



EMORY
LIBRARIES &
INFORMATION
TECHNOLOGY

OpenEmory

Enactment and Exegesis: Recontextualizing Wilson's *The Three Ladies of London* through Performance as Research

Kevin Quarmby, *Emory University*

Conference Name: Performance as Research in Early English Theatre
Studies: The Three Ladies of London in Context

Publisher: McMaster University

Conference Place: Hamilton ON Canada

Publication Date: 2015-06

Type of Work: Conference | Final Publisher PDF

Permanent URL: <https://pid.emory.edu/ark:/25593/rqcsh>

Final published version: <http://threeladiesoflondon.mcmaster.ca/par/index.htm>

Copyright information:

Property of the author and Performance as Research in Early English Theatre
Studies: The Three Ladies of London in Context post-conference website.

Accessed September 22, 2019 9:17 AM EDT

KEVIN A. QUARMBY¹

Enactment and Exegesis: Recontextualizing Wilson's *The Three Ladies of*

***London* through Performance as Research**

McMaster University's The Three Ladies of London conference engages with Wilson's early modern dramatic text through Performance as Research (PAR). The archival recordings that make up this PAR moment reside in, and are accessed from, their digital home on the Queen's Men Editions website (QME). Within the wider academic community, however, PAR has yet to achieve its full potential or acceptance. This essay considers the reason for this lessening of PAR's scholarly status, associated, as it seems, with the hierarchical superiority of more traditional print-based exegesis, which is invariably prioritized and valorized as the sole means to validate PAR's academic potential. Such valorization denies the collaborative model PAR offers as a laboratory for innovative scholarly inquiry. In addition, this essay questions the prevailing hegemony, and inherent presentism, of recent reconstructional 'original practice' scholarship, while offering an argument for recontextualizing, reviving, and re-enlivening the dramatic text through the embodied skill of the PAR actor.

Citation: Quarmby, Kevin A., 'Enactment and Exegesis: Recontextualizing Wilson's *The Three Ladies of London* through Performance as Research', *Performance as Research in Early English Theatre Studies: The Three Ladies of London in Context*, <http://threeladiesoflondon.mcmaster.ca/par/KevinQuarmby.htm>

[In] the so-called 'postmodern moment' of the late-twentieth century, happening sometime between 1950 and 1990, ... the modernist model of the nineteenth-century scholar-poet re-emerged as the 'practitioner-researcher', and fresh methods of melding art and scholarship were invented. (Baz Kershaw 2011)¹

Paradoxically, a written manuscript is still often used as a starting point or a tool when preparing a performance. The spoken word is central Interpretations, comments and evaluations in written form traditionally belong to the realm of critics, scholars and historians; that is, they are to be done from 'outside' of practice. (Annette Arlander 2013)²

¹ Kevin Quarmby (kquarmb@emory.edu) is assistant professor in the department of English at Oxford College of Emory University.

I have the distinct feeling that the university tolerates my artistic and creative research because I continue to also produce bone-tiringly appropriate academic scholarship.

(Lynette Hunter 2009)³

Within the global academic community, Performance as Research (PAR) – the United States/Canadian version of its more artistically diverse acronymic sister, Practice as Research (PaR) – remains a contentious, often paradoxical, though fast-expanding opportunity for intellectual and artistic inquiry. Developed in theatre and performance departments in the US (most notably at New York University and Northwestern University in 1980 and 1985 respectively), Performance as Research (PAR) is thus decidedly theatre-centric in its investigative approach.⁴ Performance as Research (PAR) struggles with self-identification, however, precisely because of its close association with Practice as Research (PaR), which represents the predominant 1990s model for ‘practitioner-researchers’ allied with the British academy.⁵ Generally encountered in the UK, New Zealand, Australian, continental European, the Nordic, and South African academies, Practice as Research (PaR) nevertheless finds difficulty in articulating the difference between the university and the ‘art school/conservatoire’ experience.⁶ Where does practice as professional development end and practice as research begin? Because Practice as Research (PaR) is not restricted to the theatre, but traditionally invites the established artist (musician, dancer, actor, painter, director, author, playwright, poet, etc) into the academic setting, an ‘uneasy’ historical relationship has developed between the practitioner and the scholar.⁷ The creative artist and the academic researcher vie to maintain some PaR parity of status.

As this essay will argue, the uneasy relationship between the practitioner and scholar is further exacerbated in Performance as Research (PAR), as opposed to PaR studies, because of the perceived qualitative worth of the PAR experience. Since PAR often relies less on ‘professional’ actors (those trained and experienced in contemporary theatre theory and practice), and more on ‘amateur’ actors (implying either the pejoratively unskilled or the passionately dedicated though unpaid), the concomitant value of its research is decidedly biased in favor of the scholarly observer, rather than the practitioner.⁸ Such bias inevitably leads to the very problem that has troubled Performance-as-Research (PAR) scholarship since its theatre-studies inception: the prioritizing of ‘bone-tiringly appropriate’ scholarly exegesis in written, as opposed to performed, recorded, and digitally disseminated documentary form.⁹ This textual paradox, which, as Annette Arlander reminds us, is characterized by PAR scholarship conducted ‘outside’ the practice it considers, represents the principal focus of this study.¹⁰

Given the ‘outside’ voyeurism of much PAR scholarship, understandably the objectives, methodologies, and best-practice procedures of PAR seem as elusive and mutable as the early modern drama that McMaster University’s *The Three Ladies of London* workshop/symposium seeks to examine. Nevertheless, the importance of PAR appears self-evident to mixed-media research projects like *Queen’s Men Editions (QME)*, whose willingness to mount Wilson’s play affords the opportunity to explore the experimental potential of Performance as Research within the theatrical laboratory of embodied digital scholarship.¹¹ Exploration nevertheless implies an entry into unknown, uncharted territory. Although the metaphorical map appears blank for vast swathes of our early modern performance knowledge, PAR represents the most practical vehicle for embarking on this journey of theatrical discovery.

What, then, will be the outcome of these endeavors? What new lessons about early modern dramatic production and interpretation will be learned from *The Three Ladies of London*? McMaster University's 2015 conference seems set to pose as many new questions as it does answer existing ones. As this essay's title suggests, however, it is important to contextualize this moment of PAR praxis within the broader narrative of early modern scholarship, which is dominated by an academy keen to embrace and incorporate – or possibly tame – digital technology as an adjunct to the peer-reviewed 'written' text which represents the 'spine of the system'.¹² This essay seeks, therefore, to situate this Performance-as-Research moment in the historiography of early modern theatre studies, while explaining the practitioner-researcher's role in the historio-creative process. In consequence, its purpose is to examine the archival significance of the early modern dramatic text in its 'live' articulated, though digitally recorded, performance context; note the battle for primacy between performers who 'act' with body, voice, and intellectual reflexivity, and scholars who 'react' no less intellectually, but with pen and keyboard; interrogate the importance of skill, expertise, and creativity in the re-enactment setting; consider the emergence of new technology in the application and dissemination of PAR knowledge; and question the dominance of peer-reviewable scholarly exegesis as an academic badge of entitlement for the PAR practitioner.

The textual dichotomy inherent in reconstructing a performance, which is then analyzed through the 'medium of a word-processed text', and reified by the academy as PAR scholarship, is evident in the collection of essays preceding and accompanying the conference proceedings.¹³ Indeed, the act of reading this essay – an 'act' in which you, the reader, are participating at this very moment – confirms the implicit foregrounding of scholarly textual discourse in the Performance-as-Research process. The secular exegesis, with which this essay associates itself,

seemingly valorizes ‘written’ scholarship in PAR, to the detriment of the performance enactment it examines.¹⁴ For many PAR practitioners and commentators, such scholarly exegesis remains a necessary prerequisite for departmental acceptance and research funding within the academy. The peer-reviewed written word is still key. This prioritization is not surprising, since, as Diana Taylor argues, the ‘theoretical tools’ of performance-related studies such as PAR ‘continue to be haunted by the literary legacy’, with a traditional humanities ‘training in close readings and textual analysis’ turning everything ‘into a text or narrative’.¹⁵ Even though our ‘range of materials’ expands exponentially, this focus on textuality ‘still leaves the explanatory power with the letrados while occluding other forms of transmission’.¹⁶ Likewise, Mark J.V. Olsen’s clarion call to ‘hack the humanities’, which ‘involves exploring literacies and practices beyond the *critical consumption of culture* and enacting a broader array of *critically productive* practices, including but not limited to the textual or even the critical’, confirms a growing mistrust of traditional ‘letrados’ hierarchies.¹⁷ Although the academy is unlikely to change in the foreseeable future, since close reading and textual analysis are ingrained in our scholarly psyche, an awareness of this prioritizing of the written word might at least invite experimentation with alternative forms of exegesis within the PAR setting. The *Queen’s Men Editions* website, for example, offers an innovative platform for exposing, demonstrating, translating, and presenting its ‘sensuous material’, while combining the latest advances in digital scholarship and pedagogy.¹⁸ A *QME* laboratory of PAR innovation can record, analyze, and disseminate on an international scale the ‘liveness’ of early modern dramatic experimentation.¹⁹ The written exegesis that accompanies this research must, if it is to stand the test of time and intellectual inquiry, embrace this ‘liveness’ for it to maintain its value in the academic arena.

The development of what Arlander calls ‘enhanced forms of multimedia writing’, as offered by *QME*, assists in resituating PAR away from the ‘letrados’, and more into the hands of practitioners who embody the plays they perform.²⁰ Since we no longer straddle a Nietzschean bridge between ink and paper supremacy and digital revolutionary disruption, but are active combatants in the ongoing battle to define the parameters of academic technological engagement, we must ‘not simply “digitise” the humanities – to move our scholarship online by simply substituting typeset ink on paper with pixelated fonts on a screen’ – but also develop digital platforms in a truly collaborative humanities laboratory model.²¹ As with many instances of modern warfare, battles are lost and won not on the battlefield, but in the laboratory, where practical experimentation, experiential research, and the testing of theories, drive the scientific quest for knowledge.²² Indeed, the laboratory analogy extends even further since, as Riley and Hunter suggest, the ‘modern arts and humanities have tended to structure a gap between practice and analysis’, a gap that the sciences have long chosen to ignore.²³ While the United States might lag behind this revolution in practical research, Canada, with its ‘new [in 2009] “practice-based” or “performance-led” research paradigm’, promoted by the nation’s Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC), is at the forefront of bridging the practice/analysis gap.²⁴ Only when the academic consumers of PAR resituate its critical reception away from the hierarchy of the word-processed text, and toward the transdisciplinary democratization of the exploratory laboratory, can PAR’s productive potential be realized.²⁵ The McMaster University conference offers an opportunity to examine this democratized laboratory experience at close hand.

The desire to contextualize the PAR moment mirrors the overarching desire to contextualize *The Three Ladies of London* as an inventively created performance construct.

Nevertheless, as Paul Carter describes when discussing the ‘condition of invention’ in creative arts inquiry, invention only ‘begins when what signifies exceeds its signification – when what means one thing, or conventionally functions in one role, discloses other possibilities’.²⁶

In general, a double movement occurs, of decontextualisation in which the found elements are rendered strange, and of recontextualisation, in which new families of association and structures of meaning are established.²⁷

Carter’s description of decontextualization and recontextualization is inherent in the ‘act’ of PAR. The decontextualizing and recontextualizing of Wilson’s *The Three Ladies of London* informs and/or re-forms our understanding of early modern performance in general. This same act of de- and recontextualization also demands that we de- and reconsider twenty-first-century scholarly conventions that tend to dictate the direction for many early modern theatre research agendas.

To decontextualize and recontextualize the early modern dramatic experience, PAR needs to distance the performance act from the intrinsic ‘temporality’ of prescriptive theatre research.²⁸ Without this distancing, which acknowledges the unwitting presentism of some recent scholarship, the historiographical impact of our research findings will prove less reflexively insightful, more hegemonic in their pre-dictated focus.²⁹ Of course, without the postmodern levelling of the early modern playing field by new historicist, feminist, and repertory studies commentators, our interest in the performativity of plays like *The Three Ladies of London* would hardly exist. Coupled with the now ubiquitous historicization of such playtexts, the digital revolution that permits text trawling scholarship to search for historical clues, hidden not only in the early modern dramatic canon, but also in almost every instance of printed material published over the relatively short-lived period of play production, remains of profound though unexpected importance to PAR studies. Rather than open doors for future research, the scholarship that

dictates our twenty-first-century fascination with ‘original practice’ – a suitably ironic new acronym might be ‘OPaR’ or ‘Original Practice as Research’ – now dominates, drives, and ultimately prescribes the parameters for practical experimentation and inventiveness in many PAR activities. In that respect, ‘original practice’ imposes an idea of ‘early modern authenticity’ that is as unsatisfactory in its presentist inauthenticity as it is restrictive in its research agenda diktat.

In the present academic climate, where the quest for ‘early modern authenticity’ is reflected in performance projects that attempt to recreate an ‘authentic’ past performance style and technique – evident, for example, in the ‘original staging conditions’ invoked by the American Shakespeare Center at Staunton, Virginia, and in the near-slavish adherence to actors rehearsing from minimally-cued parts – it must seem a heresy to see the elevated status of recent early modern theatre practice scholarship called into question.³⁰ The undeniably valid focus on the materiality of theatrical production, as facilitated by commercially successful reproductions of indoor and outdoor playhouses, has created the intellectual (and grant-funding) climate for such published research to prosper.³¹ As Kershaw comments, however, the ‘devil of commodification’ dances dangerously close to such authenticating ‘*lasting* “knowledge”’ teleology.³² It is therefore wise to consider Jim Davis’s caveat that, although a ‘firm grounding in the process of theatre historiography is essential’, one must still remain ‘alert to the need not only to take nothing on trust, but also to question continually the methods and methodologies through which the theatrical past is approached by theatre historians’ in the present.³³ PAR must rely on such continued methodological questioning if it is to achieve its fullest academic potential. In our attempt to reconstruct the authentic ‘how it was’, Davis adds, we should at least question the extent to which this recontextualization of the theatrical experience relies on ‘traces

that are too insubstantial to enable anything more than a speculative engagement with the past'.³⁴ Given that PAR engages with the 'ephemeral and intangible' in an 'inevitable interplay of "liveness" and disappearance in any past performance', Davis's admonishing demand, that 'research method in theatre and performance history and historiography must enable both memorialisation and disruption', while embracing 'oral testimony and embodied history as well as the material object and the written text', appears both reasonable and self-evident.³⁵ Indeed, the fact that PAR 'records and documents', as it 'also interrogates and interprets', highlights how the disruptive immediacy and liveness of creative embodiment are what differentiate PAR from traditional authenticating research models.³⁶

Like any performance-based research method, PAR 'arguably comes alive', says Davis, 'at the moment when careful scholarship and detailed research merge with imaginative speculation to ignite a creative yet informed response to live events that may have occurred either in the immediate or distant past': 'It relies on data, but as a means not an end. It is open to multiple perspectives creating a complementary and/or contrasting range of histories for any one event.'³⁷ The coming alive of a performance tradition, now lost through time and disuse, and the attendant creation of recorded and accessible data in mixed-media format, inform our interrogation and interpretation of *The Three Ladies of London*. What we do with this PAR 'moment' depends, however, on the extent that we view such research as yet another 'authentic' re-creation of lost theatre practice. Rather than settling once and for all those intangibles traditionally associated with recent early modern theatre studies, we should consider the recorded archival documentation of the 2015 *QME* experiment as a newly authenticated historical entity in its own right, which builds on the 'multiple perspectives' offered by PAR, while presenting this archive in openly-accessible, reproducible, and imaginatively interrogable form.

The demand for a new authenticity for PAR re-creativity, whereby the laboratory archive represents the only truly ‘authentic’ research material, guarantees an unmediated value for this reflexive ‘moment’ in early modern drama studies, and its ready availability for future generations of researchers. The quest for such new authenticity, versus the textual re-authenticizing associated with traditional ‘original practice’ research, is considered by Gilli Bush-Bailey and Jacky Bratton, who suggest developing ‘reactionary strategies for avoiding the pitfalls’ of presentism in the re-creative process.³⁸ Warning that traditional approaches which ‘seek to “reconstruct” past performance axiomatically carry the notion that the first, or original, state can be rebuilt’, Bush-Bailey and Bratton promote their alternative ‘reactionary strategy’ of ‘revival’, of breathing life into a play-text and observing the outcome of its creative vivification.³⁹ This quest to revive – to return some semblance of ‘liveness’ to a lost theatrical practice – as opposed to rebuilding, reconstructing, or re-creating according to prevailing scholarly opinion, implicitly foregrounds the ‘performer’, rather than the theatre historian, in PAR practice.

The very act of revival, of injecting ‘liveness’ into a drama like *The Three Ladies of London*, relies on the performers who participate in the PAR process. Indeed, as Riley and Hunter suggest, PAR research ‘requires action or acting in some fashion’, a performative function that belongs as much to the actor, as it does to the scholar or teacher who utilize such ‘action’ in the professional setting.⁴⁰ As already noted, however, action or acting need not, with PAR, be associated with actorly skill or talent. Indeed, our reliance on academic grants and funding often forces the PAR scholar to employ students and unpaid practitioners, a situation which in turn impacts, often negatively, on the perceived research outcomes. This paradoxical division between skilled and unskilled creatives, and the researchers that ‘employ’ them, adds to

the ‘them and us’ mentality of scholarly analysis. Such hierarchical disunion is only of import, however, when the ‘romantic reading of creativity’, of ‘being original at all costs’, masks the true value of ‘liveness’ in performance research.⁴¹ Although ‘expertise’ can certainly be an ‘important condition for higher creative achievement’, so Vlad Petre Glăveanu argues, ‘this does not imply that all experts are extremely creative or that beginners necessarily show little or no creativity’.⁴²

PAR requires our acceptance that all performers, regardless of experience or prior knowledge, will create diverse embodied performances, the mediated new authenticities of which still demand to be acknowledged, analyzed, and additionally researched. The actor who embodies the theatrical text – whose expertise and/or enthusiasm, skill and/or inventiveness, informs the epistemology of early modern theatre practice – and who assists in the creation of mixed-media documentation that represents the ‘articulation of practitioners’ questions and process of working’ in the PAR laboratory, is fundamental to the success of the *Three Ladies of London* exploratory project.⁴³ The actor in PAR must be trusted to bring her/his skills to the research table, as opposed to being molded by a theoretical agenda that values scholarly conjecture and textual exegesis above the ‘liveness’ of the performance moment.

Coda

The Three Ladies of London in Context conference, with its exploration of Performance as Research as an important adjunct to early English theatre studies, revealed far more by way of exciting new questions than it offered prescriptive, definitive answers. This collaborative event, which brought together its international gathering of like-minded academics and practitioners, fulfilled its experimental potential by opening a fruitful and stimulating dialogue about PAR

(Performance as Research) that continues in these ‘afterthought codas’. The overarching demand of my own pre-conference paper – that the event should manifest in a ‘theatrical laboratory of embodied digital scholarship’ – was not only met, but also exceeded in expectation. Of course, the refreshing foregrounding of subsequent questions, rather than the false celebration of substantive answers, invites a level of personal reflection not usually prioritized in post-conference exegetic analyses. The invitation to write these codas appears as radical, therefore, as the prioritized written exegesis of traditional scholarship seems ossified, especially when compared with the diverse opportunities for dissemination accorded the newly empowered digital humanist. This coda participates in an ongoing dialogue of reflexive immediacy that builds on the sense of community established over a few Canadian summer days.

If, as it appears, these codas represent proof of the strength of our new international dialogue, then the speakers who shared their own PAR experiences were principal catalysts to this exchange. For example, and in accord with Mark J.V. Olsen’s call to ‘hack the humanities’, thereby to enact a ‘broader array of critically productive practices’, Rob Conkie demonstrated his own innovative exploitation of the ‘intersections between performance as research, publication, and pedagogy’.⁴⁴ Rather than shy away from the complex interactions and intersections of these too-often isolated academic demagogies, Conkie’s multi-platform revisualizations of theatrical experimentation demonstrated the potential for thinking ‘outside the box’ of scholarly exegesis, even when inserting ideas ‘inside the box’ of a Sudoku puzzle. Conkie’s revisionist exposition of his PAR laboratory experiments revealed the possibilities for congruous inter- and intraplay between actors, directors, and academic writers.

The performed, recorded, and digitally disseminated PAR documents that Conkie presented served to prove how and why objects of research should be both aesthetically

innovative and worthy of emulation in the collaborative humanities laboratory. Just as my own paper argued that ‘academic consumers of PAR [need to] resituate its critical reception away from the hierarchy of the word-processed text, and toward the transdisciplinary democratization of the exploratory laboratory’, so Conkie’s keynote demonstrated how such ‘transdisciplinary democratization’ is already in active service among many international theatre scholars.

In a similar vein, Christian Billings’s keynote, which addressed the concepts of ‘linguistic hospitality’, ‘thick translation’, and ‘translational and performative community’ as aids for researching ‘historically distant material’, successfully countered what I call the ‘unwitting presentism’ of recent Original Practice scholarship.⁴⁵ Rather than reified objects of research, the early modern dramatic texts that Billings explores through his twenty-first century PAR practices become ‘openly-accessible, reproducible, and imaginatively interrogable’ archives in their own right. Paul Carter’s demand for ‘decontextualisation’ and ‘recontextualisation, in which new families of association and structures of meaning are established’, appears realized in the ‘performative community’ of Billings’s research.⁴⁶ Revivification, not reconstruction for its anachronistic sake seems key.

These responses to the keynote speakers dovetail seamlessly with my concerns for a revised and liberated form of exegesis and an escape from prescriptive scholarly dogma concerning OP practice. Of equal significance was the astonishing insight the performances directed by Peter Cockett and Jennifer Roberts-Smith offered me as a scholar, practitioner, and editor. Whether by triggering intellectual associations that a cold reading of *The Three Ladies of London* had failed to ignite, or by completely refocusing my impression of *Henry VI, Part 1*’s generic status in the early modern repertory, these two examples of directors and actors injecting ‘liveness’ into a performance confirmed, for me, the qualitative worth of PAR.

Likewise, and as highlighted in my paper, the question of valuing the performance of any individual, regardless of creative skill or experience, was also brought into stark relief. Both productions relied on well-meaning student performers. Both productions offered these performers the scope and freedom to experiment and explore. Both productions proved invaluable for stimulating ideas, connections, alternative readings, etc. My own interests as editor of *Henry VI, Part 1* for Internet Shakespeare Editions informed my close association with Roberts-Smith's production, and I enjoyed fully the opportunity to work with her cast on the staged production. On a personal level, the exuberance and comic flair the young performers injected into their version led me to reconsider the play's generic purpose and reception in a fascinating way. Rarely presented on the modern stage, when *Henry VI, Part 1* does appear, it is performed as if an uncomfortably ill-mannered poor cousin to its *Parts 2* and *3* counterparts. The PAR rendition of the University of Waterloo students presented instead a xenophobic, jingoistic romp through a comical history, seemingly freed from the shackles of Shakespeare completism. Characters that traditionally are presented with neo-modern realism were permitted instead to explore their cipher-like hyperrealism, with the French presented as lascivious buffoons, while the English aristocracy quarreled and contrived among themselves as the nation spiraled into factional disarray. The worthy Talbot, a medieval old-school chevalier, seemed doomed from the moment he entered the stage. The sadness of his death and exsanguination of his family bloodline only sharpened the focus by which we saw the political ineptitude of a monarch who cannot even keep the dandified French at bay, let alone control his own court. Only through the liveness of PAR could so informative a reconsideration occur. This same reconsideration – this decontextualisation and recontextualisation of a contentious 'Shakespeare' play – illustrates gloriously the impactful potential of PAR and its relevance to early modern theatre studies.

Notes

¹ Baz Kershaw with Lee Miller/Joanne ‘Bob’ Whalley and Rosemary Lee/Niki Pollard, ‘Practice as Research: Transdisciplinary Innovation in Action’, Baz Kershaw and Helen Nicholson (eds), *Research Methods in Theatre and Performance* (Edinburgh, 2011), 63.

² Annette Arlander, ‘Interlude 4: To Write PaR, Once Upon a Time in the Chilly North’, *Experiments & Intensities Vol 3, Mediating Practice(s): Performance as Research and-in-through-Mediation*, 3 (2013), <http://www.experimentsandintensities.com/published/vol-3/interlude-4-to-write-par/> (accessed 29 November 2014).

³ Lynette Hunter, ‘Theory/Practice as Research: Explorations, Questions and Suggestions’, Shannon Rose Riley and Lynette Hunter (eds), *Mapping Landscapes for Performance as Research: Scholarly Acts and Creative Cartographies* (Houndmills and New York, 2009), 235.

⁴ A concise overview of the PAR/PaR geographical and methodological division appears in Riley and Hunter’s ‘Introduction’ to *Mapping Landscapes*, xv–xx.

⁵ Robin Nelson, *Practice as Research in the Arts: Principles, Protocols, Pedagogies, Resistances* (Houndmills and New York, 2013), 8.

⁶ Nelson, *Practice as Research*, 5. For Practice as Research (PaR) in various arts disciplines see, for example: Patricia Leavy, *Method Meets Art: Arts-Based Research Practice* (New York, 2009); Anna Pakes, ‘Original Embodied Knowledge: The Epistemology of the New in Dance Practice as Research’, *Research in Dance Education*, 4.2 (2003): 127-49; Graeme Sullivan, *Art Practice as Research: Inquiry in Visual Arts*, 2nd edn (London, 2010); Jane W. Davidson (ed.),

The Music Practitioner: Research for the Music Performer, Teacher and Listener (Aldershot, 2004).

⁷ Kershaw, *Research Methods*, 63. For the interdisciplinary, industrial, and community benefits of inter-artistic creative arts research as a ‘successor science’, see Estelle Barrett, ‘Introduction: Extending the Field: Invention, Application and Innovation in Creative Arts Enquiry’, Estelle Barrett and Barbara Bolt (eds), *Material Inventions: Applying Creative Arts Research* (London, 2014), 3.

⁸ The author has personal experience of such PAR evaluation in relation to a PaR commission. In 2011, as an invited ‘actor/director/researcher’, Quarmby assisted undergraduate University of Sussex Drama Studies and English students to present their version of Ben Jonson’s *The Masque of Queens*. The presence of the practitioner-researcher proved of less significance, however, than the learning outcomes for the amateur performers, who were invited to engage ‘imaginatively with early modern drama in a contemporary theatrical context’, and to reflect on this engagement, without fully appreciating any wider significance for their research outcomes. Quoted from Matthew Dimmock, *Q3091 Early Modern Drama and Contemporary Theatre*, University of Sussex, Course Description (2011).

⁹ Hunter, ‘Theory/Practice as Research’, 235.

¹⁰ Arlander, ‘Interlude 4’.

¹¹ For video technology’s role in recording ‘the embodied experience’, see comments by Natalia de Campos in Arlander, ‘Interlude 3: To Write PaR: An International Conversation’, *Experiments & Intensities Vol 3* (2013)

<http://www.experimentsandintensities.com/published/vol-3/interlude-3-to-write-par/>

(accessed 29 November 2014).

¹² Brad Haseman, 'Performance as Research in Australia: Legitimizing Epistemologies', Riley and Hunter (eds), *Mapping Landscapes*, 58.

¹³ Mark J.V. Olsen, 'Hacking the Humanities: Twenty-First-Century Literacies and the "Becoming-Other" of the Humanities', Eleonora Belfiore and Anna Upchurch (eds), *Humanities in the Twenty-First Century: Beyond Utility and Markets* (Houndmills and New York, 2013), 238.

¹⁴ See Barbara Bolt, 'The Magic is in Handling', Estelle Barrett and Barbara Bolt (eds), *Practice as Research: Approaches to Creative Arts Enquiry* (London, 2007; rev. edn 2010), 34.

¹⁵ Diana Taylor, *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas* (Durham NC, 2003), 27.

¹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁷ Olsen, 'Hacking', 240.

¹⁸ Arlander, 'Interlude 3'.

¹⁹ See Jim Davis, 'Researching Theatre History and Historiography: Research Methods and Methodology', Kershaw and Nicholson (eds), *Research Methods*, 97.

²⁰ Arlander, 'Interlude 3'. See also Michael Schwab (ed.), *Journal for Artistic Research (JAR)*, 6 (2014) <http://www.jar-online.net/index.php/issues/view/488> (accessed 30 November 2014).

²¹ Olsen, 'Hacking', 244-5. See also Cathy N. Davidson and David Theo Goldberg, 'A Manifesto for the Humanities in a Technological Age', The Chronicle Review, *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (13 February 2004) http://uchri.org/media/pdfs/Manifesto_Humanities.pdf (accessed 5 December 2014).

²² Olsen, 'Hacking', 241. See also Erika Fischer Lichte, 'Methodologies: Theorizing Theatre and Performance', Minou Arjomand (ed. and trans.) and Ramona Mosse (ed.), *The Routledge Introduction to Theatre and Performance Studies* (London and New York, 2014), 108.

²³ Riley and Hunter, 'Introduction', xv.

²⁴ Laura Levin, 'Locating the Artist-Researcher: Shifting Sites of Performance as Research (PAR) in Canada', Riley and Hunter (eds), *Mapping Landscapes*, 63.

²⁵ For the transdisciplinarity of PAR as a 'method or methodology in search of results across disciplines', see Baz Kershaw, 'Performance Practice as Research: Perspectives from a Small Island', Riley and Hunter (eds), *Mapping Landscapes*, 5.

²⁶ Paul Carter, 'Interest: The Ethics of Invention', Barrett and Bolt (eds), *Practice as Research*, 15.

²⁷ Ibid, 15-16

²⁸ Arlander, 'Interlude 4'.

²⁹ Gilli Bush-Bailey with Jacky Bratton, 'Researching Theatre History and Historiography: Case Study 2: Memory, Absence and Agency: An Approach to Practice-Based Research in Theatre History', Kershaw and Nicholson (eds), *Research Methods*, 106.

³⁰ American Shakespeare Center, "Blackfriars Playhouse" (2014)

<<http://www.americanshakespearecenter.com/v.php?pg=124>> [accessed 18 December 2014].

See also Simon Palfrey and Tiffany Stern, *Shakespeare in Parts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

³¹ See, for example, Tiffany Stern and Farah Karim-Cooper (eds), *Shakespeare's Theatres and the Effects of Performance* (London: Bloomsbury, 2013).

³² Kershaw, 'Performance Practice', 9.

³³ Davis, 'Research Theatre History', 98.

³⁴ Ibid, 97.

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ Ibid.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Bush-Bailey and Braton, 'Case Study 2', 106

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Riley and Hunter, 'Introduction', xix. See also Ian Watson, 'An Actor Prepares: Performance as Research (PAR) in the Theatre', Riley and Hunter (eds), *Mapping Landscapes*, 84-90, claims the academy is 'not short of individuals' who combine the 'artistic complex of inspiration, talent, training, skilled craftsmanship, experience, and personal expression with a deep investigation of their artform that bears the hallmarks of academic rigor', in a manner far 'closer to the fieldwork of anthropologists or sociologists' (84)

⁴¹ Vlad Petre Glăveanu, *Thinking through Creativity and Culture: Toward an Integrated Model* (New Brunswick NJ and London, 2014), 55.

⁴² Ibid, 189.

⁴³ Adam J. Ledger, with Simon K. Ellis and Fiona Wright, 'The Question of Documentation: Creative Strategies in Performance as Research', Kershaw and Nicholson (eds), *Research Methods*, 163.

⁴⁴ Olsen, 'Hacking', 238; Rob Cronkie, 'Fain would I dwell on form': Performance / Publication / Pedagogy', *Three Ladies of London in Context*, Keynote Speakers (2015).

<<http://threeladiesoflondon.mcmaster.ca/keynote2/index.htm>> [accessed 28 August 2015].

⁴⁵ Christian Billing, 'Historiography, Rehearsal Processes, and Performance as Translation; or, How to Stage Early Modern English Drama Today?', *Three Ladies of London in Context*, Keynote Speakers (2015) <<http://threeladiesoflondon.mcmaster.ca/keynote/index.htm>> [accessed 28 August 2015].

⁴⁶ Carter, 'Interest', 15.