

critical dance studies



Lucia Rainer

# On the Threshold of Knowing

Lectures and Performances  
in Art and Academia

[transcript]

**From:**

*Lucia Rainer*

## **On the Threshold of Knowing**

Lectures and Performances in Art and Academia

April 2017, 228 p., 34,99 €, ISBN 978-3-8376-3804-2

In this in-depth analysis of artistic and academic lectures and performances, Lucia Rainer features an innovative conceptual and methodological tool that augments Goffman's Frame Analysis with a praxeological perspective. This way, she gives profound insight into how knowledge – as a practice and a concept – is associated with clarity rather than truth. Based on four case studies – including John Cage's unpublished and unabridged audio recording of *Lecture on Nothing* – the study explores how the concept of lecture performances, which adheres to two frames that never entirely blend, provides a space to (re-)negotiate the artistic-academic relationship.

**Lucia Rainer** (Prof. Dr.) teaches at Medical School Hamburg. As a performer and performance studies theorist her interests evolve around the concept of lecture performances and notions of interdisciplinary research and performative writing.

[www.transcript-verlag.de/978-3-8376-3804-2](http://www.transcript-verlag.de/978-3-8376-3804-2)

# Table of contents

---

- 1. INTRODUCTION** | 9
  - 1.1 Field of study** | 9
  - 1.2 Research questions, approach, and contribution** | 15
  - 1.3 Between scholarship and performance practice** | 21
- 2. THEORETICAL EMBEDMENT** | 23
  - 2.1 Frame analysis** | 23
  - 2.2 Practice theory** | 34
  - 2.3 The concept of knowledge** | 41
  - 2.4 Artistic research** | 54
- 3. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH** | 67
  - 3.1 Case-study-driven praxeological frame analysis** | 67
  - 3.2 Complementary video and audio analysis** | 69
  - 3.3 Four case studies** | 72
- 4. THE CONCEPT OF LECTURE PERFORMANCES** | 75
  - 4.1 Between lecture and performance** | 75
  - 4.2 Current state of research** | 76
  - 4.3 As an artistic research practice** | 80
  - 4.4 Embedded within the performative turn** | 83
- 5. THE LECTURE FRAME AND ITS FRAMINGS** | 87
- 6. ACADEMIC LECTURE: “EXPERIMENTAL PHYSICS 1”** | 91
  - 6.1 Creating a context and framing the strip** | 91
  - 6.2 Scientific demonstration** | 94

- 6.3 **Mathematical validation** | 101
- 6.4 **Illustration by use of video documentation** | 105
- 6.5 **Combinatorial clarity** | 109
  
- 7. ARTISTIC LECTURE: “LECTURE ON NOTHING”** | 113
  - 7.1 **Creating a context and framing the strip** | 113
  - 7.2 **Referencing and transcribing** | 115
  - 7.3 **Ambiguous clarity between reference and transcription** | 128
  
- 8. THE PERFORMANCE FRAME AND ITS FRAMINGS** | 131
  - 8.1 **The concept of performance** | 131
  - 8.2 **The concept of performance and the postmodernist perspective** | 133
  - 8.3 **The concept of performance within the field of performance studies** | 135
  - 8.4 **A frame analytical perspective on the concept of performance** | 140
  - 8.5 **Transcribing performances from offstage to onstage** | 141
  - 8.6 **The transformative power of performance** | 144
  
- 9. ARTISTIC PERFORMANCE: “DANCE FOR NOTHING”** | 149
  - 9.1 **Creating a context and framing the strip** | 149
  - 9.2 **Referencing** | 151
  - 9.3 **Transcribing** | 155
  - 9.4 **Ambiguous clarity between reference and transcription** | 162
  
- 10. ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE: “MAKING RESEARCH EXPERIENTIAL – FASCINATING PHENOMENA OBSERVED THROUGH HIGH-SPEED CAMERAS”** | 165
  - 10.1 **Creating a context and framing the strip** | 165
  - 10.2 **Scientific demonstration** | 168
  - 10.3 **Illustration by use of video documentation** | 173
  - 10.4 **Video-based clarity** | 177

## **11. OVERRIDING KNOWLEDGE PRACTICES | 181**

**11.1 Voicing | 182**

**11.2 Transcription | 184**

**11.3 Clarity-based alignment | 187**

## **12. ON THE THRESHOLD OF KNOWING | 193**

**12.1 Re-conceptualizing knowledge from a praxeological and frame analytical perspective | 194**

**12.2 The impact of lecture performances on the concept of knowledge | 196**

**12.3 Between and beyond art and academia | 203**

**12.4 Outlook | 205**

## **13. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS | 209**

## **14. APPENDIX | 211**

**14.1 Books and journals | 211**

**14.2 Internet sources | 221**

**14.3 Interviews | 221**

**14.4 Performances and performance scripts | 222**

**14.5 Table of figures | 222**

**14.6 Visuals | 223**



# 1. Introduction

---

## 1.1 FIELD OF STUDY

“I began to take two dance classes a week at the same time that I started to work on my thesis for my Ph.D. in molecular and cellular biology” (Le Roy 1999). This quotation originates from Xavier Le Roy’s “Product of circumstances” (1999), which – in retrospect – greatly popularized the concept of lecture performances.<sup>1</sup> Within this lecture performance Le Roy examines his artistic as well as his academic profession. He utilizes substantive lecture practices, i.e., reciting a pre-written text, relying on visual aids, giving demonstrations, and referencing formal lecture structures as well as spatial arrangements. Yet simultaneously, he exhibits and exploits these particular practices. Thus, “Product of circumstances” adheres to two frames that never entirely blend.

Le Roy’s lecture on the one side, and his performance on the other, simultaneously comment on and cancel each other out. In addition, the lecture performance finds itself at the center of incessant crossovers and is conducive to reciprocal encounters. To give an example, on January 23, 2000, “Product of circumstances” was staged in Hamburg at the theater venue Kampnagel Kulturfabrik, which claims to be “Germany’s largest production and performance facility for national and international freelance artists and is one of the most reputable venues for the performing arts.”<sup>2</sup> Yet “Product of circumstances” was not only performed at Kampnagel Kulturfabrik. Approximately five years later, on January 11, 2005, the University of Hamburg invited “Product of circumstances” to be performed in Hamburg again. Building on this, I reason that “Product of circumstances” not only distinguishes itself as a prominent

---

**1** | Until the present day, “Product of circumstances” has influenced contemporary art practice (cf. Hoffner [2010]) and a manifold amount of literature has been published on this lecture performance (cf. Brandstetter [1999]; Siegmund [2006]; Bernard [2009]; Husemann [2009]; Chapuis [2011]; and Sabisch [2011]). For more information, see also: [www.xavierleroy.com](http://www.xavierleroy.com).

**2** | As indicated on the Kampnagel theater website: [www.kampnagel.de/en/service/about\\_kampnagel](http://www.kampnagel.de/en/service/about_kampnagel). [accessed June 24, 2014].

lecture performance example but simultaneously provides insight into a contemporary phenomenon that can be termed as “performing science” or – to be more precise – “performing knowledge.” This phenomenon distinguishes itself through imprecise frames and framings. It offers the blurring of boundaries between scholarly and artistic practices and within diverging social fields (Bourdieu 1993). New forms of collaborative and collective working approaches are emphasized and explored via mixed modes of inquiry.

On the one side, “Product of circumstances,” and the concept of lecture performances in general, brings into focus that the performing arts are finding themselves directly set within scientific culture, whereas the latter “is not the culture of scientists” (UNESCO 2005, 129) but a culture of science centered on practices of dissemination. On the other side, the concept brings into focus that the lecture frame, as an academic form of talk that disseminates knowledge, is in flux. In the course of this, lecturers bow out of reading their lecture text out loud and rather center on depicting knowledge in a vivid and demonstrative manner. This shift mirrors modes of diversification regarding existing advertency. It substantiates the observation that knowledge co-legitimizes itself in and through images and visualizations that can be ascribed to a contemporary pictorial – and in a particular performative turn. This turn points toward the fact that staged on the threshold, knowledge is continually created and simultaneously challenged.

Thus, at the bottom of my study lies the observation of never finally arriving. Notions of the transitory, singular, and irretrievable bring into focus that knowledge is not a factum. Instead, knowledge occurs within the ken of activity as an encounter that is interfused by presence. Knowledge bears reference of appropriation within its individual, spatiotemporal frame. Therefore, accommodating changes within the artistic as well as the academic field, my study sheds light on the notion of knowledge as a concept that oscillates between acts of determining and re-determining. It addresses points of intersection between social fields and their varying modes of research and knowledge production. It offers the blurring of boundaries between lectures and performances. My study acknowledges that thresholds are on the move and that art and academia are not only opening their doors but also borrowing across the borders. My study appropriates the concept of lecture performances to demonstrate that knowing emerges as a matter of multiple, overlapping, and at times conflicting affairs. It underscores the idea that thresholds emerge as units that separate *and* unite.

Based on these observations, the following questions become central: (1) What are the implications of thinking about contemporary culture as a continuous performative intervention? (2) What concept of knowledge reveals itself, if knowledge practices inevitably emerge as modes of mutual inquiry? Referring to these research questions and precisely regarding the artistic and academic fields, it is necessary to make mention of a *modus operandi* termed “artistic

research.” This *modus operandi* originates from an artistic perspective that acknowledges that thresholds are *de facto* on the move. It does not determine frameworks and frames as permanent, but it actively reflects these very frameworks and frames, acknowledging their continuous transformation and interplay. Thus, based on a growing number of conferences, symposia, and the publication of respective miscellanies and journals,<sup>3</sup> the *modus operandi* and subsequent research field of artistic research exhibits and challenges field-specific practices alluding to the artistic as well as the academic domain. Artistic research builds on the unsettled relationship between art and academia and the disputed divide between practice and theory. Its *modus operandi* highly determines contemporary discussions regarding the artistic and the academic relationship. Its *modus operandi* recognizes contemporary crossovers and looks into implicit artistic *and* academic framings – historically and socially embedded – that explicitly challenge the divide between the two. Its *modus operandi* provides the impetus for transdisciplinary debate. This has consequences for the artistic *as well as* the academic field.

Albeit first and foremost connected to the artistic field, artistic research practices are hallmarked by different artistic-academic constellations and collaborations that particularly stand out because they substantially stimulate and engage in transdisciplinary dialogue. Artistic research practices act on field-specific procedures and methodologies and contest practices of knowledge formation and validation. Conversant with artistic and academic practices, artistic research exposes both the scientist as well as the artist to the challenge of, on the one hand, articulating their praxis and respecting their praxis’s inner coherence. On the other hand, artistic research mirrors field-comprehensive occurrences bringing into focus that both artists as well as scientists are putting practices to the test that operate at the margin of acknowledged praxis.

Precisely regarding the notion of acknowledged praxis, the *modus operandi* of artistic research challenges the widely held belief that the concept of knowledge is neither unitary nor exclusively and distinctly linked to the scientific field. This is of particular interest with reference to Daniel Bell’s “venture in social forecasting.” Within his study *The coming of post-industrial society* (1973), Bell brings forward the argument that the twenty-first century has passed the era

---

**3** | In this regard, it is interesting to be aware of the online Journal for Artistic Research ([www.jar-online.net](http://www.jar-online.net)), which, starting in 2011, has published bi-annually, allowing, to quote its editorial team “an ever-increasing number of artistic researchers to partake in what for the sciences and humanities are standard academic publication procedures.” Moreover, the journal seeks to bring together “diverse voices, facilitating the discourse and thus improving the artistic research community.” [www.jar-online.net/index.php/pages/view/133/](http://www.jar-online.net/index.php/pages/view/133/) (accessed October 23, 2014).

of modernity, distinguishing itself as “post-industrial” instead. From this, he infers that knowledge has become a downright productive force and *the* decisive instrument regarding social development. More than forty years later, Bell’s forecast has proven true. Published in 2005, the UNESCO world report *Towards knowledge societies* posits that contemporary societies primarily differ from former knowledge societies as they are inevitably linked to virtuous circles that result in a ceaseless “acceleration of knowledge production” (UNESCO 2005, 19). The increase expeditiously determines who has access to power and profit and who does not (UNESCO 2005, 27ff.). On account of this, the knowledge component – in the first instance – refutes other value-bound factors, i.e., capital, natural resources, and labor force, and “can go hand in hand with serious inequality, exclusion and social conflict” (ibid., 17). Knowledge is revealing itself as an utmost important source of empowerment and capacity building (cf. also Drucker 1993).

Referring to this and turning towards the academic perspective, Karin Knorr Cetina’s study regarding culture in global knowledge societies is groundbreaking. Her work is based on the assumption that “everyone knows what science is about,” but “no one is quite sure how scientists and other experts arrive at this knowledge” (Knorr Cetina 2007, 363). Building on this observation, Knorr Cetina employs the concept of epistemic cultures to capture and in the course of this be able to determine “interiorized processes of knowledge creation” (ibid.). Her argument is based on the proposition that epistemic cultures are embedded within knowledge settings and are the structural feature of knowledge societies – even though knowledge societies are far from being “homogeneous and one-dimensional” (Knorr Cetina 1999, 8). Epistemic cultures distinguish themselves through “those sets of practices, arrangements and mechanisms bound together by necessity, affinity and historical coincidence which, in a given area of professional expertise, make up how we know what we know” (Knorr Cetina 2007, 363). From this she deduces that epistemic cultures are “cultures of creating and warranting knowledge” (ibid.).

My study also examines the practice-bound arrangements of knowledge, but its most important contribution is the articulation of a field-comprehensive occurrence that is ingrained within an arrangement that can be termed as “performing knowledge.” My study supports the argument that contemporary societies particularly distinguish themselves through notions of scientific culture not being “the culture of scientists” (UNESCO 2005, 129), but a culture of science. This culture goes beyond the academic field, mirroring contemporary transformations defined in terms of the current transition to a society entitled as knowledge society. My study explores the production of knowledge emerging from and originating in the relationality of field-bound frameworks and frames and intrinsic performances, i.e., originating in and emerging from cultural-historical and conceptual dimensions and manifestations.

Regarding the practice-bound arrangement termed as “performing science,” my study pursues Knorr Cetina’s ethnographic study. Her *Epistemic cultures* (1999) examines how two exemplary, scientific laboratory cultures create knowledge. In the course of her systematic comparison, she questions scientific entity, pointing toward the fact that there are many – at times also incommensurable – scientific practices. In addition, she queries whether it is possible to “extrapolate from other forms of social order to learn what we need to know about the organization, the structures, the dynamism of knowledge systems” (ibid., 2). She has two specific concerns. Firstly, her study promotes reflection on the depth and diversity of “the contemporary machineries of knowing” (ibid., 2), increasing the possibilities of understanding contemporary praxis. Secondly, her comparison introduces epistemic cultures as structural features and practices in the transition to shaping knowledge societies.

Relating to these two concerns my study additionally corresponds to Hans-Jörg Sandkühler. He follows a similar line of argument as Knorr Cetina, positing that epistemic cultures relate to a spatial and temporal frame, within which predefined parameters regarding the formation and validation of knowledge are appropriated *and* continually negotiated (cf. Sandkühler 2002, 31, translation by the author). Knowledge alludes to an expedient, process-related praxis that is cross-linked to customs, convictions, values, and norms. These map onto practices of assimilation, affirmation, refusal, and/or resistance (cf. ibid., 33, translation by the author). Phrased differently, knowledge practices are uniquely embedded within the manifold praxis of the epistemic cultures of a social field. They advert to culturally acceptable manifestations as well as to transformations and are informed by incessant and reciprocal interdependency. Both these manifestations and transformations account for one another, yet are mutually exclusive, allowing a plurality of realities to exist. Viewed from this angle, institutional boundaries – and their internal systems of reference – play a pivotal role in the processes linked to knowledge formation. These processes build on complex textures, which, paraphrasing Knorr Cetina, can only be made visible when magnifying “the space of knowledge-in-action” (1999, 3).

My study precisely calls attention to this staged “space of knowledge-in-action,” which accommodates the field-comprehensive occurrence of performing science or rather performing knowledge. My study seeks to investigate the linkages, clashes, and confluences of staging knowledge as a site of cross-ing-over. It substantiates the observation that “knowledge-in-action” has surfaced as a happening that crosses institutional boundaries and – as I will make plausible in the course of the analysis – is increasingly emerging as multifaceted and interactive. The act of staging pursues the objective of giving an interested public insight into research processes and simultaneously creates a public forum for engaging in shared dialogue. “Performing knowledge”

positions the scientific field beyond the academic realm, expanding notions of science as a process of shared inquiry and participatory analysis.

In creating this public forum, the practice-bound arrangement of performing science coincides with encounters termed as events. Referring to theories from the field of sociology (e.g., cf. Gebhardt, Hitzler, and Pfadenhauer 2000), an extraordinary and exceptional framing, interfused with dramaturgical practices, characterizes events. In most cases, they are professionally organized and staged. Moreover, their subject-based focus directly addresses the participants – whereas very different modalities of partaking exist. These range from merely attending a public lecture to actually evaluating the lecturer and their performance. Prominent examples are, *inter alia*, science slams, science plays, science galleries, and performing science-competitions, in which the audience votes on their favorite candidate, allowing the lecture and the performance framing to mutually enrich, rather than compete, against one another.

Marking contemporary knowledge society, none of the examples named above distinguish themselves through “knowing more” or even “knowing better,” but through the very fact that they are, to borrow the words of Knorr Cetina, “permeated with knowledge settings, the whole set of arrangements, processes and principles that serve knowledge and unfold with its articulation” (Knorr Cetina 2007, 361–62). These knowledge settings pervade different social fields and impact on and diversify each field’s respective praxis. Building on these observations, the present study brings into focus the performative dimension of knowledge, i.e., how knowledge is nested in and emerges from its use.

My study sets out to advance reflection on scientific cultures, entitling both the artistic and the academic as cultures of “creating and warranting knowledge” (Knorr Cetina 2007, 363). With reference to four case studies from the artistic and academic fields, I am following the praxeological argument that knowledge is neither a representational nor technological “product” of research, but – in the first instance – process-bound. Viewed from this angle, I construe culture as practice. My study, similar to Knorr Cetina’s analysis, moves “the level of cultural analysis ‘down’ to the realm of material regularities without losing sight of symbolic regularities and the ways these are associated with the material” (*ibid.*, 364). Yet my study expands Knorr Cetina’s approach in the sense that it renders knowledge formation processes possible beyond the academic field.

With reference to the notion of scientific cultures, my study delineates notions of “sharing knowledge” (UNESCO 2005, 159ff.), inferring that scientific knowledge formation is on trial in the sense that it is less linear, authoritarian, and discipline-bound, yet in the course of this, more complex (cf. UNESCO 2005, 115). Since I am building on the observation stated above that social fields and institutional frames and framings are increasingly emerging as

multifaceted and interactive, the question arises as to how knowledge practices reveal themselves between frame-dependency and coalition. Concerning this matter, my work turns toward the concept of lecture performances,<sup>4</sup> proposing that lecture performances have not only become “a feature of contemporary art” (Jentjens et al. 2009, 5) but also a feature that crosses the field of art and mirrors scientific cultures within contemporary knowledge societies. Thus, my study argues that lecture performances present themselves as highly revealing because they provide a space to exhibit and (re)negotiate the coalition of lecture and performance and – more importantly – artistic and academic practices. While the lecture and the performance frame have often been presented in binary terms, I argue that it is thoroughly productive to consider the space in-between – the very threshold between lectures and performances.

## 1.2 RESEARCH QUESTIONS, APPROACH, AND CONTRIBUTION

Since lecture performances encompass the scope of extending the possibilities of what artistic and what academic practices might be, the question that arises is not only how an artistic or rather academic subject matter emerges from the very act of framing it as such, but also how – beyond that – knowledge emerges within. Phrased differently, how are knowledge practices inscribed within artistic and academic lectures and performances – between discursive format and self-contained event? How do knowledge practices position themselves within art and academia and – in the course of this – shift the two social fields toward or apart from one other? Hence, how does the concept of lecture performances provide a space to exhibit and (re)negotiate the coalition between art and academia?

With reference to these questions, my study takes interest in the shift from the referential to the performative dimension and relocates knowing in the micro-practices of four sample case studies. Its methodology is a praxeological frame analysis that examines practices in the context of their creation as well as application. What this means is twofold: Firstly, the praxeological perspective encompasses the potential to unpack hermeneutic as well as empirical binaries, putting into focus how knowledge-dependent determinacy as well as indeterminacy guides praxis. Secondly, the frame analytical approach provides a space to point toward the embedded and situated dimension of praxis. This is of particular interest regarding the empirical material positioned between lecture and performance *and* art and academia. To be more precise, while primary frameworks and frames induce and prefigure practices, practices themselves – in turn – give meaning and define the primary frameworks and frames, hence

---

4 | For a list of prominent examples, please see Chapter 11.4.

not pointing toward notions of “either or,” but particularly toward notions of “as well as.” In this respect, a praxeological frame analysis and the methodology of direct observation elucidates how socially situated and interrelated processes become “know-able” and *de facto* manifest themselves.

In exploring knowledge practices in all their characteristics and dependencies, my study deepens reflection on how knowing is nested within praxis. I propose that a praxeological frame analysis and its deconstructive approach encompasses the potential to determine which forms of knowing appear and reveal themselves as legible, focusing upon the micro-systematics of the social and aiming to make the implicit logic of apparent self-evident practices visible. While two of the four case studies are framed as lectures, the two others are framed as performances – in each case, one alluding to the field of academia and one to the field of art. In this context it is worthwhile to note that the praxeological and frame analytical argument undergirds the supposition that lecturing, or rather performing, continually brings forth and defines practices that count as belonging to the lecture, or rather performance, frame. Viewed from this angle, knowledge practices are inevitably – and in the first instance – social.

The first analysis explores a lecture held by the experimental physics scientist Professor Dr. Michael Vollmer. I have chosen the academic discipline of experimental physics as it particularly distinguishes itself through its investigational methodologies, aiming to transcend spatiotemporal elements inherent to physical principles. In this context, it is worthwhile to make mention of Sibylle Peters’s study regarding the derivation of experimental lectures. Within her habilitation treatise *The lecture as performance* (2011), Peters examines the narrative of the academic lecture, pointing to the fact that within the evolutionary history of the modern university, the process of researching has not always been placed exclusively prior to its presentation but also directly within. Peters paraphrases Wilhelm von Humboldt, who attests that the act of presenting quickens insight, thus proposing that the act of researching, in the form of an experiment, and the act of lecturing *de facto* intersect within the presentation (2011, 86 ff., translation by the author). On account of this, alluding to Jan Golinski (1992), Peters argues that the exemplifying character of experimental lectures – between illustration and demonstration – encompasses the potential to facilitate the advancement of transdisciplinary research, i.e., research between art and academia (Peters 2014, 489ff.). This form of research is not predictable, i.e., it is “un-know-able,” what the experiment will *de facto* illustrate and demonstrate. In this regard, knowledge does not testify to consistency but adheres to its individual processes of the singular. Returning to the present case study linked to the field of experimental physics, this implies that “the know-able” relates to a process of the singular, which is – in the first instance – embedded within the interplay of a scientific demonstration, math-

ematical validation, and illustration using video documentation. The use of a high-speed video camera provides the framework for making the invisible, spatiotemporal-bound elements of effective velocity visible, i.e., “vis-able.”

The artistic lecture that I have chosen is Cage’s seminal “Lecture on nothing,” which deals directly with the lecture frame, specifically its framing and frame specific limits. In this respect, Cage’s lecture devotes itself to the question: how does a lecture emerge when an artist takes the position of the lecturer? In addition – apart from greatly influencing a concept that would come to be called lecture performance – “Lecture on nothing” distinguishes itself through its investigation of how a lecture’s score serves as a catalyst for rethinking the correlations between the notation, the enactment, and the actuality of a lecture.

The third case study, Eszter Salamon’s “Dance for nothing,” reflects on this very question, even though direct correlations between Cage’s lecture and Salamon’s performance are neither wholly straightforward nor unambiguous. Hence, referring to the Goffmanian theater frame and a performance concept as termed by Erika Fischer-Lichte, the question arises as to how an artistic lecture emerges when reframed as an artistic performance, precisely dealing with the very question of the lecture’s or rather performance’s author, principal, and animator. As definitions are not definite, the question raised is: what role does the framework theater and the framing performance effectively play regarding the performance’s knowledge practices?

Thus, the fourth case study, Professor Dr. Michael Vollmer’s and Professor Dr. Klaus-Peter Möllmann’s academic performance, “Making research experiential – fascinating phenomena observed through high-speed cameras,” staged at the University of Giessen and the Performing Science<sup>2</sup>-Competition, is doubly framed. On the one side, it is staged within an academic framework and has explicit similarities to acknowledged academic lecturing practices. This means the performance comprises practices that are, firstly, generally known to the participants as academic, secondly, precisely perceived as such, and thirdly, performed – mindless of being aware of this or not – accordingly. On the other side, the academic performance is staged within a competition framework and distinguishes itself through a manifold complex of performance practices. Thus, it is – more explicitly than the other three case studies – located in the context of the broader question regarding the thick interrelatedness regarding frames and framings, building on three aspects in particular. Firstly, the academic performance is staged within a competitive setting, in which artists as well as scientists – which the competition’s pre-jury selected prior to the competition – are competing against one another. Yet, and this is the second issue, the pre-jury has abstained from artistic or rather academic frames and

framings regarding the competition's set-up and its prize awards<sup>5</sup>. Despite this and owing to the competition's setting, some artists have however – and this is the third aspect – framed their performances as lectures, while some scientists have framed their lectures as performances. This causes the boundaries between artists and scientists – and their lectures or rather performances – to be highly blurred.

In this context, it is necessary to mention the fact that the transition from four individual case studies to generalized statements is justified by the iterative and recursive quality of analytically acquired practices that are empirically manifest in multiple cases. In this respect, the empirical findings facilitate the emergence of a knowledge concept that touches upon the non-priori deterministic properties of knowledge. In the course of this, the challenge lies in doing justice to praxis, which is – inevitably – only indirectly accessible. The double structure of knowledge practices displays itself as methodologically complicated, as the practices derive from multiple and at times conflicting “nexus of doings and sayings” (Schatzki 1996, 89). This confronts the analysis with the ingrained gap of practical and verbal reasoning and the methodological problem of plausibility (cf. Reckwitz 2008, 199, translation by the author, as well as Lynch 2001, 146).

Over and above, practices in general, and knowledge practices in particular, are not completely intelligible and explicable in the sense that they can be transcribed into a written text, but in fact emerge through the indexical and demonstrative quality of praxis itself – yet without becoming explicit per se. In these terms, every text reveals itself to be problematic as practices are always pre-constructed in accordance with language structures. Cognition is inevitably inscribed causing text to unavoidably emerge as a structuring agent in the perception of reality. Furthermore, a text's sequence-based structure can merely advance reflection upon one sequence at a time in spite of the fact that – within praxis – sequences tend to overlap. In this regard, words are merely assimilated and never adequate, thus superposing and transforming praxis. This transformation can be addressed, yet not solved.

Taking this into account, my study's multifocal and multidisciplinary perspective underscores the constitutive and interactive interrelations between lecture and performance and artistic and academic practices, inevitably addressing the question of where, how, and by whom boundaries are being

---

**5** | The first Performing Science-Competition staged in 2007 at the University of Gießen categorized the presentations by the candidates' artistic and academic backgrounds. Hence, there were artistic and academic prize awards. In 2011, however, this categorization was set aside, and the jury solely awarded three candidates regardless of their artistic or rather academic professional orientation.

drawn. In this respect, I recognize lecture performances to be a concept that renders contemporary occurrences – at the intersection of knowledge formation and induced regulation – comprehensible. The concept exposes how collision infiltrates contemporary practices and facilitates a shift in knowledge formation and validation processes – between artistic and academic lectures and performances.

Referring particularly to the space between the artistic and academic fields, the concept of performance becomes pivotal as it can be appropriated on an interdisciplinary scale as an expedient methodological tool that allows for making different cultural practices comprehensible. The concept of performance promotes reflection on how social recurrences and replications manifest themselves while simultaneously rethinking notions of the social. Hence, the implementation and actualization of a concept as that of performance points to the present experience linked to the singularity of the event that is not brought forth apart, but *in* and *against* its material and discursive denotation. New analytical parameters, which renegotiate and inevitably confound the fixed order of knowing, reveal themselves. Regarding notions of (un)certainly, the anthropologist Michael Jackson suggests

Lived experience accommodates our shifting sense of ourselves as subjects and as objects as acting upon and being acted upon by the world of living with and without certainty, of belonging and being estranged. (Jackson 1989, 2)

This shifting sense pertains to the interplay of referencing a subject matter and producing the very subject matter. It exposes the basis upon which the performative dimension of knowing reveals itself – between lectures and performances as academic teaching *and* artistic research formats. Beyond that, my study brings into focus the centrality of performance within contemporary knowledge society and points toward the necessities of thinking about contemporary culture as a continuous performative intervention.

Building on this, my study introduces a dynamic knowledge concept that attempts to understand individual knowledge practices and their relevance to the broader social context while simultaneously displaying itself as incessantly alterable. My work adheres to interrelations of acts of framing and acts of knowing – to their intrinsic correlations and the potential of transforming the epistemic through performance. This methodological approach does not exemplify the application of theoretical considerations, but goes beyond in the sense that it provides a conceptual and methodological tool to gain insight into contingent practices that are difficult to grasp. Hence, in appropriating a praxeological frame analysis and asking what lectures and performances *know* rather than what they *are*, my study marks the displacement of knowledge from the domain of truth – regardless of the artistic or academic field. The respective

cross-section attests that within the lecture and the performance frame a form of knowing is always already presupposed *and* at work.

Irrespective of the social field, my study aims to promote a more profound understanding of notions of knowing between lecture and performance and between academia and art as well as to put the separation into perspective. Particularly regarding lectures, Erving Goffman remarks:

Given that the situation *about* which a lecture deals is insulated in various ways from the situation *in* which the lecturing occurs, and is obliged to be insulated in this way, can an illustrated discussion of this disjunctive condition be carried on without breaching the very line that is under scrutiny? (Goffman 1981, 164f., italics in the original)

Here, Goffman points to the fact that praxis is predetermined by its larger cultural and scientific paradigms. Praxis adheres to frame-specific methodologies and mirrors frame-specifically acceptable knowledge acquisition. Praxis is bound to its spatiotemporal elements – always being more than it knows itself to be. This raises the question how it is *de facto* possible to scrutinize praxis.

My work is engaged in this very question. Its transdisciplinary approach aims to act as an intermediary that reworks the relationship between artistic and academic practices. It contributes to the field through providing a space for the gradual transitions of how knowing comports itself at the interface of lecture and performance and the artistic and the academic. To be more precise, while the artistic and the academic field are entitled to their differences, my study sets its focus and promotes reflection on the actual practices within these two fields, deploying the concept of lecture performances. What this means is twofold. Firstly, while my work contributes to contouring the concept of lecture performances, it, secondly, corroborates the hypothesis that while the artistic or rather academic “products” keep the two fields apart, their matter of doings, i.e., their practices, comprise similarities. From this, I contend that the sustained division between the artistic and the academic field primarily relates to processes of dissemination rather than actualities. As both art and academia have, in the course of time, developed separate domains, my work calls attention toward “the space of knowledge-in-action” (Knorr Cetina 1999, 3), rather than the discourse surrounding it. Thus, theoretically as well as methodologically, my study particularly contributes to the fields of artistic research, performance and theater studies, and cultural studies. My work acts on field-specific procedures and methodologies and contours a knowledge concept that renders possible encounters beyond social fields with the objective of stimulating and engaging in transdisciplinary dialogue.

### 1.3 BETWEEN SCHOLARSHIP AND PERFORMANCE PRACTICE

During the process of writing this study, I attended numerous lecture performances, conducted interviews with performers and field experts, and completed theoretical research. Simultaneously, I was consistently engaged in my own artistic practice that (re)articulated my research positions. In this respect, my artistic practice and the actual staging of lecture performances inhabited a space in-between where knowing was – first and foremost – in the process of being established. Within this process, I compiled scores, wrote observation protocols, and carried out open interviews. I did, to borrow the words of Gilbert Ryle, “a bit of theory and then [...] a bit of practice” (Ryle 1949, 29) as:

To do something thinking what one is doing is, according to this legend, always to do two things; namely, to consider certain appropriate propositions, or prescriptions, and to put into practice what these propositions or prescriptions enjoin. (Ibid.)

Thus, working at the intersection of scholarship and performance practice, I postulate permeability between theoretical and practical (re)articulation. Yet during my research process I also adopted the position of a Ph.D. candidate within a university context. I accepted regulations in which there is no provision for a practice-based doctoral degree. This clarifies why this part of the present study is exclusively theory-based. I am however very much aware of the fact that the act of writing about performance fundamentally alters the artistic practice. On account of this, I have, to borrow the words of Peggy Phelan, found myself more and more inspired by acts of writing and publishing that “re-mark again the performative possibilities of writing itself” (Phelan 1993, 148). At the present, I am exploring a methodology within which words *de facto* emerge as performative. In the course of this, the graphic composition presents itself as a starting point to (re)examine my epistemic interests and start investigating productive contact points between my text, the video stills, the purpose-made diagrams, and the practical implementation of Goffman’s frame analysis. At this juncture, it is crucial to state that the graphic compositions relate to medium sensitivity, i.e., a work-in-progress, that I am further exploring and implementing.