son's theses on navigating the interdisciplinary arts will in this regard also help with locating important concepts within the various fields, and locate also their historic relationships to critical knowledge creation. What remains to be explored then is *how* exactly different performing arts have been converging into an intermixed model, as well as how the concept of curating has become an important endpoint for organizational practices (such as choreographer, dramaturg, or composer) in different ways in different fields. Though the observed trend is towards a mixing of disciplines and a convergence in interdisciplinarily-oriented institutions, discrete histories and medium-specifics inform this convergence, and should be preserved in the interest of fostering a rich interdisciplinary field, rather than one overdetermined by e.g. the dogma of the visual arts.

3.3 Curating Dance / Dance Curating

This examination of the emergence of curatorial practice in the field of the performing arts starts with dance. Dance is a particular case due to the infatuation of museum curators with dance in recent years for various reasons that will be examined. It therefore offers if not the closest direct relationship with museum curating, then certainly the most theorized, as well as an interesting illustration of interdisciplinary exchange often falling along the lines of disciplinary background: marked differences in the interpretation of dance in the museum often seem to fall along the lines of disciplinary affiliation.

Surveying the relationship between curatorial practice and dance will be the beginning of creating a conceptual foundation for theorizing curatorial practice in music. By examining the ways in which the philosophical goals of curatorial thinking interact with the realities of dance history and dance practice, insights into the particularities of performing arts practices more generally can begin to be drawn. The issue is not just how the concept of curatorial thinking from Chapter 2 looks when applied to dance, but rather also how the specificities of dance practice themselves inform, change and interact with this thinking as well.

3.3.1 Dance is Hard to See

> "Dance is hard to see" (Yvonne Rainer quoted in Lambert-Beatty 2008, 1)

André Lepecki, in the introduction to a reader on dance, identifies five aspects of the practice that can help orient the discussion on its relevancy, namely "ephemerality, corporality, precariousness, scoring, and performativity." He argues that the

fact that dance has come to be defined by an engagement with these facets has allowed it to act also as a mirror for our society's confrontation with the same on a broader scale: Its ephemerality disrupts the economies of objects, as has been presented in the previous section. Dance's corporality can become a site for understanding, critiquing, changing how we relate to our bodies, which are the locus of so many vectors of power. Its precariousness as an art form mirrors the precaritization of labour under financial capitalism. Scoring relates to the directives given to the body, its systems of codification and disciplining. Finally, the performativity of dance, the fact that it only exists in the moment of its enactment, disrupts notions of authenticity and finality; dance must be ongoing in order to exist at all. (Lepecki 2012, 15)

Dance is ideally positioned as an art form to deal with these issues, according to Lepecki, because of its history of experimentation with what have turned into the core building blocks of contemporary reality. If work in a post-Fordist society is becoming performative and affective, then dance's affectivity and ephemerality are its model. This relevancy of dance should not however be understood as inevitable; dance did not win the relevancy-lottery for contemporary society. Rather,

> dance was already *equipped* to tackle the problems at hand. However, it still had to rediscover itself, away from the paradigms of aesthetic modernism (thus it had to form a critique of the notion that dance was "the art of movement") and of choreonormative modes of training, composing and presenting dance. (Lepecki 2012, 19)

Though well-placed, it is much more the recent history of dance since the beginning of its period of experimentation in the late 1950s that would give it the capacity to be so relevant. This divestment from a modernist paradigm is interesting and relevant for current CCM practices that still seems to have difficulties divesting from the same model, and which, though possessing a similarly-relevant package of characteristics (ephemeral, performative), has failed to resonate in the same way.

Scholar Sally Gardner analyzes dance's relationship to a history of experimentation and the divestment from aesthetic modernism by contrasting the emergence of modern dance (different from the "aesthetic modernism" criticized by Lepecki) with the tradition from which it departs, namely ballet. She writes of that older art form:

> Ballet was the 'folk dance' of the aristocracy, and has continued as a form of eminently 'social dance' in the sense that it is publicly instituted, supported and widely taken for granted." (Gardner 2008, 55)

In pointing out the "publicness" of ballet, Gardner seems to contrast its affiliation with notions of the spectacle and the projection of power (see once again the universal expositions) with the "individuality" and therefore subversiveness of mod-

ern dance practice. As it has often been closely tied to individual choreographers, it creates idiosyncratic practices that resists codification and therefore systematisation by the same mechanisms. The individualized value systems created by such practices she in turn also contrasts with the publicness and thus pervasiveness of ballet and its measurement of quality, arguing that "in ballet the ultimate point of choreographic reference is always the externally generated norms or ideals of the ballet style – what [Laurence] Louppe calls an 'absolute reference [1997:31]'" (Gardner 2008, 58).

The early work of Yvonne Rainer, with works like *Trio A* (1966) will help illustrate this shift, and will help as well to formulate a revised framework for understanding dance practice that in turn connects with its uptake in 21st century museums. The four-and-a-half-minute work was an attempt by Rainer to strip away "story, character, and emotional expression," as well as anything that made the dancer's body extraordinary, alluring, or seductive (Lambert-Beatty 2008, 5). What was left was a task-like grammar of the body itself, attempting to expose the bare functioning of the body as a thing in itself, using only the energy needed to do so, and not any more (ibid.).

In her own analysis of *Trio A*, Rainer begins with a list of aspects of minimal sculpture, attempting to translate them (self-admittedly in a non-systematic way) into the practice of dance. *Trio A* should thus "eliminate or minimize" phrasing, development and climax, variety, and the virtuosic feat, as well as "substitute" them with "found" movements, repetition, task-like activity, and a human scale. (Rainer [1966] 2008, 58)

Rainer's reference to minimalism allows for a useful point of comparison with the ideas developed on minimalism's theatricality in section 3.2.1. It shows a similarity of concern about the construction of the performative event and the encounter with the work, rather than an emphasis on figuration or ornamentation taken from a specific tradition (of ballet, of figurative art). Just as minimal art was seen to violate the medium-specificity of painting, bursting out of its frame and interacting with the spectator in their reality directly, so too was *Trio A* an attempt to reject the spectacle of dance in favour of a distillation of the situation of performance itself. Dance at the time was for Rainer a play of admiration by the audience and their gaze, answered by a seduction on the part of dancers (Rainer [1966] 2008, 13). Trying to counter this, Rainer conceived of *Trio A*'s aforementioned task-like movements, and instructed performers to not make any eye-contact with the audience. Her intention in doing so was to bring the performing human body into a state where it could be regarded in the same way as an object—understood here in the sense of the minimalist objects with which she identified.

Trio A's antispectacularity was a way for Rainer to address the situation of performance itself, the moment of encounter between the spectator and the purely physical body. In this way, just as minimalism rejected the interiority of the pic-

ture frame, so too did Rainer's work reject the interiority of the dance spectacle in favour of an engagement with the constitution of the encounter itself *as* encounter. Her work was a negation of spectacle, focusing performance to the specific moment of its enactment rather than on its incarnation of an "absolute reference" as mentioned in relation to the value system of ballet above (Gardner 2008, 58). The work thus becomes a way of developing a kind of dance practice that is focused on understanding the audience as part of the work itself, rather than exterior to it or looking in on the spectacle from the outside (perhaps of the proscenium arch). They became rather *participants* in the performance, in that their mode of seeing, their "period eye" (to borrow an analogous concept from Bourdieu) was itself being directly challenged and brought into question, not just served with its appropriate input within an agreed-upon system.

This way of understanding the work of Rainer by Lambert-Beatty is initially somewhat contradictory, as it would seem to suggest that the aversion to objecthood that has traversed this volume now seems to be the solution to the issue of the engagement of spectatorship. However, just as has been illustrated with minimalism and its "theatricality" criticized by Fried, the cypher of "objecthood" is used by these experimental practices of the 1960s to mean a kind of artistic production that rejected the spectacle in favour of an engagement with the performative constitution of the moment of art-production itself; the network approach put forward in section 3.2.1.

Lambert-Beatty's analysis of Rainer is particular in that after establishing that the focus of the work is on understanding the spectator-dancer relationship as its core concern, she analyzes *Trio A* not in relationship to a history of dance that it seemingly rejects, but in relationship to the "changing culture of mediation" of the mid-1960s (2008, 131). Because the dance focuses on its relationship to the audience, it follows then that an understanding of the audience of the time, an attempt at the reconstruction of the Bourdieuan "period eye," would be the most sensible way of reconstructing and analyzing how the work was transgressive. She thus takes reviews, photos, first-hand accounts of the work not as universal facts, but as themselves indexical of what made the work so transgressive at the time.

For this reason, much of the chapter Lambert-Beatty devotes to *Trio A* specifically is focused on photographs of the work from its first performances in the 1960s. She first argues that the constant, slurred movement of the dance, as opposed to the separation into phrases of ballet, was a means for Rainer to counter and critique the sexualization of the audience's gaze on the dancer's body. She second points to the material reality of those same photographs, many of which have some body part or another smeared and out of the camera's focus, arguing that this can be read as more than just the conventional image language for denoting movement, seeing it rather as "miniature acts of rebellion within the photographs themselves …; almost as if the frozen bodies are resisting their photographic status,

still" (Lambert-Beatty 2008, 164): *Trio A* designed as a transgression and struggle with both the image-world of its day and the constitution of the scopic regime in which it was to act. Rainer's objective of turning dance into an object through the removal of ornamentation and the rejection of spectacle turned her practice into an experimentation with the modes of perception of her audiences. In the same way, minimalism's rejection of the painter's hand, its insistence on primary forms and large dimensions, were transgressing the medium-specificity of the painting, and directly take part in the performative event of the encounter between art and receiver.

What these practices have in common is that they use medium- and discipline-specific approaches in order to produce works that approach from different angles this performative state. As Rainer's *Trio A* shows, what is required for dance to move away from its modernist project set by the ballet tradition is to focus on becoming an artform able to engage with contemporary issues, critically exploring as its aesthetic project how power acts on the body. This is how the discipline can manage to both retain a level of specificity related to the embodied and tacit knowledges emerging out of its tradition (also of experimentation), while at the same time developing practices focused on the performative event of their constitution.

In having clarified and worked out for itself this approach to its medium, dance has arguably also gained a flexibility to participate in both the transdisciplinary context of mixing arts practices, and interdisciplinary context of programming different kinds of art practices from several fields. This is because what constitutes dance practice in a formal and categorical sense become more unclear than ever, however the focusing of dance practice on the performative event of its realization has allowed for a productive crisis of definition to emerge. Said differently, the question *what is dance?* becomes as crucial to answer as it is impossible, in that any systematic answer that this question demands would per se be rejected. Dance scholar Erin Brannigan argues that as dance, over the course of the 20th century moved away from its established relationship to ballet, the project of contemporary dance became shaped by people seeking alternatives, trying to figure out what dance could stand for (Brannigan 2015, 6). What has resulted is a flourishing of dance practice, a whole host of partial, situated answers to the question of what dance is.

Furthermore, because these practices are critical, situated, and concerned with the constitution of the event of critical knowledge production, they can be said to share many characteristics with curatorial practice as it has been analyzed in the previous chapter. Though a further investigation into the historical developments of modern dance is outside the scope of the current volume, what can be seen is that the productive crisis of dance would produce a rich array of dance practices that would also come to interact in numerous ways with forms of performance in the visual arts.

The task here is not to examine such interrelationships in depth, but rather to look at how it has interacted with concepts of curating. While modern dance's move towards a focus on the constitution of the event of performance, and its emphasis, seen in *Trio A*, on eliciting criticality through e.g. a disruption of the period gaze, its concerns begin to resemble many of those of the visual arts as well. It is thus no coincidence to see the proximity between the likes of for instance Rainer and Robert Morris, as well as the growing influence of dance and choreography in visual arts practice in the years since, which will be examined more closely in the next section.

3.3.2 Dance and the Museum

Art historian Claire Bishop identifies three waves of the intermingling of dance and visual arts. The first is in the late 1930s and early 1940s, in particular with the legacy of the Bauhaus, the second in the late 1960s and 1970s with the emergence of minimalism and performance art, and last the current wave as of around 2000. She also surveys three major museums and their relationships to performance over these three periods, the NYC MoMA, the Whitney Museum of American Art, and the Tate Modern, showing that, of the three museums, aside from occasional performances and the collection of dance-ephemera, and the Whitney's persistence in supporting various performing arts causes throughout its history, significant about the current wave of visual arts and dance is the unprecedented scope and scale of these museums' commitment to performance (Bishop 2014b, 63). If additional evidence of this trend is needed, the breath of major museums that have made commitments to creating departments and positions for curators of performance (which includes dance as a significant category) around the turn of the 21st century is overwhelming. Bishop relates that though Tate Modern does not have a performance department, Catherine Wood is their "Curator of International Art (Performance)," the MoMA has had a department for performance since 2009, the Whitney has a full-time performance curator since 2013, the Stedelijk Museum has a so-called *Public Program* including much performance, etc. (Bishop 2018, 27n20). Similar engagements by art fairs, including *14 Rooms* at Art Basel 2014, and the "Live" section at the Frieze art fair also as of 2014, help underscore the dimensions of this dedication. These institutions will often understand and present dance as existing in a significant relationship with the visual arts and many of its historical movements, including performance art.

Given this scope, there is something different that must be precipitated out of the connection between the museum and dance this time around, granted that the various practices of historical modern dance show a certain degree of consistency in their emphasis on the constitution of the performative event, from Duncan to Cunningham, Rainer, and others. Two reasons for the increased role of dance in the museum since 2000 will be given; one having more to do with the realities and

practicalities of 21st century museums, the other having more to do with the fact that the chief concerns of contemporary art have come to resemble those of dance.

A Practical Solution

Whereas earlier forms of visual arts performance took place in theatres (DADA) and galleries/lofts (happenings and Fluxus), they began by around the 1980s to take place more in public space (e.g. William Pope.L). The rise of relational art (e.g. Felix Gonzalez-Torres) and institutional critique (e.g. Andrea Fraser) in the late 1980s and early 1990s would then move visual art performance directly into the museum. Lastly, live installations, and delegated performances performed by artists for hire beginning in the 1990s (Abramovic's 2010 retrospective, or LeRoy's "Retrospective," both at MoMA) disconnected performance from their authors and began to shift the nexus of visual arts performance to the museum (Bishop 2018, 25–26).

As these large-scale museums began to grow in influence and prominence as tourist destinations, performance began to be seen as a way of marrying this newfound relevancy of the museum together with artistic practices that were not as mausoleal, but were rather happening live as a persistent spectacle, playing into the growing importance of the experience economy for museums in the 21st century (Bishop 2014b, 72). The Tate Modern for instance around this time begins programming performing arts as one-off events, as a way of profiling its increasingly popular museum, and offering a different form of cultural event to attract more visitors (ibid.). Also notable is the large-scale project *11 Rooms* (first in 2011 for the Manchester International Festival, then later expanded incrementally up to *15 Rooms* at the Long Museum in Shanghai in 2015) by Hans Ulrich Obrist and Klaus Biesenbach. Visitors found themselves in an oversized corridor designed by Herzog & de Meuron with doors extending along either side. Entering them would each reveal one room where a performance was ongoing over the duration of the exhibition's opening hours.

What can be observed with the increase in popularity of performance writ large at institutions such as the Tate Modern or *11 Rooms* is also a gradual muddying of the boundaries between dance and performance art, to the point where, with terms such as "conceptual dance," the borders between them become impossible to differentiate any further (see also Rogoff's concept of "expanding fields" in section 2.4.3.). This mixing would occur in particular in relation to certain lines of dance practice coming from a lineage of the Judson school and the Merce Cunningham Dance Company. These lineages of dance practice have well-established relationships to the visual arts, in their common relationship to Black Mountain College (and therefore the Bauhaus) and subsequently to the New York School and Minimalism. This makes them naturally compelling for visual arts curators to program (Bishop 2018, 28). Bishop points out that this choice on the part of visual arts insti-

tutions to shift their performance programming from performance art to dance in particular can be understood by looking at the difficult relationship performance art has had historically with arts institutions (27). Not only is performance art intentionally resistant to being collected like painting or sculpture, but its ethos is often one of an oppositionist and confrontory politics to the visual arts institution. The performer/receiver relationship itself is often called into question, many times to an extent meant to unsettle or challenge the audience directly (as in Abramovic's loaded gun and other such objects in *Rhythm 0*, 1974) (ibid.). Conversely, dance, particularly when it has been transplanted from its familiar home in the theatre, offers a safe and attractive alternative, and plays well into the spectacularization of the museum-going experience. As Bishop argues in a different text, the pared-down, austere presentation of much dance in the museum offers a marked contrast to much contemporary art production; "[t]he dancer's body holds a knowledge that cannot be simulated, and thus satisfies a yearning for skill and seduction that visual art performance rejected in its inaugural refusals of spectacle and theatre" (Bishop 2014b, 72) (this position is also taken by Sabrine Breitwiser, see also section 3.2.2). Dance in the museum can thus often be read as a kind of underhand move, an infiltration of the valorization of skill and technique in performance long scorned by performance artists in the interests of boosting museum attendance and audience engagement.

This reality of dance's relationship to the museum therefore however in quite strong contrast to the position put forward earlier that with the advent of modern dance, as exemplified by the work of Rainer and others, its aesthetic project would largely become one of criticality and exploration e.g. the body's relationship to its subjectification by power. This would seem to contradict the reality of the situation as it has been put forward here, with dance being recontextualzied once again as an artistic practice with a skill-based conception of virtuosity leading to it being a trojan horse for formal beauty in the museum.

It is useful at this stage to revisit some of the lessons learned by examining the work of Jackson, in particular her first thesis that "one set of eyes is seeing the reproduction of a tradition where another pair of eyes may have assumed invention," once again the "hazard of swapped contexts" (Jackson 2014, 57). Where perhaps one way of viewing the entrance of dance into the museum is as the reproduction of a tradition of the commercialization of the museum experience, this view may also fail to account for other facets of what is happening with this change. In order to explore these shifting viewpoints further, it is useful to examine more closely the relationships between early instances of dance in the museum and their scholarly reception.

"A Choreographed Exhibition"

In 2008, what scholars seem to agree was the first so-called "dance exhibition" took place at Kunsthalle St. Gallen, entitled "A Choreographed Exhibition" (2008). The format would grow rapidly from there, the beginning of a whole subgenre of dance exhibition in the museum, mainly by a small subset of conceptually-minded dancers, such as Xavier LeRoy, Boris Charmatz, Martin Spångberg, Tino Sehgal, or Jérôme Bel. In principle, the format offers an interesting solution to the issue of dance in the museum: rather than just presenting dance performances in the gallery, a "choreographic thinking" would be applied to the curatorial concept for the project itself. Practitioners of dance would then go about working in the museum as an expansion of choreographic practice understood as curatorial practice.

Dance scholar Erin Brannigan raises a series of issues around this entanglement of dance and museums that show both its dangers and its possibilities. Brannigan begins by taking a closer look at the seminal "A Choreographed Exhibition" at Kunsthalle St. Gallen, and in particular how the exhibition was understood by its curator, Mathieu Copeland. Examining this exhibition will allow once again a closer look at the actual realization of such projects, and the conceptual problems that they raise.

The exhibition consisted of three dancers who were present during the opening hours of the space for a month, realizing scores given to them by dancers, artists, and choreographers sequentially one after another over the course of the day. For Copeland, creating an exhibition consisting only of the movement of bodies in a space was a way of resisting the culture of the art object, a criticism of the art world which takes on critical, political, and temporal dimensions (Brannigan 2015, 12). Dancing becomes cast as a subversive act against the commodification of the object, a way of attempting through its "immateriality" to resist involuntary participation in the art market. However, in the accompanying exhibition catalogue, Copeland begins his exhibition text by wagering a redefinition of the exhibition as a "choreographed polyphony" (Copeland 2013, 19). He then uses it to re-examine the constitutive components that form the exhibition—which is for him "material, textual, textural, visceral, visual" (19). His intent is to rediscover ephemerality and the immateriality of experience and lived time within this constellation through the gestures and movements of the dancers he hires, who become the medium through which the exhibition will be realized. Copeland also points to the "inherent choreography" that accompanies gestures and movements whenever they appear as something which can be made visible via a criticism of the art world's emphasis on objects. Brannigan summarizes his attempt at subverting an object-based art system through performance by saying that Copeland's focus is on

> the contribution of dance to the visual arts' critique of the subject/object division and the social and political forces this unleashes, along with a destabilization of

> the object as the primary model for the work of art, and finally the reactivation of an intersensorial mode of spectatorship in our encounters with art. (Brannigan 2015, 15)

This understanding of dance as emphasizing "an intersensorial mode of spectatorship" is what allows for her to characterize the relationship in Copeland's work between dance and the visual arts. She writes that for him, "*choreography* is equated to the exhibited result of curating and organizing materials, bodies, spaces, [etc.]" (Brannigan 2015, 12). It becomes then a practice "of control and constraint across a multiplicity of physical and intangible variables," in the sense of mediating the conditions of a given event (ibid.). What this means is that equating choreography with the practices of curating from the visual arts amounts to a nivellation of choreography with exhibition curating, and thus the curator with the choreographer. She then criticizes this comparison between curator and choreographer, arguing that "[t]he methods and practices of choreography … are lost here, and the term stands for a much broader concept of a composition for living bodies" (2015, 12–13). The emphasis rests on the curatorial gesture that brought the project into being, rather than the individual dancers, who are treated as a neutral and undifferentiated medium—a notion that is outdated in the field of dance, where the individuality of specific dancer's bodies play an important part in works (13).

This touches on two significant issues. The first is a return to Jackson's thesis that "Innovation to Some Can Look Like a Reinvented Wheel to Another," also called the hazard of swapped contexts. What for Copeland is a transgressive move, creating an "immaterial" exhibition as a rejection of the culture of the art object becomes, when looked at from the perspective of dance, a project that ignores the specificity of the individual dancers' bodies, and that thus does not reflect the material-specific knowledges or current trends in choreographic practice. It becomes a project involving dancing, dancers, and choreographers, but because of its configuration and conception becomes a protest against the art object, rather than a specifically choreographic work.

Second, the contention implicitly made by Copeland that choreography and curating are indistinguishable terms because both involve the organization of materials and bodies in spaces is reminiscent of curator Irit Rogoff's criticism of the expansion of terms explored in Chapter 2. She argues in "The Expanded Field" that there are a great deal of coexistent terms that have widened the scope of their respective definitions so as to become evacuated of stable meaning. For Rogoff, a great deal of these terms in the arts field have

> a historically determined meaning which has been pushed at the edges to expand and contain a greater variety of activity—but never actually allowed to back up on itself and flip over into something different. (Rogoff 2013, 43)

These terms have been siloed and kept in line as a means of suppressing their need to take off in new directions.

Relating this to Copeland's statement as to the equivalence of curating and choreography, the parallels are clear: Choreography is defined for him not in terms of its narrower, historically determined meaning as was established with modern dance, and codified by Lepecki and others (i.e. it is a particular tradition of composing the movement of bodies), but rather as a practice of composing the movement of bodies *in general*. This is the process of inflation at work that Rogoff is calling out. The concept of choreography as put forward by Copeland is evidence of its being expanded, with the result being the destabilization of its meaning and an unclear (or underdetermined) relationship to its object. Rogoff's position is that one should not bother trying to work out the new boundaries of this kind of expanded term, but rather that the inflated term should be popped, and allowed to "flip over" into new approaches, for instance via new paths originating at the crossroads of dance and visual arts curating.

Taking these two criticisms into consideration, can it perhaps be Brannigan's analysis more than the project itself that is simply not approaching the project from an effective viewpoint for understanding? While Copeland's flattening of the concept of choreography may not have been curatorially very interesting, regarding the exhibition solely from the viewpoint of dance would also seem to miss his intention of creating a subversion of the art object, as has been argued with Jackson. What seems to be more probable in this situation is that the performance exhibition genre was in its infancy, and both curator and critic were experimenting with how to approach a renewed interest in the immaterial, performative experience of the exhibition. A useful way of addressing this impasse is to compare it with the analysis of a more recent example.

Grey Zone

To this effect, Claire Bishop argues that as this form of performance has developed in the intervening years, it has begun to offer its audience a unique form of performative experience. In a recent article from 2018, she argues that the dance exhibition exists in a so-called "grey zone" between the white cube and the black box, a clever play on words, but also an example of interdisciplinary hybridity. For Bishop, the performance exhibition is unique in its ability to offer an audience experience that has been lost in the two traditional spaces to experience art, the black box and the white cube. The black box, she relates, emerged out of a desire in the 1950s and 1960s to strip the theatre of its baroque technologies and return it to its essence, namely the audience–actor relationship, a project now also supplemented by an emphasis on multimedia technologies. The white cube for its part is a typically-modernist exhibition space, decontextualizing objects and portending to a

rationalist-objectivist environment for their viewing. Common to both is that they function as spaces for conditioning and disciplining of the subject through enforcement of certain codes of behavior in order to minimize disruption: one must not be too loud or boisterous in either of them. (Bishop 2018, 30–31)

Bishop's argument is that with the introduction of dance performance into the white cube space, "the viewing conventions of both the black box and the white cube are ruptured …, [and] the protocols surrounding audience behavior are less stable and more open to improvisation" (Bishop 2018, 31). The unruliness of dancing bodies in an exhibition space, especially given the often marathon nature of these performances, provides the audience with a certain cover to also "be themselves" and conform less to preestablished norms of museum or performance-going. She takes as an example a dance exhibition that has further developed Copeland's approach, namely Anne Imhof's work for the German pavilion for the Venice Biennale 2017. Entitled *Faust* (2017), the performance consisted of a raised glass floor, allowing visitors to walk as if floating a metre over the pavilion floor. Underneath, and occasionally above as well, a troupe of performers interacted with various objects in the space, danced, and rested. Performers above the glass would dance among the visitors; performers below would press their bodies up against the glass, or fog it up with their breath, while the audience, separated only by that thin pane, either filmed on their phones, or looked on at close proximity (Bishop 2018, 34–35).

In *Faust*, there is no best vantage point, the audience is free to move around and pick their own unique perspective on the performance. The event time of a performance at a specified hour is replaced as well by the exhibition time set by the opening hours; in this way as well the audience determines themselves the length of the performance by "voting with their feet." Most importantly, the dance exhibition allows for a regaining of intimacy between audience and performers because of the factors above. Dancers twist and push through the throng of people, they relate to you their personal stories, or you observe their genuine moments of distress or rest. Because of this, the dance exhibition has become the place "where you go to see performers sweat" (Bishop 2018, 31).

Bishop's position towards the "grey zone" created by dance exhibitions is an example of how both artists/curators and theorists can successfully navigate the nexus of references that come together at the intersection of dance and visual arts. Bishop shows that Imhof, Sehgal, LeRoy—and perhaps even Copeland—have managed to create practices that combine the concerns of their dance practices with those of the museum, presenting these works also in such a way as to work well specifically in their unique context.

Showing also how the discourse around these events has developed, she also shows with this article how the scholarship around dance in the museum has matured and developed an effective language and perspective on these kinds of projects since its rather basic beginnings at the beginning of this third wave of

dance in the museum. Bishop's most striking position is to emphasize in her article the titular "grey zone" between dance and visual arts that is created by dance exhibitions as their most important characteristic due to their innovative approach to spectatorship.

Placing emphasis on this is itself a departure from the norm in this discourse. Over the past decade or so of its formation, the focus has often come to lie strongly on issues of precarity for dancers in the museum. New forms of dance practice have often been accused of being the result of the neoliberalization of dance work, and thus the dismantling of norms regarding dancers' working conditions.[5] Bishop herself explicitly positions her article as moving forward from this trend, arguing that the whole application of Italian post-Workerist thought (such as Virno) to the field of performance is, though important, only serves the propagation of gloomy narratives of neoliberal conquest over art (2018, 23). Rather, she states that she wants to show how, speaking of *Faust*,

> this work isn't simply an unreflexive replication of the neoliberal experience economy in which it thrives, but tells us important things about the changing character of spectatorship. (Bishop 2018, 24)

This attempt to move past a certain part of the existing discourse on dance in the visual arts is interesting in that in trying to refocus it on the character of spectatorship, it is pointing more in the direction of trying to understand how a new format can be understood phenomenologically as a uniquely new kind of hybrid.[6] This prioritization returns to a central point, namely that the danger of simply expanding terms should be carefully avoided, instead when engaging with interdisciplinary arts, the task should be to try to understand the hybrids that occur as unique blends that can potentially create new paths forward, rather than trying to fit them into already "overexpanded" concepts. These should importantly be understood to include *both* curating and choreography, but perhaps not new concepts like that of the grey zone coined by Bishop.

In any case, against this background of a maturing field of dance exhibitions, the concept of the grey zone that dance exhibitions create corresponds with an ap-

5 See in particular the special issue of *TDR* entitled "Precarity and Performance" edited by Nicholas Ridout and Rebecca Schneider in 2012, and also Shannon Jackson's "Just-in-Time: Performance and the Aesthetics of Precarity" (2012).

6 Also illustrating this maturation of the genre, a progression in the sophistication of Bishop's thought on this topic can quite clearly be seen between the 2018 article being discussed and an article on the same topic from 2014 entitled "The Perils and Possibilities of Dance in the Museum: Tate MoMA, and Whitney" (Bishop 2014b). Whereas the first article is much more an attempt to establish a historical and factual basis for these new dance initiatives, the second is more concerned with the question of what new forms of perception these initiatives are creating.

proach to curating that cuts across various disciplines and creates new approaches and perspectives on artistic practices. Dance exhibitions bring together elements of different artistic traditions: conventions of exhibition of visual art, modern dance's emphasis on being "hard to see" i.e. being experiential rather than based on an object/subject division, the media-informed viewing habits of the contemporary spectator, and even the programming requirements of contemporary museums. In doing this, a new form of mediating performance is emerging in practice, one that untangles this genealogical puzzle in ways that respond to the demands of new kinds of audiences. In the best instances of these grey zones, and other combinations of dance with the museum, this form of mediating dance is both *critical* in its focus on and thematization of the spectator-performer relationship, where it is suggesting a new kind of intimacy, but also *informed by the history of modern dance* and thus *discipline-specific*, continuing and reimagining a certain form of dance practice.

This is lastly also an example of how the concept of curating, having been developed in the visual arts, can flow into the performing arts and create also there new forms of presentation through a curatorial engagement with the specificity of the mediation of performance to contemporary audiences. As will also be shown in in the next section on curatorial practices in the theatre, what is meant by this kind of development is not just a maturation of the theoretical tools used in analyzing performance, but also a mediating praxis that is itself developing too.

3.4 Curating Theatre / Theatre Curating

3.4.1 Dramaturgy vs. Curating

Theatre scholar Tom Sellar argues in his 2014 essay "The Curatorial Turn" that the performance curator is the "great white hope for progressive theatre makers" (2014, 21). This inflationary claim is contrasted by Sellar with the historical role of the dramaturg, who he portrays as fulfilling similar functions in regards to "[c]onnecting a public to the art through interpretation," but who does not possess the same level of institutional power and influence to be able to do this effectively (26). The performance curator is thus portrayed as a rebranding of the dramaturg's role, the only difference being imbuing them with more control over budgets and authority over decision-making. This effectively imports the curatorial discourse's mystification and emphasis on the author-function. His definition thus reads like an expansion of the term curator into the field of dramaturgy in the interest of dramaturgs wanting to assert their power and authority over the performance event within theatre institutions.

The concept of dramaturgy, and more specifically the role of the dramaturg, deserve however a more nuanced exploration than this, in order to evaluate the