

## **“Reflecting *with* practice. The 'research score' as a medium of artistic research?”**

*Good Science is rare and when it occurs it is an event that should be cherished like a miracle, commented on and disseminated like a work of art.*  
(Latour 2004, 223)

### **Introduction**

On October 1st 2016, I will present the results of my research for the 2<sup>nd</sup> artistic part of my doctorate. The aim of this paper is to provide a summary of the progression of my research since the examination of my 1<sup>st</sup> artistic part (October 2012) and to give an outline of the aims and goals of the 2<sup>nd</sup> artistic part. The paper is structured into three sections.

In the first section, I recapitulate the points of departure when embarking on my doctoral studies and I give a short description of the outcomes of my 1<sup>st</sup> artistic part. One result of the 1<sup>st</sup> artistic part was that the so-called ‘research score’ came to the fore as my main research practice. In the course of the years, as I will explain below, the research score evolved from a consistent practice to think through the Manipulations into a medium of artistic research. As a translation (Benjamin 1968) of the Manipulations, the research score gradually achieved an independent status as a method of reflection in its own right. In the course of my research, by opening up the scope of reflection to go beyond the Manipulations, the research score further expanded into a medium of artistic research. As a result of this expansion, the mode of reflection advanced from reflecting *on* artistic practice towards reflecting *with* artistic practice. Accordingly, I suggest that reflecting with the research score is now turning into an artistic practice. Next to that, the writing of two essays (Hug 2016a, 2016b) has been an empowering and ridding experience that opened up the gateway towards the research for my 2<sup>nd</sup> artistic part in which I invite other artists and artist-researchers to put my research to the test.

The second section of the paper discusses some ideas by sociologist of science B. Latour (2004) about how to talk about the body without falling into the trap of dualism. It explores how the practice of the Manipulations might be related to his notions of ‘articulation’ and ‘proposition’. I summarize a number of principles Latour proposes as criteria for the assessment of scientific research and round up the second section with an outlook on how these criteria might serve as a touchstone for my 2<sup>nd</sup> artistic part.

In the third section I provide a brief sketch of the progression of the two phases of collaborative research for the 2<sup>nd</sup> artistic part conducted so far. I conclude the paper giving an outlook on the questions that have emerged and that we most likely will focus on in the third and last phase of our collaborative research, finding its conclusion in the examined presentation.

## **Section One: On the Progression of my Research since the 1<sup>st</sup> Artistic Part**

### *1<sup>st</sup> Artistic Part (October 2012)*

In October 2012, I presented the lecture-demonstration “Imaginary Properties. Thinking through (the) Manipulation(s)”, which was examined and passed as the first artistic part of my doctorate. In the lecture section I introduced the topic of my research: the question of alteration of perception in and through the Manipulations. I suggested that “it is in the enactment of the relationship between sensing, perceiving and reflecting that the process of alteration can take place”<sup>1</sup>, and that the Manipulations were a useful practice to study this process. I further proposed that “an analysis of the operative concepts and of the strategies that are applied in the *Manipulations* contributes to our understanding of the knowledge that is created in and through this artistic training practice” (ibid.) and I presented the Glossary as an outcome of my analysis.<sup>2</sup> In the practical section of my presentation, I introduced Manipulations Nos. 1 and 2 through

---

<sup>1</sup> Manuscript of lecture-demonstration “Imaginary Properties. Thinking (Through) the Manipulation(s)”, held on October 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2012, Theatre Academy Helsinki.

<sup>2</sup> See below (p. 3) for a short description of the creation of the Glossary and for a more elaborate account Hug (2016b).

video material. Afterwards I gave a brief live demonstration of some training practices used in Body Weather and did a live performance of the research score, followed by a short movement improvisation.

The 1<sup>st</sup> artistic part marked the beginning of a process that had as its goal to think through the Manipulations and to linguistically articulate the impact of this practice on the performer's process of perception. In particular, I was interested to come to terms with the modes of knowing that were engendered in and through this practice. Theoretically, I situated my research in the discourse around the notion of 'bodily knowledge'<sup>3</sup> and in the discussion on the epistemological and methodological issues of artistic research. Practically, my research proceeded through two parallel trajectories: one has been to maintain the practise of the Manipulations, the other has been to continue my explorations with the research score.

### *Small Shifts with a Significant Outcome*

The research score was one of the main methods to reflect on the Manipulations and to contribute to the writing of the Glossary. The research score is an adapted solo version of the duo practice of the Manipulations. Without an actual giver, the receiver *imagines* receiving the Manipulations and recreates the sensation of being given while at the same time contemplating on emergent thoughts. These thoughts are then documented either through instant writing or by making an audio recording of the spoken words. The Glossary was created by compiling a list of keywords used in the training with Body Weather Amsterdam and by conducting a series of performative writing tasks, including the research score, providing the written content for each individual word. The intention behind creating the Glossary was to make explicit the tacit knowledge that is considered to be embodied through the Manipulations, and to reveal the role of the language used in the process of transmission and instruction.

I came to conceive the research score as an embodied approach to explore the Manipulations from *within* practice, turning the Manipulations into an

---

<sup>3</sup> See Hug (2016a) for a discussion of the bodily knowledge created in and through the Manipulations.

epistemic object. It was a somewhat unexpected result of the process of creating the Glossary that the research score became established as the main research practice, whereas the Glossary took a backseat in the further course of my research. It might be that I underestimated the value of the Glossary as a research output and as a source of knowledge for others. Instead, I was keener on further exploring the research score as a method of embodied reflection on the Manipulations.

### *1<sup>st</sup> Shift: The Research Score and Walter Benjamin's Notion of Translation*

In the course of time, as I continued to regularly practice the research score, there were two small, but I would argue probably significant shifts. The first shift happened as I began to write an article about the 1<sup>st</sup> artistic part<sup>4</sup>. The writing of this article asked me to closely re-examine *what* I actually did when I practiced the research score, and *how* I did it. This task shifted the focus of my research slightly away from investigating the Manipulations and towards an analysis of the research score. As a consequence of this first shift of perspective, the practice of the research score *itself* became the primary epistemic object of my investigation.

Inspired by Walter Benjamin's ideas about the task of the translator<sup>5</sup>, I came to consider the relationship between the research score and the Manipulations in terms of *translation*. According to Benjamin, it is impossible, and not even desirable, to provide a *literal* translation. A good and successful translation, he claims, can only *touch* on the original<sup>6</sup>, thereby aiming to capture its deeper sense. In a similar way, the research score is not a *literal* translation of the Manipulations. It is impossible to exactly, and *literally*, re-create by oneself the very same sensations one has when one is actually being given the

---

<sup>4</sup> See Hug (2016a)

<sup>5</sup> See Benjamin (1968)

<sup>6</sup> Benjamin speaks of a *tangential touch* between the translation and the original: "Just as a tangent touches a circle lightly and at but one point, with this touch rather than with the point setting the law according to which it is to continue on its straight path to infinity, a translation touches the original lightly and only at the infinitely small point of the sense, thereupon pursuing its own course according to the laws of fidelity in the freedom of linguistic flux." (80).

Manipulations. The attempt for a literal re-creation of the duo practice of the Manipulations through the solo practice of the research score is doomed to fail. The score can only *touch* on the specific kind of sensation that is experienced in the original practice of the Manipulations. Touching on the Manipulations, the research score is at the same time faithful to the original *and* betrays it:

[T]he research score betrays the original of the Manipulations by turning a duo into a solo practice; yet from another perspective, the research score is faithful, because it reiterates one of the core principles in the creative process of Body Weather: the (re-)creation of past experience by memory and imagination. (Hug 2016b, 176)

Gradually, by reflecting on its own modes of operation and by taking itself as the object of investigation, the research score began to take on its own life. The score was no longer only a method of reflecting on the practice of the Manipulations, but it gradually became an independent method of reflection that stood on its own feet.<sup>7</sup> In this way, the idea of the research score as a translation of the Manipulations, and the conceptualization of the score as a method of embodied reflection, prepared the ground for a second shift that I consider equally significant as the previous one.

### *2<sup>nd</sup> Shift: The Research Score Becomes an Expanded Method of Reflection*

The second shift occurred as I started to use the research score not only as a means to reflect on the Manipulations, but more and more also as practice to reflect on concepts and notions that I encountered when preparing, for example, for a research presentation at a conference, or at a seminar at the University of the Arts Helsinki. For example, when I prepared for a lecture-demonstration at a conference on dance research in Reykjavik in May 2015, one of the questions I addressed was how the practice of the Manipulations could become expanded into a method of artistic research. How did my artistic research change the

---

<sup>7</sup> For Benjamin the translator's task consists in transforming the original through the translation: "It is the task of the translator to release in his own language that pure language which is under the spell of another, to liberate the language imprisoned in a work in his re-creation of that work." (80) Note that Benjamin speaks of translation as a 're-creation' of the original. Can the research score be conceived as a re-creation that liberates the 'pure language' imprisoned in the original of the Manipulations?

practice of the Manipulations so that it could become a method of knowledge production? The key concept at the core of this question was the notion of 'method'. One way of preparing and gathering material for my contribution to the conference was to practise the research score for several times while reflecting on the notion of 'method'. Significantly, it was around the same time when I was reflecting with the research score on the notion of 'method' that I came to consider the research score as a *method* of reflection.

This way of practicing the research score as a method of embodied reflection made a lot of sense to me, and I began to frequently draw on this approach in order to think through ideas and concepts that I encountered. Whenever I would want to enter another mode of reflecting on concepts, and to think through ideas that I came across in my conceptual research, I would practice the research score at my work place at home as *one* possible way of reflecting on a piece of writing - next to other rather conventional ways of thinking through ideas in a more rational and less embodied manner while sitting at my desk. During that time, I practiced the research score reflecting on and with<sup>8</sup> among other concepts the notions of 'place', 'time', 'participation', 'third space', 'potential', 'method', 'cut', 'tacit knowledge', 'thinking', 'training', 'not-knowing', 'touch', 'struction', 'embodied reflection', 'diffraction', 'unfinished thinking', 'specificity', 'emptiness', 'relation', 'exhaustion', 'articulation'.<sup>9</sup>

Thus, with the *second* shift the research score further expanded into a method of embodied reflection that could be enacted in relation to *any* given notion, concept or question of interest, no matter whether it related to the Manipulations, Body Weather or *whatsoever*. As a translation that had acquired its own independent status, its own mode of existence, the research score, in tangential touch with the original of the Manipulations, was now able "to continue on its straight path to infinity (...) thereupon pursuing its own course

---

<sup>8</sup> To say that I was reflecting 'on and with' actually already indicates a transition from reflecting *on* to reflect *with* a notion. To reflect *on* a notion creates a subject/object relationship, a relationship between a knower (the one who reflects) with the known (the reflected). To reflect *with* a notion entails a co-relationality: a thought composing, or being composed, *with* sensing: Thinking with an awareness of (being in) touch. Thought and touch touching.

<sup>9</sup> Next to this, I also continued to practice the score *without* reflecting on a specific notion.

according to the laws of fidelity in the freedom of linguistic flux.” (Benjamin 1968, 80)

*From reflecting on practice towards reflecting with practice*

Returning to an observation I made earlier (Hug 2016b), I propose that these two small shifts in the practice of the research indicate

a shift in the mode of reflection: from reflecting and writing *on* practice towards reflecting and writing *with* practice. This shift is small and subtle, but I want to argue that it is significant, because it points to an altered relationship between artistic practice and reflective writing, in which neither is subjected or subordinated to the other. In the research score (...) reflective writing and artistic practice no longer pertain to supposedly separate domains that are arranged in an uneasy relationship, but they are intimately interwoven. The relationship between reflective writing and practice has become one of co-creation and of composing-*with* the other as an equal partner. (Hug 2016b, 188; original emphasis)

In my understanding, the separation between reflective writing and artistic practice is suspended in the research score, and reflective writing can be seen to become an artistic practice.

The questions that follow from here are whether in this state of suspended separation one can still make a distinction between a subject and an object of reflection, and whether there still is a gap between language and experience. More generally stated, is there a difference between the knower and the known? What knowledge is being represented and by whom? How is this knowledge articulated and through which language? In other words and from an epistemological perspective, does the research score still belong to a system of representation in which language has the function of representing knowledge and experience? Is there still a gap between the knower and the known to be bridged by linguistic statements? Or does the research score open up the possibility for an alternative epistemological model, in which the representationalist and rationalist notion of ‘reflection’ has been replaced by the performative and posthumanist notion of ‘diffraction’?<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> K. Barad (2003) has proposed to consider the process of knowing in terms of diffraction rather than reflection. According to Barad, a knowing subject is not reflecting

What these questions seem to indicate is the following: far from being only a method of investigating a training practice, the research score seems to have evolved into a medium of artistic research. As a medium<sup>11</sup>, it provides the ground for articulating thoughts in relation to and *with* an artistic performance training practice. The score is more than a method to reflect *on* or *about* this practice. As a medium of artistic research, the research score is no longer merely a method to reflect *on* an epistemic object (the process of perception and its alteration, the modes of knowing) but it effectively/affectively alters and re-configures the process of thinking altogether. The articulation of this process of thinking is becoming an artistic practice. The research score can be understood as a proposition for a different *kind* of thinking.<sup>12</sup>

### *Writing Research and/as Empowerment*

In the years that followed my first artistic part, I strived for a more elaborate articulation of my research by bringing its theoretical and practical components into a more direct conversation with each other.<sup>13</sup> Throughout the time, there remained a certain tension between how I experienced and conceived of myself when working with either Body Weather practitioners or when working with colleagues from the context of artistic research. While I felt very insecure about how to share my questions with Body Weather practitioners, I was much more at

---

from outside or exterior to the known object or phenomenon, but it is itself an integral, yet separable, part of the phenomenon that it aims to understand – an exteriority within. She writes that the notion of diffraction “troubles dichotomies, including some of the most sedimented and stabilized/stabilizing binaries, such as organic/inorganic and animate/inanimate. Indeed, the quantum understanding of diffraction troubles the very notion of *dicho-tomy* – cutting into two – as a singular act of absolute differentiation, fracturing this from that, now from then.” (168, original emphasis)

<sup>11</sup> See Kirkkoppelto (2015) on the notion of artistic practice as a ‘medium’ of artistic research.

<sup>12</sup> See below in *Section Two* my discussion of the notion of ‘proposition’.

<sup>13</sup> The relationship between, simply put, theory and practice is a major concern of many artist-researchers and recognized as one of the core issues in the field of artistic research. When I graduated from the Master of Artistic Research program in Amsterdam in 2009, there was still a significant gap between the theoretical and the practical parts in my own research. Back then, I was not able, yet, to fill this gap. One of my aims when beginning with the doctorate in 2011 was to tackle this issue and to develop methods for interweaving the perceptual inquiry with conceptual research. The research score is the most concrete and immediate proposition I can make in this direction.

ease to open up my work to those who were familiar with the notion of artistic research.

This feeling of tension, or division, changed considerably with the writing of two essays in 2015.<sup>14</sup> The writing of these two essays resulted in a deep sense of relief and liberation. I felt relieved, because I had finally externalized a large share of the ideas that had accumulated throughout the years of my research. And I felt liberated, because the task of writing turned into an act of appropriating the work and of claiming authorship in the process of reflecting and knowledge making. Thus, giving voice to the artist-researcher equalled an act of empowerment that made me feel more confident (i. e. capable, refined, articulate, entitled) to share my research in the Body Weather context.

With both essays entering the process of publication I felt ready to make the next step and to overcome the gap in myself between the practitioner and the artist-researcher. I now had a strong desire to go into the studio and to engage with others in the practical research that is advanced through the research score. I felt an urge to shift from doing the practical research mainly by myself and to go into collaboration with others. In 2015, I pressed ahead with this shift by taking a couple of initiatives: I organized one workshop on the Manipulations with Frank van de Ven and a second one with van de Ven and Christine Quoiraud, during which I presented my research; I initiated a group that regularly met to practice the Manipulations in Berlin; I offered open studios to my colleagues at the Theatre Academy during my study trips to Helsinki; and I made try-outs with my colleagues from AREAL (Artistic Research Lab Berlin).

## **Section Two: Towards the 2<sup>nd</sup> Artistic Part**

### *Aims and Objectives*

In the course of progression of my research, it became clear what I needed to focus on in my research for the 2<sup>nd</sup> artistic part: I wanted other artist-researchers and practitioners to put my research to the test - in particular the

---

<sup>14</sup> See Hug (2016a, 2016b)

research score. It would be necessary to share my knowledge as comprehensively as possible in order to enable my collaborators to critically examine my research both from within the practice as well as by taking into account its written articulations. The aim of this collaborative process of participatory performative research is to get a clearer idea of the relevance my research potentially has for others in the field of artistic research, as well as to identify possible gaps and blind spots, implicit assumptions, misconceptions, errors, and idiosyncrasies. I expect that by getting fellow artist-researchers engaged in my inquiry a more differentiated and multi-vocal (re-)articulation of my research will come to the fore.<sup>15</sup>

In relation to developing the conceptual apparatus for the methodological approach to the second artistic part, two theoretical contributions from the field of Science Studies have been most stimulating. One is an essay by feminist philosopher Karen Barad (2003) in which she outlines her ideas about an alternative epistemological model of a posthumanist performativity that is juxtaposed to a representationalist model that she criticizes for granting language too much power.<sup>16</sup>

The other major source of inspiration is an essay by Bruno Latour (2004). In this piece of writing, he explores how to scientifically talk about the (human) body without falling prey to the classic dualism that separates the body into either physiologically objective or phenomenally subjective. The concepts of 'articulation' and 'proposition' are the two key notions Latour employs in his project to develop another vocabulary. Next to proposing another way to talk about the body, Latour delineates a series of principles for the assessment of scientific research from the perspective of an alternative normative political epistemology. In the following section, I will first discuss the concepts of 'articulation' and 'proposition' and their relation to the practice of the Manipulations. I will then present Latour's principles for the assessment of

---

<sup>15</sup> I envision this process in terms of an *expanded peer review*.

<sup>16</sup> I am particularly interested in Barad's concepts of 'material-discursive practice', 'intra-action', and 'diffraction'. I assume that these concepts will help me to refine my notion of the research score, but cannot elaborate more on these notions in this paper.

scientific research and consider how these might be used as criteria to review the research for my second artistic part.

*Latour (I): On 'articulation'*

Following William James, Latour suggests that “to have a body *is to learn to be affected*, meaning ‘effectuated’, moved, being put into motion by other entities, humans or non-humans” (Latour 2004, 205; original emphasis). He further elaborates on what ‘learning to be affected’ could mean by giving an example: In the perfume industry, the sense of smell is trained through the use of a so-called odour kit (*malette a odeurs*) – a collection of distinct fragrances that the student is taught to detect and to differentiate. In the course of the training, Latour expounds, the student becomes more and more proficient to smell even the subtlest differences, and, thus, is said to be acquiring a ‘nose’. To put it briefly: Latour shows how the odour kit is applied as a tool for learning to be affected, and he argues that the odour kit not only enables the student to acquire a body, but that it also trains the body to become more *articulate* by being able to differentiate smells in great detail.<sup>17</sup>

“The main advantage of the word ‘articulation’,“ Latour writes, „is not its somewhat ambiguous connection with language and sophistication, but its ability to take on board *the artificial and material* components allowing one to progressively have a body.” (Latour 2004, 210; original emphasis) Another benefit of the word ‘articulation’, he explains, is that it foregrounds the process differentiation by highlighting the layers of differences that are created in the process of training. Thus, ‘articulation’ allows pinpointing a shift, or transition, in the capacity to behave and to enact perception differently:

---

<sup>17</sup> “Through the training session, [the student] learned to have a nose that allowed her to inhabit a (richly differentiated odoriferous) world. Thus body parts are progressively acquired at the same time as ‘world counter-parts’ are being registered in a new way. Acquiring a body is thus a progressive enterprise that produces at once a sensory medium *and* a sensitive world. (...) Through his kit and his ability as a teacher, he has been able to render his indifferent pupils attentive to ever more subtle differences in the inner structure of the pure chemicals he has managed to assemble. He has not simply moved the trainees from inattention to attention, from semi-conscious to conscious appraisal, he has taught them to be affected (...)” (Latour 2004, 207)

Before the weeklong session, the pupils were inarticulate. Not only in the sense of a conscious and literary sophistication, of their ability to speak about the odours; but they were also inarticulate in a deeper and more important sense: *different odours elicited the same behaviour*. Whatever happened to the world, only the same obstinately boring subject manifested itself. An inarticulate subject is someone who whatever the other says or acts always feels, acts and says the same thing (...). In contrast, an articulate subject is someone who learns to be affected by others – *not by itself*. (Latour 2004, 209/210; original emphasis)

Latour points out that ‘articulation’ has nothing to do with the ability to talk with authority. Instead, it indicates a capacity to be affected by difference. Learning to be affected, thus, means training the body’s capacity to constantly become more differentiated. Affect and differentiation coincide in a body that is becoming more articulate(d) by the training.<sup>18</sup>

### *Articulating the Body with the Manipulations*

I have elsewhere provided detailed accounts of the Manipulations and suggested that one of the aims of this practice is to cultivate the body’s capacity to affect and to be affected (Hug 2016a, 378; Hug 2016b, 5; Hug 2016c). In the example given by Latour, the articulation of the body is advanced by training the sense of *smell* as a means for learning to become affected and differentiated through (combinations of) odours. In the case of the Manipulations the body of the receiver is mainly articulated through the sense of *touch*. The touch of the giver, upon entering the body of the receiver, translates into a diverse and complex entanglement of sense perceptions. Depending on the receiver’s sensitivity, the

---

<sup>18</sup> Latour repeatedly points out that ultimate goal of learning to be affected is the production of difference, which in turn enables a *more* of articulation: “Articulations (...) may easily proliferate without ceasing to register differences. On the contrary, the more contrasts you add, *the more differences and mediations you become sensible to*.” (Latour 2004, 211; original emphasis) “The more mediations the better when acquiring a body, that is, when becoming sensitive to the effects of more different entities (...). The more you articulate controversies, the wider the world becomes. (...) I want to be alive and thus I want more words, more controversies, more artificial settings, more instruments, so as to become sensitive to even more differences. My kingdom for a more embodied body!” (Latour 2004, 211/212) “(...) The more artificiality, the more *sensorium*, the more bodies, the more affections, the more realities will be registered (...). Reality and artificiality are synonyms, not antonyms. Learning to be affected means exactly that: the more you learn, the more differences exist.” (Latour 2004, 213; original emphasis)

touch can be registered on the levels of the skin, tissue, fasciae, muscles, bones, joints, ligaments, organs, meridians, fluids, and so on; it can also activate the receiver's memory and imagination, triggering certain feelings and emotions. Thus, it is the specific application of touch by the giver that articulates the body of the receiver.

Similar to the odour kit, yet operating on different registers of the sensory spectrum, the Manipulations can be understood as a *touch* kit providing a series of specific touch-based hands-on operations (what would be the odours in Latour's example) that are applied in order to train the body's capacity to be affected and differentiated. The process of articulation is not unilateral, but reciprocal: The receiver fosters the availability and the disposition of the body to become affected and differentiated by actively allowing to be touched and to be moved. It is through the specificity of touch by the giver in co-relation with the receiver that the body becomes more articulate. Thus, adopting the notion of 'articulation' from Latour, I propose to consider the Manipulations as a training practice that allows the practitioner to acquire a more articulate(d) body.<sup>19</sup>

### *Latour (II): 'Proposition'*

Training the sensory apparatus, thus, is a way of articulating the body. It is by learning to become affected and differentiated that the way to more articulation is paved. For Latour, the question that follows from there is: *What* is articulated? According to him it is neither 'words' nor 'things', but 'propositions'. He explains:

It cannot be 'words', as if articulation was a purely logocentric term. (...) It cannot be 'things' if by this we mean a substance defined by primary qualities (...) because then the bodies that are affected by those

---

<sup>19</sup> What makes the situation for the Manipulations different, however, is that one cannot purchase this kind of tool kit through online shopping, as it is possible for the odour kit (one can easily find many offers on the web). The process of learning the *form* of the Manipulations and acquiring the ability to execute a touch-manipulation with the proper accuracy requires an extended time of training. However, I would suggest that it is precisely because *both* the giver *and* the receiver are *mutually* training their bodies to become more affected and more differentiated that very different ethical parameters are at stake in the process of articulating the body through the Manipulations than in the example given by Latour. See Hug (2016a, 375 ff.) for a more detailed description of the intercorporeal relationship between the giver and the receiver in the Manipulations, and for the ethical implications of this relationship.

differences will have entirely disappeared, and, with them, the articulation. Working in the vicinity of Isabelle Stenger's Whitehead, I have acquired the habit of using the word *propositions* to describe *what* is articulated. The word 'proposition' conjugates three crucial elements: (a) it denotes obstinacy (position), that (b) has no definite authority (it is a *pro*-position only), and (c) it may accept negotiating itself into a *com*-position without losing its solidity. (Latour 2004, 212)

If an articulated proposition is neither a word nor a thing – then what is it? In Latour's example, an *odour* is a proposition that is articulated through (a combination of) perfume(s). By analogy, this would mean that *touch* can be understood as a proposition that articulates the body with and through the (sequence of the) Manipulations. Further expanding the analogy between *odour* and *touch* in relation to Latour's definition of the word 'proposition' in the section cited above, I suggest the following characterization of how *touch*, in the Manipulations, can be understood as an articulated proposition:

First, the element of obstinacy, or position, that is attributed by Latour to 'proposition' can be detected in the specific *form* of touch in the Manipulations. The form of a touch in the Manipulations, its design, its placement in relation to the body of the receiver, its direction, its intention and its application by the giver – all these components of touch are not accidental, but, instead, have been carefully crafted and premeditated; thus, each individual application of touch asserts a well-defined position in the sequence of the Manipulations; each touch articulates the form with some obstinacy, or determination; the form makes the touch *felt* and, thus, articulates the body of the receiver.

Second, despite of its positionality and obstinacy, as a proposition that is articulated with the Manipulations touch has no definite authority. Touch may not be im-posed on the body of the receiver, but it should offered as a proposition. This proposition is made resolutely and with determinacy, but it does not claim any authority. It *pro*-poses a feeling, a sensation, without *im*-posing it.

Third, touch in the Manipulations articulates a proposition that is not static or fixed, but that allows room for constant negotiations and dynamic exchange between giver and receiver. Despite a certain imperative to articulate touch in the Manipulations as clearly and determinedly as possible, its effects are

indeterminate and its form is never an end in itself. By the way of its specific execution, touch in the Manipulations provides the opportunity for a *re-composition* of the body by reciprocally co-composing in relation *with* the body of the other.

*Latour (III): Criteria for the Assessment of Scientific Research*

The question finally addressed by Latour is: What are the criteria we can draw on in order to assess scientific research? How can we tell whether a proposition is *well* or *badly* articulated? What is there to hold on, when there is no more right or wrong? “If the world is made of propositions, and if the action of knowledge is conceived as articulation, we are not left without any normative stance” (Latour 2004, 214), Latour reassures us. Drawing on the work of Isabelle Stengers and Vinciane Despret, he outlines a number of principles for what he terms an ‘alternative normative political epistemology’.

To begin with, Latour reminds us that scientific knowing is the exception rather than the rule. He states: “[K]nowing’ is not the automatic outcome of an all-purpose general methodology: it is, to the contrary, a rare event.” (Latour 2004, 214). In those rare cases that knowing happens, its articulations are good and interesting, because they are characterized by “fecundity, productivity, richness [and] originality” (Latour 2014, 215). Bad articulations are “‘boring’, ‘repetitive’, ‘redundant’, ‘inelegant’, ‘simply accurate’, [and] ‘sterile’” (ibid.), he writes. Scientific knowing has to involve risk-taking<sup>20</sup> and it mustn’t be easy; the laboratory settings need to be radically reshaped in such a way that they afford the studied object (human or non-human) the possibility to resist: “*devise your inquiries so that they maximize the recalcitrance of those you interrogate.*”<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> “To be interesting, a laboratory has to put itself at risk. (...) The real risk to be run is to have the questions you were raising *requalified* by the entities put to the test. What is to be falsified is not just the empirical instance of the theory, but also the theory, the very research programme of the imaginative scientist, the technical apparatus, the protocol. (...) ‘Am I asking you the right questions? Have I devised the laboratory setting that allows me to change as fast as possible the questions I ask depending on the resistance of your behaviour to my questioning? Have I become sensitive to the possibility of your reacting to artifacts instead of to my questions?’”

<sup>21</sup> Latour points out that “the truly revolutionary insight of Stengers and Despret’s epistemology is to have shown that this motto is paradoxically harder to apply to

(Latour 2004, 217; original emphasis). Against a notion of scientific objectivity that demands from all involved parties, researcher and the researched, to remain as little engaged and as disinterested as possible, Latour promotes a radically opposite attitude:

[A] disinterested scientist abstaining from any interference with uninterested entities will produce totally uninteresting articulations! The path to science requires, on the contrary, *a passionately interested scientist who provides his or her object of study with as many occasions to show interest and to counter his or her questioning through the use of its own categories.* (Latour 2004, 218; original emphasis)

The question, Latour elaborates, is not whether one takes (objective) distance or shows (subjective) empathy. It is neither one nor the other that defines good science. The more pertinent question, he writes, is whether distance and empathy

*help maximize the occasion for the phenomenon at hand to raise its own questions against the original intentions of the investigator (...)* It must be clear (...) that abstaining from biases and prejudices is a poor way of handling a protocol. To the contrary, one must have as many prejudices, biases as possible, to put them at risk in the setting and provide occasions of manipulation for the entities to show their mettle. It is not passion, nor theories, nor preconceptions that are in themselves bad, they only become so when they do not provide occasions for the phenomena to differ. (...) So neither distance nor empathy is a sure guide that a good science has been concocted, but only this criterion: is there now a distance between the new repertoire of actions and the repertoire with which we started? If yes, then time has not been wasted; if no, then money has been spent in vain, no matter how 'scientific', in the traditional sense, the results look." (Latour 2004, 219; original emphasis).

---

humans that non-humans. Contrary to non-humans, humans have a great tendency, when faced with scientific authority, to abandon recalcitrance and to behave like obedient objects, offering the investigators only redundant statements, thus comforting those same investigators in the belief that they have produced robust 'scientific' facts and imitated the great solidity of natural sciences! The only true discovery of most psychology, sociology, economics, psychoanalysis, according to Stengers and Despret, is that, when impressed by white coats, humans transmit objectivation obediently: they literally mimic objectivity, that is they stop 'objecting' to inquiry, in contrast to *bona fide* natural objects which, utterly uninterested by the inquiries, obstinately 'object' to being studied and explode with great equanimity the questions raised by the investigators – not to mention their laboratories!" (Latour 2004, 217; original emphasis)

Lastly, Latour addresses the question how to make a distinction between good and bad generalizations. According to him, good generalizations are those propositions that are *more* articulate in the sense of being more differentiated, whereas bad generalizations are less articulate because they are reductive:

The good ones are those that allow for the connection of widely different phenomena and thus generate even more recognition of unexpected differences by engaging a few entities in the life and fate of many others. The bad ones are those which, because they had had such a local success, try to produce generality, not through connection of new differences, *but by the discounting of all remaining differences as irrelevant.*" (220; original emphasis)

Good generalizations, following Latour, are those that do not eliminate but produce and proliferate differences in order to advance from less articulated to more articulated propositions: "Generalization should be a vehicle for travelling through as many differences as possible – thus maximizing articulations – and not a way of *decreasing* the number of alternative versions of the same phenomena." (221; original emphasis)

### *Rounding up*

I propose to test Latour's model (2004) as a *touchstone* for the collaborative research in and through my 2<sup>nd</sup> artistic part. According to this model, the following questions can be formulated:

First, in relation to the notion of 'articulation': Has my research become more articulate(d), that is, has it been affected and become more differentiated by working with my collaborators?

Second, in relation to 'proposition': Are the propositions that I make *well* or *badly* articulated?

Third, (how) does my research stand up to Latour's principles of assessment: has (scientific) knowledge been created, at all? Is this knowledge interesting, that is, is it fruitful, productive, rich, original? Does the research involve risk? Has it looked for recalcitrance and provided occasions to differ? What has changed in the course of the research? Has the repertoire of actions become expanded, have new practices been invented? Do the generalizations

that are being made in the articulation of the research allow for new connections with widely different phenomena and do they generate more recognition for unexpected differences?

It may not be possible to answer all these questions with the research for my 2<sup>nd</sup> artistic part, but it might be a beginning.

### **Section Three: Putting my Research to the Test**

#### *Collaborative Research*

The aim of the research done for the 2<sup>nd</sup> artistic part is to open up my research practice and to put it to the test through collaborating with a group of five artist-researchers from the field of dance and performance. How do they relate to the questions that are activated by my research? Does my research touch on issues that are relevant for them? What have I failed to consider, what have I skipped, bracketed, or neglected? What, from their perspectives, are the crucial questions and core issues that are interesting and call for further investigation? How do they see the relationship between my research practice and its written articulation?

To say it with Latour, the goal of the collaborative research is not to eliminate but to produce and proliferate differences in order to bring forth a more differentiated articulation of my research, in particular the research score, and to further advance its development into an epistemic object and a medium of artistic research that can be examined and critically assessed.

#### *1<sup>st</sup> Phase: Experimentation*

The collaborative part of the research process is structured into three phases. In the first phase (May/June 2016), I worked for 10 days in Berlin with Paula Kramer and Josh Rutter. The focus of the first phase was to prepare for the following two phases in Helsinki and to explore how to effectively transmit the core elements of my research practice: the Manipulations and the research score. Before the beginning of the project, only one of the participants had a solid

experience of the Manipulations; none of them had ever practiced the research score. However, in order to be able to explore and critically examine my research practice I felt that all collaborators needed to have a fairly good grasp of it. How to transmit a research practice that had evolved over more than a decade in the time of a couple of days?

What this first phase of experimentation brought out was that it would probably be a good idea to focus on a small number of selected practices and to deepen those instead of spreading out too broadly. The feedback I received by Paula and Josh also suggested that in the second phase, when working for the first time in Helsinki, it might be helpful to dedicate two days mainly to intensive practice and to introduce the research score early on. This approach would ensure that the bodies were filled with experience before we were delving more into exploration, reflection and discussion.

Furthermore, what emerged from this first phase was a heightened awareness on my part of the complexity of the research score, and of the particular issues that may surface in its transmission, especially with regard to the question of recreation. As I have outlined in the first section of this paper: the research score will never be able to function as a *literal* translation of the Manipulations. It became evident from the feedback by Paula that learning and doing the practice of the research score was extremely challenging, because it confronted her with the impossibility to accomplish the task successfully. This experience can be frustrating and confusing, she warned. How to prevent this from happening, given that five days are precious short and that the process of transmission is not an end in itself, but only the necessary condition for being able to focus on the next step - the exploration and critical examination of the practice? A suggestion made by Paula and Josh was to provide beforehand a number of different strategies for how to approach the issue of re-creating the Manipulations through the research score.

### *2<sup>nd</sup> Phase: Transmission and Exploration*

As a result of the preparatory work in Berlin, I had quite clear an idea of how to enter the second phase in Helsinki in June 2016, and which practices to focus on.

The working group now consisted of Outi Condit, Riikka T. Innanen, Tashi Iwaoka, Paula Kramer, and Josh Rutter. The emphasis of the first two days was on the transmission of the Manipulations and the research score, focusing on the part of receiving, since it is the recreation of the sensation of receiving the Manipulations that is one of the core issues in the practice of the research score.

Next to that I introduced an exercise called 'breathing through'. In this exercise, one person lays on the ground while another person places a hand somewhere on the torso of his or her partner's body. The laying person is asked to send the breath towards the hand, breathing in and out the place of touch. The touching person focuses on sensing the movement of the breath, every now and then changing the place of touch and gradually spreading out over the whole body. After some time, maybe 10 minutes, the person touching withdraws and the laying person continues to work in solo, imagining to be touched and breathing through imaginary hands. This solo version of 'breathing through' is called 'imaginary hands' and serves as a strategy to construct the process of receiving in the Manipulations. It is therefore also a core element in recreating the sensation of receiving in the research score.

In the following 3 days, the focus shifted from transmission to reflection, discussion and feedback, while at the same time giving space to further deepen and explore the experience of these three practices (breathing through, Manipulations, research score) and the connections in-between them.

### *3<sup>rd</sup> Phase: Questions concerning the notions of alteration, recreation, translation*

As we are approaching the third and last phase of collaborative research, which will happen again in Helsinki and with the same group of people, I am still in the process of reflecting on the experience of the second phase of working. In the past weeks, I have been processing and analyzing the documentation, in particular the transcripts of the research scores we have been doing, and of the shared reflections and discussions we had. At this moment, in my view the main topics that have come to the fore through the collaborative practice-as-research have to do with the notions of alteration, recreation and translation.

Without going into further details, it seems appropriate to say that all members of the group shared the impression that the effect of the Manipulations is an alteration of the perception of the body in relation to itself and to other (human or nonhuman) bodies, and that the recreation of this sense of alteration in the research score poses fundamental questions and problems. How to go about and recreate the sensation of being given the Manipulations and the effect of alteration? *What* is actually recreated in the research score and *how*? What is bracketed? Is it the *touch* itself that is recreated, or is it the *effect* of the touch, the movement or the sensation? What is the difference between real touch and imagined touch? And how to deal with the fact that it is impossible to exactly recreate the sensation of receiving, and, therefore, also the sense of alteration induced by the Manipulations?

On the other hand, there were questions about the nature of relationship between the Manipulations and the research score: How important are the Manipulations for the research score? Does one need to learn the Manipulations before one can do the research score, or can there be a version of the research score without the Manipulations? What are the basic elements of the research score that one cannot do without? Can there be a translation of the research score into other practices? If so, what then is the relationship between the research score and its translation?

It seems to me that these are questions worth to be followed up during the third and concluding phase of my collaborative research for the 2<sup>nd</sup> artistic part in Helsinki in September.

#### References:

- Barad, K., 2003. Posthumanist Performativity: Toward an Understanding of How Matter Comes to Matter. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 28 (3), 801–831.
- Benjamin, W., 1968. The Task of the Translator [first printed as introduction to a Baudelaire translation, 1923], in *Illuminations*, trans. Harry Zohn; ed. & intro. Hannah Arendt (NY: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich 1968), pp.69-82
- Hug, J., 2016a. Modes of Knowing in Body Weather Performance Training. In: Enderlein, U., ed. *Zwischenleiblichkeit und bewegtes Verstehen. Intercorporeity, Movement and Tacit Knowledge*. Bielefeld: Transcript, 367-380.

Linking paper, 2<sup>nd</sup> artistic part by Joa Hug, October 2016

- Hug, J., 2016b. Writing *with* practice. Body Weather performance training becomes a medium of artistic research. *Theatre, Dance and Performance Training*, 7 (2), 168-189.
- Hug, J., 2016c. *Body Weather Manipulations No. 1 & 2* [online]. Available from: <http://theatredanceperformancetraining.org/2015/11/body-weather-manipulations-no-1-2/>[Accessed 14 June 2016].
- Kirkkopelto, E., 2015. Artistic Research and its Institutions. In: L. Torbjörn, ed. *Artistic Research – Yearbook 2015*. Stockholm: Swedish Research Council, 49-53.
- Latour, B., 2004. How to talk about a body? The Normative Dimensions of Science Studies. *Body & Society* 10 (2-3), 205-229.