles and Ulster bring a unique and important nuance to the established musical narrative of South Africa and abroad.

Dimitris Exarchos (Goldsmiths, University of London)
‘Roger Redgate’s Compositional Thinking and the Limits of Writing’

Since philosophy’s linguistic turn, the concept of writing has met a post-structuralist manifestation and has been associated to absence and death, as opposed to the living presence of logos. Crucially, writing was shown to precede speech/logos, thus undermining the latter’s sovereignty. This generalized sense of writing indexes any kind of inscription and operates on the limits of representation, of language and of thought (Jean-Luc Nancy). Thus, there is no direct correlation between concept and sign, and meaning is in constant flux. Meanwhile, academic practice underwent profound impact from new musicology’s deconstruction of writing about dead-white-male composers’ work, usually conceived as a corpus of exemplary masterpieces. Recent musicological work has largely developed themes suggested by

---

2 The term ‘coloured’ may be derogatory in other countries, in apartheid South Africa it denoted an ethnic group of mixed race and is still in use in South Africa today.
ethnomusicological practices and sound studies; an upshot of this is a certain neglect of music composition and the musical ‘work’.

This paper aims at examining a certain kind of composition which implicates writing, in the form of music notation, as integral part of its process and of its work. Such approach is exemplified in the music of currently active composer Roger Redgate, whose work explores such considerations and creatively questions the limits of notation. As a tracing of instrumental technique, notating is relatively removed from the sounding of the work, which raises ontological and performative issues. Writing around such themes puts in question the limits of musicological writing itself. To the extent that writing is a vehicle of critical deconstruction, what limits may be imposed by the presence of the composer? Further, how does the deconstructive is animated with regard to practice already assumed to have internalized such function? This paper will attempt to activate the registers of writing with regard to Redgate’s work, with reference to the practices of composition, notation, and improvisation.

Ikuko Inoguchi (City, University of London)

‘Are We Telling the Truth?: John Cage’s Writings, Biographies, and his Created Image’

Contemporary, avant-garde composers often write about their compositional techniques and musical works, or discuss their sources of inspiration at interviews. These provide useful, valuable information to biographers, practitioners, and scholars, clarifying the composer’s creative process, new concepts and approaches to music. However, are artists always telling us the truth? We often quote the composer’s words in an article or a programme note to inform the reader or the audience their intentions and the meaning of their musical work. But by doing so, are we giving ‘correct’ information to them?

John Cage (1912–92) is one of the most prominent 20th-century composers. His most famous yet controversial work is 4’33”, widely known as the ‘silent’ piece; he is also recognized for his use of chance operations and association with Zen, both of which are frequently discussed in his books and interviews, e.g., Silence (1961) and For the Birds: in conversation with Daniel Charles (1981). Biographers and scholars regard Cage’s attendance at Daisetz Suzuki’s lecture on Zen as one of the most significant events, and often quote Cage’s keywords ‘interpenetration’ and ‘unimpededness’ to explain the compositional process of Music of Changes (1951). The composer claims that in this work the chance operations were adopted to eliminate his own taste; my analysis of Seven Haiku (1952) suggests a possibility that he manipulated the results of the chance operations. Similarly, my study of Suzuki’s transcript of his lecture shows that the two keywords derive from Kegon, and Cage’s writings pose a question if he was aware of this but manipulated information for self-promotion. I will discuss how Cage’s image as an advocator of Zen has been created by his writings and interviews as well as by other writers who repeatedly quoted his text.
Seth Josel (Orpheus Institute, Belgium) and Luk Vaes (Orpheus Institute, Belgium)

‘HIPEX and the case of Salut für Caudwell’

Performing contemporary music is logically assumed to entail working with the composers. It is naturally assumed that this relationship is straightforward.

Even though contemporary is often thought to be of the ‘now’, with the composers still living, the knowledge the performer seeks to find in the interaction with them is not necessarily satisfactory.

HIPEX is a research project at the Orpheus Institute, established to investigate historical performance practices of experimental music. Strands include live electronics from the 1960s, unfinished pieces by Mauricio Kagel, and iconic works for solo instruments. Composers and historical performers are consulted in order to negotiate the issues of a transhistorical performance.

This presentation will focus on Helmut Lachenmann’s Salut für Caudwell (1977). This monumental work for two guitars is not only known for its radical treatment—sonic and physical—of the instrument, but also for its striking setting of a text by the English Marxist, Christopher Caudwell.

There are currently four sets of materials for Salut, two of which have been published. Extensive research has revealed a myriad of discrepancies between the ‘corrected’ autograph, the manuscript edition, and the print edition. For the moment, Lachenmann, who is now 81, is hesitant to revisit the score and sort out the issues which we have meticulously and extensively catalogued.

The guitar duo for whom the piece was composed has given well over 100 performances of the work. They played exclusively from the original manuscript and are unaware of the magnitude of the issues that exist that remain for subsequent performers. Both players have a fundamentally different approach towards critical inquiry and towards the relationship to the composer. One player has been available for consultation, the other less so.

Through the use of select examples from the materials available to us, we shall highlight performativ and interpersonal challenges.

Kathryn S. Kelley (Texas Tech University)

‘Psycholinguistic computational analysis: Artists’ writing as a regulatory mechanism’

There is a trend that visual artists—benders of conventions archived into contemporary art historical and critical texts—have robust expressive and critical writing practices. This trend occurs across time, mediums and movements. Why are these makers of things, twisters of conventions, compelled to write? Is the textual practice a latent mechanism involved in creativity? What is the act of writing doing for the artist that so many engage the practice?

In ‘Giving an Account of Oneself’, Judith Butler suggests that ‘for urgent reasons, we must become self-narrating beings’ particularly when there is a perceived breach in conventions of doing or being (2008). Social psychologist, James Pennebaker has found through experimental writing manipulations that patterns of expressive narrative construction, meaning making, and perspective-taking that target stressful
experiences, or value affirmation predicts reductions in intensity and duration of dysphoric internal experiences. These same text-based narrative processes appear to regulate physiological, psychological and cognitive resources. Further, psychological creativity studies correlate the capacity to regulate internal resources as a possible facilitating mechanism in creative achievement. Following Pennebaker’s methods for analyzing expressive writing texts, I employed Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC) computational software to examine relevant psycholinguistic inter-subject cues of narrative construction, meaning making, and perspective-taking in 1,465 texts written by 200 contemporary visual artists. Based on Butler’s ‘urgent reasons’, regulatory mechanisms’ potential roles in creativity, and Pennebaker’s findings, the preliminary results appear to support the possibility that artists’ writing practices may afford them a mechanism for up- and down-regulating affective, psychological and cognitive resources in ways likely to support their creative practice.

This paper follows my initial foray into the possibilities and pitfalls of using text analysis in examining inter-subject patterns amongst artists and their writings. It investigates artists and their textual practice as an amalgamation of numeric frequencies.

**Silvia M. Lazo (University of Texas, Rio Grande Valley)**

‘**Sounding the Boricuan Jukebox: Pueblerino Sonorities, Agency, and Style in the Works of Roberto Sierra: Reflections on Research and Writing on a Living Composer**’

The writing of biographies of living composers presents particular challenges and benefits to musicologists. In this paper, I summarize insights found in academic literature, as well as reflections from my own experience while researching and writing on Puerto Rican composer Roberto Sierra (b. 1953). Planned as an introduction to a critical biography tentatively entitled *Sounding the Boricuan Jukebox: Pueblerino Sonorities, Agency, and Style in the Works of Roberto Sierra*, I map the advancement of my project from its original conception, development, and methodology, to concluding themes and book structure.

Living composers can provide invaluable insights to the musicological record. Skepticism aside, research on living composers can lead to significant payoffs: unhindered access to personal archives, recording how a composer theorizes about his/her life, detailed notes on musical works, direct observation of premieres and reception, and the filling of musicological gaps in textbooks and academic literature related to various countries.

Composer Ana Lara (b.1959) once lamented the lack of musicological interest in the classical music of today’s Mexico, as evidenced by an unbalanced focus on nationalist composers of the past (‘What Makes Latin American Music ‘Latin’? Some Personal Reflections’, Walter Clark, 2009). Thus, I engage my materials with contemporary issues which may serve as a guide for other musicologists seeking to write on living composers. Additionally, as an Introduction to a book, I aim to guide readers thru the biographical process and provide evaluative considerations on the final product. While no claim is made as to a final biography on Roberto Sierra – by nature, the writing on a living composer is a ‘work-in-progress’ – my book covers a broad swath of biographical data, compositions, and analysis that may prove useful for textbooks and future research.
Adam J. Ledger (University of Birmingham)

‘In the room: Bearing witness to theatre rehearsal and directing’

Writing from within a rare opportunity to follow a complete rehearsal period, Gay McAuley begins by identifying the academic ‘reluctance to engage seriously with rehearsal practice’. Whilst this suggests an academic tendency to deal finitely with performance, it also concerns, practically, the difficulty of gaining access to the rehearsal room, how it may be possible to stay there and, once outside, what languages to employ in order to write about what has taken place.

Over recent years, I have had both the pleasure of being allowed ‘in the room’ with several directors, including Carrie Cracknell, Kathryn Hunter, Katie Mitchell, Ivo van Hove and Eugenio Barba, experiences I draw on here, but also the frustration of being denied access by others.

Recently, Paul Allain has suggested that, ‘if one does have privileged access to such [rehearsal] processes, it might be “indecent” to say nothing’, yet foregrounds issues of access and authorship (I suggest I have encountered something of a range). Positionality is thus vital: McAuley, borrowing from ethnography, suggests she is a ‘participant-observer’; in relation to his collaboration with Thomas Ostermeier, Peter Boenisch suggests he is ‘practice-relevant’. Here, I suggest I have become a ‘participant-witness’. This position is thus also a transition, a Janus-like stance in order both to be in the room and to bear witness, whilst acknowledging choices and sometimes strategic observational blinkers as a means to ‘engage seriously’. I include, too, some examples of the (potentially institutionally problematic) forms of writing a close encounter with creative processes might encourage.

Karen Malpede (John Jay College of Criminal Justice, City University of New York)

‘Writing about writing and being written about: Negotiating a personal (ecofeminist, pacifist) aesthetic in Plays in Time (2017)’

I am lead author of Plays in Time: The Beekeeper’s Daughter, Prophecy, Another Life, Extreme Whether (Intellect, October 2017), an anthology that includes essays by three literary critics, one political writer and two artists, plus an essay I authored about the ecofeminist, pacifist, poetic and ritual strategies I employ.

These four plays are differently radical in content and form. Each is about a compelling contemporary social issue: Traumas of sexual abuse and mass rape, set during the Bosnian war; intertwining legacies of the Vietnam, Iraq; Israeli-Lebanon wars; 9/11 and the US torture program; the struggle between American climate scientists and climate change deniers. I have directed the plays as well. Prophecy and Another Life

---

5 McAuley, op. cit., p.2.
6 Peter Boenisch, The Theatre of Thomas Ostermeier, 2016, p.91.
I have been written about badly and well. I have been critically lacerated and critically praised. The critical essays in this book are, of course, laudatory. Because I was trained as a literary critic, I have often written about my own work, as well as the work of other living, and dead, writers, in two books People’s Theater and Women in Theater: Compassion and Hope, and numerous essays (NY Times, TDR, New Theatre Quarterly, Kenyon Review, etc.).

I propose to discuss the strangeness of attempting to articulate and advance a radically personal aesthetic (something artists used to do much more frequently) while negotiating between career halting damnation and well-articulated praise. I will talk about research, collaborations with activists, lawyers, scientists, refugees and trauma specialists and influences from theater history. I will describe the search for a language and structure different for every play that might reveal and penetrate violent realities of the Anthropocene while dramatizing processes of grieving, healing, forgiveness, biophilia and resistance.

**Federica Marsico (University of Pavia, Italy)**

‘Writing about a Homosexual Contemporary Composer: The Challenges of Hans Werner Henze’s Music’

Hans Werner Henze (1926–2012) was one of the most prolific and successful German composers of the second half of the twentieth century. In the late forties he was among the first participants in the Darmstadt summer courses, which became in the following years the world-leading centre of avant-garde music. Since the sixties, however, he entered upon a personal artistic course that was often in friction with the most experimental and radical choices of contemporary music.

Academic research on Henze's music started in Germany in the late eighties (Peter Petersen, Hans Werner Henze, ein politischer Musiker: zwölf Vorlesungen, Hamburg 1988). In the following years it overstepped the national boundaries, giving life to numerous musicological studies that focus on various aspects of Henze’s artistic production.

Although Henze’s works have captured the interest of many researchers, his homosexuality was considered sporadically by scholars as a hermeneutic category to read his music. Henze’s catalogue is full of works that can be interpreted from a queer point of view. Especially in his numerous theatrical works homosexuality never finds expression explicitly on stage, but often is represented through a cryptographic language that needs to be caught and understood by scholars.

This paper shows the challenges for studying the works of a contemporary homosexual composer from a queer perspective, as well as the difficulties for the scholars to implement this approach. It can make an important contribution both to the more general knowledge of the expression of homosexuality in the contemporary music and to the definition of a queer musical aesthetics of our age through a dialogue with other disciplines.
Majeed Mohammed Midhin and Maysaa J.A. Al-Abas (University of Essex)
‘The Artist as a Character in Contemporary British Theatre’

The focus of this paper is the representation of the artist as a character in British theatre. Accordingly, I attempt to show that British playwrights, whether male or female, use their main fictional characters as artists either for self-reflexivity or to comment on the situation of being an artist. In accordance with the above premise, the responsibility of the artist and the function of art is investigated with due reference to radical thinkers, philosophers and writers such as, among others, Immanuel Kant, Oscar Wilde, Georg Lukács, Antonio Gramsci, Walter Benjamin, Viktor Shklovsky, Bertolt Brecht and Jean-Paul Sartre. This investigation concentrates on the conceptualization and contribution of those intellectuals to the definition of the role of the artist.

The present paper poses the following questions: as a fictional character, how can the artist function as a member of a certain community whilst at the same time retain the distinctiveness of his or her role as an outsider? Is he or she committed to the creative work or to the social usefulness of society? If so, can we expect art or the artist to have the answer to society’s problems? Or is that an overly high expectation to place on the artist? How did artists feel living in a society under censorship? How can they avoid being censored? And if they failed, what is the price of free expression?

Springing from the discussion about the dilemmas of the artist in British theatre, it will become apparent how these dilemmas, represented by fictional characters, bring forth the dominant plays about artists. Within the framework of the British playwrights such as Tom Stoppard, Howard Barker and Timberlake Wertenbaker, it is demonstrated that the pressing dilemma which radical artists are faced with nowadays are multiple: social, commercial and political.

Sasha Valeri Millwood (University of Glasgow; British Library, London)
‘Affirming the composer’s prerogative: case studies from Thea Musgrave’s workshops with performers’

Discourses on the role of specified individual performers in the creative process of composers range from those which completely disregard it to those which treat it as commensurate with co-authorship. Where a composer is writing for a particular performer, there may be a process of consultation, termed workshopping, whereby the performer is afforded a means of direct influence. This possibility is wont to being characterised as a form of empowerment which yields a substantive collaboration between composer and performer. However, such a characterisation is liable to overlook not only the differences in role, but also disparities in power, which are manifested in constraints to the scope afforded to a performer to propose ideas or amend material at a given juncture in the compositional process.
This paper will examine two case studies from Thea Musgrave’s compositional output in which tensions arising from these constraints are documented in archival sources. These tensions sometimes invite the dialectical question as to whether composing for individuals were inherently antagonistic to aspirations to secure canonic status.

In *Postcards from Spain*, a set of miniatures for solo guitar, a profuse correspondence between Musgrave and the guitarist, Michael Lorimer, demonstrates a receptiveness on Musgrave’s part to remarks about technique, but only limited flexibility regarding creative input once the score had been drafted.

In *Lamenting with Ariadne*, an instrumental work commissioned by the Birmingham Contemporary Music Group, a public workshop furnishes a semblance of consultation and publicity, yet, when it comes to the proof stage of editing the score, disagreements emerge between Musgrave’s and performers’ preferences for fingering and layout.

Through a contextualisation of the sources for these case studies, this paper will reflect on the epistemological challenges of reconstructing creative processes, with reference to the relationships between archival sources, official narratives, and the living protagonists, especially Musgrave herself.

Mimi Mitchell (University of Amsterdam)

‘Reflections from a Subjective Interviewer: Writing about the Baroque Violin Pioneers’

Deciding to interview and write about the pioneers of my own field sounded like an exciting and fairly easy task, since I was already very aware of these musicians and their accomplishments. The reality was a double-edged experience, and I will be examining both the positive and negative sides of my ‘insider’ status in this paper.

The Baroque violin pioneers, all born between 1925 and 1947, welcomed me into their homes and their workplaces. They all seemed delighted that one of their own was interested in hearing their stories and were surprisingly candid in answering the more difficult questions I posed. Able to discuss the musical and technical sides of the profession as well as being truly interested and impressed by their achievements, I was able to negotiate this side of the interviewing process with ease.

There was also a shadow side. Artists of a pioneering generation are very invested in their artistic legacy and pioneer status, and my interviewees were no exception. Confronted with oft-repeated stories and well-ingrained phrases, I had to work hard to try and discover the reality behind the facade. These musicians also had their preconceived ideas about me, and I occasionally felt like a captured insect pinned onto the examination table squirming to escape.

Writing about one’s own field became, to my surprise, an exercise in self-reflection. It was impossible to divorce my own background and musical preferences when speaking to these important and influential figures. I was not an impartial academician, nor could I pretend to be. Was it possible to present this important material in an honest and unbiased way?
Ian Pace (City, University of London)
‘When Ethnography Becomes Hagiography: Uncritical Musical Perspectives’

Ethnomusicologists have employed ethnographic techniques for much of the history of their discipline, drawing upon experiences and methodological considerations found in the fields of anthropology and sociology. Since the late 1980s there have been a range of studies – from scholars working in a variety of disciplinary fields – applying such techniques to the study of forms of Western music-making, whether folk, popular, art or otherwise. While some of the key early texts of this type involved highly critical perspectives upon their object of study, more recently, another group of scholars have presented a quite different attitude and concomitant approach. This not only eschews musical value judgement (as advocated by various ethnomusicologists) but also pointedly refuses to develop a sceptical or critical perspective towards many statements from artists collected through the ethnographic process. Often the ethnographer sees their role as ‘allowing the artist to speak for themselves’ and prefers description and cataloguing to analysis. Furthermore, such work often deliberately avoids engagement with types of knowledge or perspectives found in various other musicological sub-disciplines. I argue here that this approach entails a type of transposition of attitudes derived from post-colonial guilt into non-colonial fields of study, and as such are very problematic in the latter context. I also argue that such approaches and methods can frustrate attempts to differentiate scholarly writing on one hand and journalism, bureaucratic reports, or even promotional literature on the other, other than in terms of the liberal employment of certain jargon, and that some work identified as the product of ethnographic study essentially reiterate much older types of musical writing. With these considerations in mind, I propose some ways by which there can be a more productive dialogue between musical ethnography and other strategies for writing about living musicians.

Julija Pesic (University of Toronto)
‘The Aesthetics of Self-Narration in the Biographical Documentary Marina Abramovic on Belgrade Culture and Her Roots (2012)’

‘The Aesthetics of Self-Narration in the Biographical Documentary Marina Abramovic on Belgrade Culture and Her Roots (2012)’ is my research project in which I explore how the cinematic techniques construct the personal and artistic identity of Belgrade-born New York-based performance artist Marina Abramovic, known for her record-breaking 2010 MoMA retrospective. Primary research includes the short biographical documentary film Marina Abramovic on Belgrade Culture and Her Roots (2012) in which two filmmakers, Matthew Akers and Jeffrey Dupre, alternate sequences related to Abramovic’s past and present, her Belgrade’s childhood and current artistic career, in order to rethink what characterizes biographical documentary as a film genre; in other words, how subjective and objective points of view in the documentary film as a visual medium create distinction and/or an overlap between Abramovic’s ‘I’ and ‘others’. Since there are different perspectives in the narrative structure of this film, my project is also interested in how these different types of narrative influence the dynamics between Abramovic-the-artist and Abramovic-the-image. Specifically, the documentary is organized as a processed biographical journey in which Marina Abramovic, who appears in the film as its main character, narrates three key points that act to determine her personal life and artistic
opus: childhood, her relationship with her mother and her mother’s death. The linearity of life is being realized through a cyclic process of childhood, youth, and death, which corresponds directly to the three main thematic determinants of narration in the structure of the film (Abramović’s childhood, youth and mother’s death).

Performance studies’ theoretical frameworks, cultural anthropology, and cultural theory frameworks, inform my research. Thus, I am interested in the intersectionality of visual aesthetics and the embodied self, including but not limited to the questions of authorship, authenticity, subjectivity, and memory work.

Julia M. Ritter (Mason Gross School of the Arts, Rutgers University)

‘Writing and Rendering Dance Through Fandom: The Creative Practices of Spectators Impact Analyses and Interpretations of Punchdrunk’s Sleep No More’

Since its premiere in 2011, an international fan community (fandom) has formed around Sleep No More (SNM), the UK-based Punchdrunk’s long-running immersive production in New York City, and expanded with the opening of SNM in Shanghai in 2016. After encountering the highly sensory, nonverbal, and choreographic performances, fans reflect upon their embodied experiences of participatory engagement and transform them into writings and art that are shared on social media platforms, specifically Tumblr blogs. Investigation of these blogs provides evidence of how fans write about and render dance and the performances of dancers through fan fiction, digital painting, illustration, and collage. As a dance scholar researching choreographer Maxine Doyle and the dancers of SNM, the discovery of the fandom and the breadth of its creative output consequentially shifted my strategies of writing about contemporary artists. By approaching the writing and art of fans as primary source materials, my analyses of choreography become more prismatic and my descriptive writing more nuanced. In addition, the work of fans challenges assumptions and shifts perceptions about who is writing about contemporary artists and how this writing is shared. Drawing upon interviews with artists and fans, this paper demonstrates how the fan-driven creativity materializing within the public sphere of the Internet is contributing to analyses and interpretations of performance. Fan-generated works emerge from a particular kind of perceptual framework that immersive choreography evokes in its spectators, one that impels fans to produce creative research in order to share knowledge and artistry. The productivity of fans suggests that the realms of critical and theoretical studies of and writing about performance – traditionally occupied by critics and scholars – are now shared with spectators, whose examinations of performance are reflected in the cultural products posted on their blogs, constituting new forms of writing and discursive practices in and of themselves.

Marc Röntsch (Stellenbosch University, South Africa)

‘Writing the untold: The Christopher James biographical project’

The Christopher James Collection in the Documentation Centre for Music (DOMUS) at Stellenbosch University, South Africa, consists of over 100 boxes containing material ranging from hand-written manuscript scores, personal correspondences and diary entries. James was born in Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe), and studied composition
at the University of Pretoria before doing a Doctorate of Musical Arts (DMA) at the University of Cincinnati on a Fulbright bursary. As a composer, James’s style conflated traditional European musical textures with southern African instrumentation, rhythms and harmonies. His compositions include works such as Four Portraits for Pianforte in Four Movements (1982), Songs of Lamentation and Remonstration (1985), Images of Africa (1987) and Paradise Regained (1999).

Because few performers or musicologists have engaged with James’s life or oeuvre, the archive became the main source of information in writing the untold story of James’s life. This paper has been conceptualized and written in the final stages of my doctoral dissertation on James, which focused not only on the creation of a narrative of James’s life, but also on engaging with both his compositional output and the ‘life and works’ paradigm by critically reading James’s works through the lens of his life as read through the archive. The focus of this paper is to reflect critically on this process by referring to the similarities and interactions between archival and biographical theory and speaking to mechanisms for sensitively discussing and engaging with the mythology surrounding composers with mental illness.

Fernando Machado Silva (Centro de Filosofia das Ciências da Universidade de Lisboa [CFCUL], University of Lisbon)

‘For an art of living: On João Fiadeiro and Fernanda Eugénio’s Question Game and AND_Lab artistic research project’

A new book on the Body and Portuguese Artists is soon to be published by a British publishing house. Why is this relevant? Not only does the book address the topic of the present conference, but more importantly it points to the need to frame the change undergone on performative arts since the Portuguese revolution last century. Being one of the participants of this book, our intention is twofold. On one hand, to be an ‘ambassador’ of a long-awaited project on Portuguese performance arts, both nationally and internationally; and, on the other hand, by developing further our chapter analysis, to present one of the most innovative and challenging Portuguese choreographers, João Fiadeiro (1965). Our paper will centre on the project the choreographer created with the anthropologist Fernanda Eugénio, the AND_Lab, as well as one of their research instruments, the ‘Question Game’.

Their practice deals with two problems: how to live together and how to not have an idea. By underlining Deleuze’s silent presence one finds throughout the texts – such as event, in-between, rhythms, starting from the middle, etc. – we will highlight their proposal of aiming at life itself or bringing the impersonality of immanent life to performance. What can be immediately said about their research is that what matters is nothing other than the process, the questioning and requestioning of what is being done, what is happening, and that can be summed up by their main concern: how to live together? Hence, this is a project in which the artistic and social aspects are diluted to give life to a meeting between participants, and where what is at stake is the ability to manage to live sustainably. Although not new, this attentional movement from art to everyday life is seen from a different perspective in this text.
Andy W. Smith (Independent Scholar)

“‘Being-within-itself’: Photography and Autobiography in Howard Barker’s fictional worlds’

'I photograph what I do not wish to paint and I paint what I cannot photograph’

– Man Ray quoted in Sontag, On Photography, p.186

Howard Barker is well known as a dramatist, poet and artistic director of his theatre company The Wrestling School. Less well known is his work as a visual artist, designer and scenographer, using a variety of fictional characters replete with imaginary biographies whose work would become emblematic of the aesthetic style of the company.

The purpose of this paper is to put forward a fourth, vital element of Barker’s art practice to go alongside theatre, poetry and painting: his photographic work for The Wrestling School. The development of Barker’s photographic practice is further complicated by the creation of an alter-ego through which the work is constructed: Eduardo Houth, the identity through whom Barker has also written his autobiography in the third person, A Style And Its Origins (2007). Barker addresses the complexities of self-authored narratives through the voice of Eduardo Houth; as Lynda Haverty Rugg writes, ‘Autobiography, like photography, refers to something beyond itself; namely the autobiographical or photographed subject. But both autobiography and photography participate in a series of signs that we have learned to read – at one level – as highly interdeterminate and unreliable’.

Barker’s use of Houth as his authorial voice allows for a certain distancing effect in A Style And Its Origins, and this paper will explore how Barker’s development of Houth as his alter ego and the self-portrait in A Style And Its Origins is another way of capturing the past, using his photographer alter-ego to imprint images of his subjective experiences through language. This paper will also focus on Barker’s creative practice as a photographer through a close reading of his images, from original prints provided by Barker himself.

Andrei Sora (University of Surrey)

“‘Freak Show Excess”: Steve Vai and his self-presentation in the media’

This paper draws on research from sociology, psychology, media studies, and musicology in order to uncover the complex relationship between musical expression, artist discourse, and personae. It focuses on the way Steve Vai, one of the most renowned and influential modern electric guitar players, presents himself and his music to the media. Vai himself admits that his relationship with the press is a calculated one, divulging that he is aware of what journalists write about him as a person, as a guitarist, and as an entertainer. In light of this insight, his demeanour in the press could be understood as an extension of his stage persona, in the sense that even interactions with the press involve a performance.

I analyse dozens of video and print interviews that span the almost three decades of Vai’s career as a solo musician in an attempt to trace patterns, changes, and contradictions in his views on his music and artistry. Musical analyses of key tracks from his catalogue will be contrasted with Vai’s statements on the same pieces, as well

as with general statements on expressivity, interpretation, and meaning. This is not to assume intentionality, but rather to ask what sort of gap there is between how Vai sees himself and presents himself as a music maker, whether or not he sees music as self-expressive, or as involving a constructed persona.

Elisabeth van Treeck (Ruhr University, Germany)

‘Deconstructing self-commentary: Olga Neuwirth’s compositions and writings’

Although questionable and unmasked as situated in media, discourse, and epistemes at least since Foucault’s famous essay on the ‘author-function’, the ‘authority’ of ‘authorship’ is still apparent when the artist is also the commentator of her/his own works. Especially prevalent with contemporary art in its ever-expanding discoursivity, hybridity, and entanglement, the artists themselves see a need to self-comment on their own works in writing, interviews, paratexts. Thus they pre-shape the scholarly discourse through their own ‘authority’ by offering all-too-easy metaphors and explanations. Discarding this commentary however seems almost as problematic as simply succumbing to their doubtful ‘authority’ – the question arising is how to integrate artists’ self-commentary into scholarly writing without tainting one’s own scholarly work with prefigured categories yet still using self-commentary as a viable source of potential insight into the complexities of contemporary art.

My proposed case study will be the 1968-born Austrian composer Olga Neuwirth. Neuwirth not only composes but also self-reflexively writes about her work in order to establish working models and metaphors for her own compositions but also as a commentary and instructions for her audiences, for directors, and conductors. My example would be her concept of ‘androgy nous sound’ and ‘hyper-sound’ when describing her compositional method of combining sounds of traditional instruments with sounds of newish electronic instruments.

As an approach I would like to propose a wider understanding of the concept musical ‘composition’ – allowing to include Neuwirth’s own commentary not only as poetologically important but also as significant in its own artistic, and literary meaning into her overall œuvre, thus productively flattening the discursive categories of ‘artistic work’ and ‘commentary’ into a textual network, refusing the privileged ‘authority’ of the artist’s commentary while retaining its significance.

Charles Wilson (Cardiff University)

‘The autobiography in works: Memorializing and forgetting in Hans Werner Henze’s Ein Werkverzeichnis 1946–1996’

During the 1990s the German composer Hans Werner Henze embarked on a wholesale ‘meta-revision’ of his published output – an undertaking that not only involved the revision of individual compositions but also sought above all to establish the boundaries of his official œuvre. What marked the project out as unusual, however, was not the act of revising or withdrawing individual works, nor the act of self-cataloguing itself, but the speed and intensity of the process. In just five years a quarter of his output was subjected to changes ranging from the minute (a single-word substitution in a subtitle) to the wholesale (painstaking bar-by-bar recomposition), the
results of this process documented in a handsomely produced catalogue from his publisher Schott.

Henze’s Werkverzeichnis has all the outward trappings of a catalogue raisonné, but it departs in key respects from conventional scholarly practice. Rather than moving forward from earlier sources, editions or versions to later ones, Henze’s catalogue is presentist in orientation, tracing history backwards from the current state of the work and in notable cases erasing those traces altogether. This paper will discuss the specific implications of some of these erasures in light of Henze’s political activities in the later 1960s. But it will also explore the wider question of the extent to which a creator’s wish to erase, or palimpsestically overwrite, parts of their history and compositional identity – things that have hitherto circulated freely in the public domain – should be respected. To invoke the controversies surrounding the European Court’s ‘Google ruling’, who decides what, in any composer’s output, has the ‘right to be forgotten’?

Karina Zybina (University Mozarteum Salzburg; Eliette and Herbert von Karajan Institute)

‘A conductor in focus: A musicological approach to Nikolaus Harnoncourt’s life and works’

The aim of this paper is to present an experimental strategy for writing about contemporary musicians, taking as a case study one of the leading figures in the classical music world, an Austrian conductor Nikolaus Harnoncourt (1929–2016). Having established himself initially as a cellist (from 1952 to 1969, he was a part of the Vienna Symphony [Philharmonic?] Orchestra), Harnoncourt later evolved into a pioneer of the so-called Early Music movement, a founder of his own period instrument ensemble, Concentus Musicus Wien, a leading interpreter of numerous baroque and classical musical masterpieces, and a well-known author of several influential books, mostly on such subjects as performance history and musical aesthetics. Nonetheless, his legacy remains largely understudied so far, despite the recent publication of a collective volume Ereignis Klangrede. Nikolaus Harnoncourt als Dirigent und Musikdenker (2009, ed. by Wolfgang Gratzer) that gathers the proceedings of the symposium of the same title. Taking this publication as a starting point, my paper seeks to develop its own approach to writing about a contemporary musician, drawing together a broad spectrum of methods from different disciplines, such as musicology, history, sociology, and journalism. By merging a computer-assisted musicological analysis of Harnoncourt’s musical interpretations (made with the Sonic Visualizer) with its historical and social backgrounds informed by Harnoncourt’s own interviews and studies, this paper attempts to construe Harnoncourt’s ‘life’ in music through a mirror of his multifaceted creative output.
Keynote Biographies

Professor Lorraine York

Keynote Address:
“‘The Artist is Present”: Ethical Liveliness and the Academic Study of Contemporary Artists’

Professor Lorraine York is a contemporary Canadian literature specialist with a particular interest in theories of celebrity and authorship. At present she is the Professor of English and Cultural Studies at McMaster University, Toronto, Canada. Her first book, The Other Side of Dailiness, (ECW Press, 1988) examined the role of photography in postmodern Canadian literature. Front Lines: The Fiction of Timothy Findley (ECW Press, 1991) was a study of systems and discourses of war as intertexts in Findley’s work. She also edited a collection of essays on Margaret Atwood, Various Atwoods, for Anansi Press in 1995. Her book, Rethinking Women’s Collaborative Writing, published by the University of Toronto Press in 2002, reaches beyond Canadian literature to examine the workings of power, difference and property in collaborative works by women in English, American, Italian and French as well as Canadian literary and theoretical texts.

Her 2007 book Literary Celebrity in Canada brings theories of celebrity drawn from film and cultural studies to bear on the celebrity of earlier Canadian figures like L.M. Montgomery, Mazo de la Roche, Stephen Leacock, Pauline Johnston, as well as contemporary writers Michael Ondaatje, Carol Shields and Margaret Atwood. It was nominated for the Raymond Klibansky Prize for the best English-language book in the Humanities published that year. Her most recent book, Margaret Atwood and the Labour of Literary Celebrity appeared with the University of Toronto Press in the spring of 2013 and was shortlisted for the Gabrielle Roy Prize. She is currently working on two books: one on a theory of reluctant celebrity, and one on Nobel Prize-winning author Alice Munro as a reluctant celebrity whose reluctance constructs her as a model citizen of a nation that imagines itself peculiarly resistant to celebrity’s attractions.
Professor Paul Allain

Keynote Address:
‘From Practice to Publication: Playing in Minefields’


He has published several edited collections on Grotowski as part of the British Grotowski project. In 2012 published *Andrei Droznin’s Physical Actor Training* with Routledge, a DVD/booklet. He has contributed extensively to the Routledge Digital Performance Archive. In 2015 his coedited book and online collection *Voices from Within: Grotowski’s Polish Collaborators* was published. His coedited *Acting with Grotowski: Theatre as a Field for Experiencing Life*, by Zbigniew Cynkutis (Routledge 2015) was launched in New Delhi, India in November 2014, at the Polish Cultural Institute.

In 2015 he gained funding from the Leverhulme Trust to make films about physical acting for Methuen Drama Bloomsbury. This will be published in January 2018 as *Physical Actor Training - an online A-Z*. Draft films are currently available at the Digital Performer website.
Professor Björn Heile

Keynote Address:
‘Between the “disease of admiration” and the “hermeneutics of suspicion”: working on living composers and musicians’

Professor Bjorn Heile is presently the Head of Music at Glasgow University, he is the author of *The Music of Mauricio Kagel* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006) and the editor of *The Modernist Legacy: Essays on New Music* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2009) as well as the co-editor (with Martin Iddon) of *Mauricio Kagel bei den Darmstädter Ferienkursen für Neue Musik: Eine Dokumentation* (Hofheim: Wolke, 2009). Bjorn spent eight years at the University of Sussex, more than three of which as Head of Department. Prior to this he was at the University of Southampton, where he received his PhD and spent the next year as Leverhulme Special Research Fellow.

Mostly interested in music of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries and he is increasingly drawn to integrative approaches, whereby different forms of music - popular, classical, traditional, jazz, western and non-western - are not studied in isolation from one another but comparatively. His expertise lies greatest in avant-garde and experimental music (notably that of Mauricio Kagel) and jazz. Professor Heile currently directs a British Academy-funded project on ‘Mauricio Kagel: Estate and Legacy’ (2013-14), and is currently working on an application for a larger follow-up, entitled ‘Mauricio Kagel’s Experimental Music: Text and Performance, Process and Product’, for submission to the AHRC.
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