

## 5 Philip Auslander

### Can we conserve performance?

*A conversation with Hanna B. Hölling,  
Jules Pelta Feldman, and Emilie Magnin*

Philip Auslander's primary research interest is in performance, especially in relation to art, music, media, and technology. He has authored nine books and edited two collections, exploring diverse forms of aesthetic and cultural performances such as theater, film acting, performance art, music, stand-up comedy, robotic performance, and courtroom procedures. Some of his notable works include *In Concert: Performing Musical Persona* (2021), *Reactivations: Essays on Performance and Its Documentation* (2018), *Performing Glam Rock: Gender and Theatricality in Popular Music* (2006), and the third edition of *Liveness: Performance in a Mediatized Culture* (2023). Apart from his research on performance, Auslander has also contributed art criticism to publications like *Artforum* and has written catalogue essays for museums and galleries in several countries; he also serves as the editor of *The Art Section: An Online Journal of Art and Cultural Commentary*. In addition, Auslander is an active screen actor with credits listed on the Internet Movie Database.

**What does the concept of conserving performance entail from your unique perspective, and, while documentation may be a tool for conservation, why is it not necessarily interchangeable with the preservation of performance?**

I see documentation as the precondition for conservation. In other words, documentation provides the data from which performances can be conserved. In my book *Reactivations* (2018), I argue that a beholder can reactivate a performance imaginatively from its documentation.<sup>1</sup> This is the purpose of documentation—to make the performance accessible after the fact to an interested audience. I understand conservation to be an elaboration of this process, whereby the conservator reactivates the performance from its documentation and other archived materials for an audience. Conservation is thus a step beyond documenting and archiving documentation.

I should also say that by 'reactivation,' I do not mean only reenactment, but anything that gives an audience an experiential sense of the performance. Reenactment is thus a form of conservation, though it is not the only form. In this context, I often think of dance and the body-to-body transmission of

performance knowledge. As I understand it, this is how Marina Abramović works with the people who reenact her performances: she trains performers in the physical disciplines her work requires.<sup>2</sup> These reenactments certainly derive from documentation (including Abramović's memory), but her performances are also conserved in the bodies of the people who reenact them as well as her own. These physical memories constitute a kind of documentation, but they also preserve the embodied performance itself, which documentation does not necessarily do. Such practices extend well beyond the art world. For example, there is a rock band called the Dark Star Orchestra that reenacts specific past performances by the Grateful Dead.<sup>3</sup> This, too, is a way of conserving both specific performances and performance practices in the bodies of the musicians that also involves photographic and audio documentation.

**How can we differentiate between the practices of documentation, archiving, and conservation, and what is the interplay between these activities in preserving cultural heritage and knowledge for future generations?**

In short, to document is to create a record of a performance. To archive is to organize and preserve these records and other materials related to the performance, and to conserve is to use the archived documentation/information to make the performance accessible after its original iteration (whatever form that took).

**You say that you do not consider documentation to be synonymous with conservation but rather view it as a prerequisite for conservation. Furthermore, you suggest that documentation need not be limited to the pre-performance or performance stage but can also be generated retrospectively. In light of this, I am curious about the methods and techniques that can be employed to document performances retrospectively.**

In some cases, reenactment is a technique of retrospective documentation. For example, the photographic documentation of Vito Acconci's *Following Piece* (1969), for which he followed randomly chosen individuals through the streets of New York until they went inside, derived from his reenacting something he claimed to have done previously. In a more general sense, documentation is always retrospective, even when it is produced contemporaneously with the performance, because it references the future by making the performance accessible after its initial iteration. Chris Burden's documentary practices exemplify another kind of retrospective documentation, since the photos that depict his performances are modified from those of the performed event. For example, the most widely circulated image of Burden's *Trans-Fixed* (1974), for which he was crucified on a Volkswagen Beetle, is a grainy, atmospheric, black-and-white picture in which the figure and the car

occupy the whole frame and seem to emerge from darkness. Other images of the event are brighter, in color, and show the nondescript garage in which the car was parked. The whole effect of these images is far more prosaic. The performed event thus serves as raw material from which the documented performance is created through post-production. Babette Mangolte's film of Robert Morris's performances, *Four Pieces by Morris* (1993), could also be considered a kind of retrospective documentation, though I think the category of conservation might be more useful here since the films provide access to an experience of the performance derived from documentation and memory.<sup>4</sup>

**What is your perspective on conserving performances that only exist as photographic reality, despite never having taken place physically? I am curious about this in light of your statement that a performance can be considered real as long as it has been documented, regardless of whether it actually occurred in a physical space.**

I'm intrigued by this question, but I don't have a good response to it yet. I wonder whether, in such cases, documentation is co-extensive with conservation since the performance took place only in the space of the photograph. To preserve the photograph is thus to conserve the performance. In light of what I was saying earlier about reenactment as a means of conservation, I suggest that such reenactments should take the same form as the initial work. In other words, a reenactment of Yves Klein's famous *Leap into the Void* (1960), a photograph showing Klein leaping out of a second-story window, should be another photograph, not a live recreation of the action Klein's photo depicts.

**What about instances where a few photographs, or even a single image, come to be synonymous with the whole performance?**

The iconic image often represents a performance as a single picture that people associate with the entire event. The black-and-white image of Burden's *Trans-Fixed* that I mentioned earlier is an example. While a single image may not accurately reflect the whole experience of a performance, I don't believe it's merely reductive. For one thing, a still image can convey more than meets the eye, as it implies what happened just before and just after the moment captured. Additionally, I've conducted experiments where I showed a still image from *American Moon* (1960), a Happening by Robert Whitman, and then a film of the same moment. My audiences didn't necessarily feel they gained more information from the moving image. I think the still image or single image can have more power than we give it credit for, and it may convey more than just an isolated moment or a static representation of a dynamic event. For instance, Walter Murch, the celebrated film editor, used one image to represent each scene or significant moment in the films he worked on.<sup>5</sup> In short, while I acknowledge that the iconic image may not represent the entirety of a performance, I also believe that there is more to the still image

than is typically allowed for, and the representation of a performance in a single image may not necessarily be an ontological betrayal of the event. Nevertheless, one of the things the restoration of performance art could involve is the rebuilding of our understanding of what a performance was by putting the iconic image back into the context of the performance as a whole.

**What are your thoughts on the issue of authorship in performance documentation, particularly with regard to historical performances? It's common for the documentation of a performance to be displayed under the name of the performer rather than the photographer or videographer who recorded it. What do you think about this practice?**

I've been thinking about this for a while, especially in the context of historical performance art. In New York, there were photographers like Peter Moore and Babette Mangolte who made a name for themselves by documenting art performances. Moore was more active in the '60s while Mangolte was more prominent in the '70s. These photographers, and many others, became go-to sources for performers who wanted their work to be captured in photographs.

That performance art has been assimilated into the idea of the art object is evident from the ways photographers and videographers have documented performances over the years. At the start, the identity of the photographer was deemed less important than the work itself and the performer who created it, just as if they were photographing a static work, and this remains true in most cases. However, more recently, some artists have begun to use performance photography as material for their own work, which has led to a reassertion of authorship over this documentation. For instance, Mangolte has staged exhibitions using her performance photography as material, which has enabled her to use it in ways that go beyond its original function, such as her installation *Looking and Touching* (2007), in which viewers were invited to sort through and compare multiple images of the same performances. While the photographer's or videographer's role in documenting performances traditionally has been effaced, there are now instances where their identity as an artist in their own right is more prominently asserted. This could betoken a shift in the way we understand the documentation of performance art.

**Can you conceive of a performance that vanishes? While it is plausible for a performance to be forgettable or unremarkable, the idea that it vanishes is challenging, as it may still have some effect or sway on those who experienced it. Perhaps, after all, performance is more robust than its common understanding indicates.**

This question is inherently paradoxical. If there is no evidence that a performance ever took place, how can we know that it vanished? On the other hand, if there is evidence that it happened, then it hasn't vanished entirely. In essence, we cannot discuss the prospect of a performance disappearing

entirely because we have no examples to draw from. Even performances that are largely forgotten still leave behind some remnants, whether it's a trace of memory or a review in a magazine, which prevents them from vanishing entirely.

**With a multitude of ways in which performance can exist and be preserved, is it feasible to completely eradicate, destroy, or ruin it?**

In a world dominated by social media, in which everything seems to be captured in some form, it would require considerable effort to completely eradicate it! But there is a more subtle process of canonization at work that determines which performances are considered to be significant and, therefore, whose documentation and preservation are considered to be important. Non-canonical performances are less likely to be documented or preserved (or their documentation to receive this level of attention) than the canonical ones. As I point out in *Reactivations*, the process of canonization does not occur after the fact. We don't document every possible performance then decide later which ones belong in the canon. Rather, the performances we take care to document and preserve are those we deem to be canonical a priori.

**Are there aspects of performance art as a medium that inherently complicate the formation of a canon?**

To expand a bit on my previous response, canon formation in the context of the history of performance art begins with documentation: performances that are considered to be important are more likely to be thoroughly documented. The issue of which performances are considered to be worth documenting and preserving occurred to me while writing in *Reactivations* about theater scholar Michael Kirby and his editorship of the *Drama Review* during the crucial period from 1969 to 1986. Kirby believed that writing was the best way to document and preserve performances, that written descriptions were more valuable than photographs. He also believed that the purpose of documenting performances was to preserve them for future audiences. Kirby aimed for a future utopian audience who would understand advanced performances better than we can now. But in editing the journal, Kirby had to make decisions about which performances were worth documenting and preserving for this future audience, and the result of these decisions helped to define the canon of performance art. The irony is that Kirby couldn't possibly have known what the future audience would find interesting or understand, yet he made decisions about which performances would be available to them. The canon, therefore, is a product of past decisions about which performances are worth preserving, and what we have access to now is a result of those decisions. So the issue of which performances are considered to be worth documenting and preserving is an important one, as it shapes

our understanding of performance history and what is considered valuable in the field.

Not that long ago, performance art wasn't part of the art-historical canon at all, or barely so, because it was perceived as a practice that had no place in the art world, or only a very marginal place. And in a lot of instances—I'm thinking about the 1970s—some of what I would consider to be performance-based works were labeled as 'process art' or 'conceptual art.' For me, those kinds of distinctions are not necessarily that important. But even so, in a lot of cases, the work had to be assimilated to a standard art category, like sculpture, for example, in order to be considered as art at all. Performance art has only recently become a canonical category. And as we know, it's only very recently become institutionalized through museums, galleries, and festivals. Unresolved questions around how performance art fits into the cultural economy of visual art include: How is it saleable as art in the art market? How is it displayable as art in the realm of museums?

**Given that a performance can take many forms and repeat through different times, places, and mediums—not to mention bodies—how do you define a performance work?**

My approach to this question involves a fairly traditional notion of the work, namely, that a performance work employs performance as a key medium and has an identity and integrity. I do not limit performance works to live performances, and I tend to consider works that employ performance to be performances even in cases where others might think of them as films or photographs (Klein's *Leap into the Void* is an example). I believe that each iteration of the work, whether a new rendition in a different medium or a new staging or interpretation, sheds fresh light on it and can reveal what it means or how it functions in a variety of different contexts. These iterations have to retain the identity of the work and, at the same time, further that identity. Otherwise, the idea of their being iterations of a work becomes meaningless. Unless the work is completely open-ended, there has to be at some point an iteration that is so far off from what the work *is* that it is no longer considered an iteration of that work. Although I adhere to a notion of the work as something that has a continuous identity across its iterations, I don't consider the work to be deterministic of its iterations. Some pieces are structured to be more deterministic than others but, ultimately, I don't think the work determines its iterations.

As I've said, there are canonical performance works, but there are also canonical iterations of performance works. David Tudor playing John Cage's 4'33" (1952) is a canonical iteration. People have even said if you don't perform it the way David Tudor performed it, you're doing it wrong.<sup>6</sup> (They are referring to the gravity, focus, and elegance of gesture Tudor brought to the work.) I don't agree with that, but it represents an attitude that lies behind many of the objections to reperforming historical works. There's a kind of

privilege associated with the original performance—an Allan Kaprow Happening, for example—a supposition that it possesses some kind of aura that, the fear is, cannot be recreated through the reperformance. I think that's another aspect to consider—trying to avoid the trap of canonizing particular iterations of performances, let alone particular works.

Performance art, to a very large extent, started off as one-off events. Kaprow specifically said at one point that each Happening should be performed only once.<sup>7</sup> Fast-forward to where we are today. It's as if that notion of the unique performance or the one-off performance is lost in the dust. Ragnar Kjartansson, whose work I enjoy a great deal, is a good example of an artist who not only distributes his works across different platforms (live performance and video installation in particular) but who also repeats live events at different venues. His *An Die Musik* (2012) is a piece in which eight pairs of singers and pianists spread out in the performance space perform Schubert's song of that title simultaneously and repeatedly. It premiered at the Migros Museum für Gegenwartskunst in Zurich in 2012 and has also been performed at the London Contemporary Music Festival and the Reykjavík Art Museum, both in 2017. He is but one of many people whose performances are completely designed for reiteration and to be performed multiple times in different places. The question that I'm pondering right now is, how different is this from theater? Earlier on, and in the minds of some people still to this day, performance art was thought to be a kind of performance that isn't theater, even anti-theatrical. And I'm wondering if by now, it has become theater. Not entirely, because it's obviously not institutionalized as theater, it's institutionalized as visual art, but in terms of its processes and procedures and some of the assumptions behind it, performance seems to have become increasingly theatricalized.

**Are there any examples you have in mind of iterations of performance works that you think are so false to the identity of the work, however defined, that they ultimately don't count as the work?**

As you know, I wrote an essay about Cage's 4'33".<sup>8</sup> As a consequence, I watched a lot of performances of that piece. I'm not going to say that if you don't do it like David Tudor, you're not doing it right. But I will say that, over time, I think this piece has become very diluted, to the extent that any framing of four minutes and thirty-three seconds—and maybe throw in a musical instrument—becomes a performance of it. I think Cage would probably be okay with this, and I don't think it's a hideous violation of the work's integrity. But at the same time, we've reached the point where the substance of the work has gotten lost under the surface of the work, which is easy to replicate, while the deeper aspects of it, which have to do with the ideas of duration as the materiality of music and of the piece as an articulation of time in performance, are not. But I try to be open-minded about how performers

interpret their material. I can't think of a lot of examples of iterations of performances that betray the work because I'm not looking for them. As I said earlier, I do believe as a theoretical proposition that there is a limit past which an iteration is no longer an iteration of the work, but in terms of my experiencing things in the world, I'm not particularly hoping to find deviant interpretations to get upset about.

A work might iterate in different iterations or reenactments, reperformances and so on, and each of those is somehow similar to the original act. But the work might also spread out into relics—objects—documents that are no longer performative iterations. The work becomes something else. In the case of Nam June Paik's *Zen for Film* (1962–64), the work becomes a filmic relic, no longer the projection. To keep a 16mm film in a film can and present it as such—a sacrosanct object prevented from performing its original function—seems to me close to a form of veneration familiar from religious objects. Perhaps we might speak of a relic of a filmic performance that documents certain aspects of the reality of a performance but that is no longer the performance itself.<sup>9</sup> How might that complicate the identity of a performance?

*Zen for Film* is a really interesting example, and I find your commentary on it compelling. I might come at it from a different angle. It seems to me a curious case in which the historical trajectory from cult value to exhibition value, identified by Walter Benjamin, has been reversed. A filmic performance intended to be projected (performed, exhibited) has been transformed, as you say, into an inaccessible object. As Benjamin observes, "Today the cult value would seem to demand that the work of art remain hidden," and this is exactly what has happened with *Zen for Film*.<sup>10</sup> This reassertion of cult value, its implicit refusal of exhibition value and its implications are fascinating subjects I hope we can pursue in another conversation.

To me, the term 'relic' suggests objects used in performances such as props, settings, furniture, etc., that may be exhibited as works thereafter. I have difficulty in thinking of these as iterations of the performance itself, however. Chris Burden used the term 'relic' to describe artifacts he used in performances then spun off as sculptural objects, often presented in elegant vitrines. Given the mortification of the flesh that many of Burden's performances entailed, his use of a term with religious overtones is surely not accidental, though his relics are entirely given over to exhibition value. A relic of Burden's *Trans-Fixed* consists of two blood-stained nails, presumably the ones with which he was crucified to the Volkswagen, elegantly displayed on red velvet. These objects fulfill one of the functions of performance documentation: they provide evidence that the performance took place. They also make the viewer's reactivation of the performance more visceral: seeing bloody nails is not the same as imagining them. The fact that Burden always accompanied his relics with written texts in which he describes the



performance matter-of-factly in the first person suggests, however, that the relics do not convey enough information about the performance to serve as free-standing documents, but take on meaning only as concretions of an event described by other means.

**What role does intention play in performance, and what role might it play in performance conservation? I'm thinking here not only of the traditional authorial model, but also a model that involves a network of different people involved in performance, perhaps including actors that are asked to perform a 'delegated performance.'**

There are multiple levels of intention involved in performance, its documentation, and its preservation. Performance is always an intentional act, even if the intent is to allow for things to happen that are not predictable. Allowing for the unintentional to occur is necessarily intentional! Documenting performance is also an intentional act, particularly in the choice of documentary medium and how the medium is used. Both Peter Moore and Babette Mangolte, the two performance photographers I mentioned earlier, sought to subordinate their own presence as photographers to the intentions of the artists whose work they photographed.<sup>11</sup> The institutionalization of performance art has also been intentional. There is a deliberate effort to make performance into something that can be institutionalized as art. This is not happening spontaneously. It's driven by specific people—curators, gallerists, and artists themselves—with the fairly specific goal of trying to find a place for performance art in the structures of the art world and art market. The processes of documentation, archiving, restoration, conservation, and curation we've been talking about all contribute to the process of institutionalization. I am neither a curator nor a conservator, so I don't know to what degree the artist's intent is seen as important in these contexts. But I find Wimsatt's and Beardsley's critique of the 'intentional fallacy,' an old concept in literary criticism, persuasive. They raise the question of how one is to determine the artist's intent. If the artist did what they intended, one need only look at the work itself. If not, one has to look outside the work for something that is not actually an aspect of it.<sup>12</sup> If I am restoring, or even just cleaning, a painting, let alone conserving a performance work, does my understanding of what I should do come primarily from the work itself or from information external to it?

The question of intention in the case of 'delegated performance' is complex and requires a more extensive discussion than we can get into here. Going back to Happenings, Michael Kirby described the kind of performing he saw in them as task-based, and suggested that the performer need have no intention other than to execute a physical task, ascribing artistic intention to the artist who designed the event rather than the performer.<sup>13</sup> I recently interviewed Lyn Bentschik, a performance artist who reperformed some of Marina

Abramović's work for European museum shows.<sup>14</sup> Although we did not talk directly about intention, Bentschik's comments suggest that their intention was not to recreate Abramović's performances but to perform Abramović's pieces faithfully, but in their own way. In thinking about reperformance as a mode of conservation, the question of how intention is construed on all of the levels I've mentioned is worth examining.

**In some sense, even in a purely imaginative way, the internal experience of a performance has something to do with the spectatorship of a performance. How might that internal experience be transmitted and preserved?**

One of the biggest questions regarding preservation and conservation has to do with the audience experience. Maybe things are changing, but, conventionally and traditionally, what is preserved and documented from performance is what the artist does and not the audience's participation and reaction. This becomes obvious in the exclusion of the audience from documentation. For the most part, the documentation of performance has been much more in the fine art tradition of preserving the work than in the ethnographic tradition of gathering information about the event and all of its participants. I am not saying this as a criticism. I have thought a lot about audience over the course of my career, and I still find it difficult to imagine a good way of capturing or understanding the imponderability of audience experience, especially considering that each spectator may have a very different experience from every other.

In the last chapter of *Reactivations*, I talk about a concept that I call "karaoke performance art."<sup>15</sup> The chapter addresses one idea about how people respond to performance art or any kind of performance. I suggest that people watching a performance inevitably want to know how it *feels* to do what the performer is doing. This is a large part of what lies behind the appeal of video games like *Guitar Hero*: they give us the opportunity to share somewhat in the experience of performing. The appeal of this is to be able to take on the identity and physicality of a rock musician for a moment. For the most part, exhibition practices and performance documentation do not acknowledge this desire or encourage people to explore it as part of their potential relationship to the work. Of course, sometimes the performers are doing things you can't do, which is another very important part of performance—that you're watching people who are able and willing to do things you can't do. When I watch a performance, I'm always thinking, what would it be like to do that? Maybe I could do it or simulate doing it in a way that's enjoyable, through *Guitar Hero* or karaoke. Or maybe I can't; I have this image in my head right now of Matthew Barney crawling up the side of the proscenium in *Cremaster 5* (1997), and I can't do that, I've never been able to do that, and will never be able to do it.<sup>16</sup> But I can still look at him and think, well, what

would that be like? What is that about on a physical and experiential level? That's one of the appeals of endurance art. You will never do anything like it, but you can still imagine yourself performing for many hours or six months or a year. The tension between being able to imagine it while at the same time recognizing that this is an experience you will never have gives the idea of endurance its teeth. It is also what can make reperformance poignant. The fact that someone other than the artist can undertake the performance makes the experience seem more accessible.

The internal experience of the performer is also difficult to capture and include as part of the record. I've become interested in the phenomenology of performing and what it feels like from the performer's point of view, but it is extremely difficult to find information about it. So far, I've looked for such material primarily with respect to musicians, but it's very hard to find. You really need performers who are able to provide an account of what's going on inside them and can talk about it in a way that doesn't just fall into clichés or serve as a means of furthering their agenda.

That said, information about the internal experience of the performer or the audience is necessarily specific to a particular iteration of a particular performance. The experience of performing might be very different from occasion to occasion. Therefore, unless much data were gathered from multiple iterations, information about the performer's experience would tend to privilege the particular iteration from which it was gathered. And the task of gathering this kind of information from multiple iterations of a performance is a daunting one, just as it is for studying audiences.

*All questions were contributed by the interviewers. The question on authorship was contributed by Aga Wielocha.*

## Notes

- 1 Philip Auslander, *Reactivations: Essays on Performance and Its Documentation* (Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2018), <https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.9870761>.
- 2 Philip Auslander and Lyn Bentschik, "On Reperforming Abramović: Lyn Bentschik in Dialogue with Philip Auslander," *The Art Section: An Online Journal of Art and Cultural Commentary*, January 2023, accessed May 10, 2023, [www.theartsection.com/reperforming](http://www.theartsection.com/reperforming). It is noteworthy that Bentschik, who performed Abramović's works at European museum retrospectives of her work, prefers the term 'reperformance' to 'reenactment' because of the latter's seeming reference to acting.
- 3 See Dark Star Orchestra (website), accessed May 10, 2023, [www.darkstarorchestra.net/](http://www.darkstarorchestra.net/).
- 4 The film is a reconstitution of the performance work done by the sculptor Robert Morris in the 1960s. *Four Pieces by Morris*, directed by Babette Mangolte (1993), 16mm color film, 94 min.
- 5 Koral Ward, *Augenblick: The Concept of the "Decisive Moment" in 19th- and 20th-Century Western Philosophy* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), 147.
- 6 On August 29, 1952, David Tudor premiered the three-movement piece "4'33" as part of a contemporary piano music recital at Maverick Concert Hall in Woodstock,

- New York, a venue for chamber music. The audience, which consisted mainly of connoisseurs of music and musicians, witnessed Tudor sitting at the piano and, to signify the start of the piece, closing the keyboard lid. This action was repeated for the second and third movements, with the lid being briefly opened to indicate the end of each movement. For a discussion of 4'33" from a performance perspective, see Philip Auslander, "John Cage's 4'33": A Performance Perspective," Naxos Musicology International (website), March 15, 2022, accessed May 12, 2023, [www.naxosmusicology.com/essays/john-cage-s-4-33-a-performance-perspective/](http://www.naxosmusicology.com/essays/john-cage-s-4-33-a-performance-perspective/).
- 7 "Perform the happening once only. Repeating it makes it stale, reminds you of theatre and does the same thing as rehearsing: it forces you to think that there is something to improve on." Allan Kaprow, *How to Make a Happening*, MassArt, 1966, vinyl record.
  - 8 Auslander, "John Cage's 4'33".
  - 9 Hanna B. Hölling, *Revisions: Zen for Film* (New York: Bard Graduate Center, 2015).
  - 10 Walter Benjamin, "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction," trans. Harry Zohn, in *Illuminations*, ed. Hannah Arendt (New York: Schocken, 1969), 225.
  - 11 Auslander, *Reactivations*, 81–85.
  - 12 William K. Wimsatt and Monroe C. Beardsley, "The Intentional Fallacy," *The Sewanee Review* 54, no. 3 (1946): 469.
  - 13 Michael Kirby, "Introduction," in *Happenings: An Illustrated Anthology*, ed. Michael Kirby (New York: E. P. Dutton, 1965), 17.
  - 14 Auslander and Bentschik, "On Reperforming Abramović."
  - 15 Auslander, *Reactivations*, 97–108.
  - 16 *Cremaster 5* (1997) is the final part of *The Cremaster Cycle*, a series of five films completed by artist Matthew Barney between 1994 and 2002. In one scene, the character played by Barney scales the opera's proscenium arch. *Cremaster 5* (1997), 35mm color film with sound, 94 min.

## Bibliography

- Auslander, Philip. *Performing Glam Rock: Gender and Theatricality in Popular Music*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press, 2006. <https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.11477>.
- Auslander, Philip. *Liveness: Performance in a Mediatized Culture*. 3rd ed. London: Routledge, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003031314>.
- Auslander, Philip. *Reactivations: Essays on Performance and Its Documentation*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.3998/mpub.9870761>.
- Auslander, Philip. *In Concert: Performing Musical Persona*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 2021.
- Auslander, Philip. "John Cage's 4'33": A Performance Perspective." Naxos Musicology International (website), March 15, 2022. Accessed May 12, 2023. [www.naxosmusicology.com/essays/john-cage-s-4-33-a-performance-perspective/](http://www.naxosmusicology.com/essays/john-cage-s-4-33-a-performance-perspective/).
- Auslander, Philip, and Lyn Bentschik. "On Reperforming Abramović: Lyn Bentschik in Dialogue with Philip Auslander." *The Art Section: An Online Journal of Art and Cultural Commentary* (January 2023). Accessed May 10, 2023. [www.theartsection.com/reperformancing](http://www.theartsection.com/reperformancing).
- Benjamin, Walter. "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction." Translated by Harry Zohn. In *Illuminations*, edited by Hannah Arendt, 217–51. New York: Schocken, 1969.
- Hölling, Hanna B. *Revisions: Zen for Film*. New York: Bard Graduate Center, 2015.

- Kaprow, Allan. *How to Make a Happening*. MassArt, 1966, Vinyl Record.
- Kirby, Michael. "Introduction." In *Happenings: An Illustrated Anthology*, edited by Michael Kirby, 9–42. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1965.
- Ward, Koral. *Augenblick: The Concept of the "Decisive Moment" in 19th- and 20th-Century Western Philosophy*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008.
- Wimsatt, William K., and Monroe C. Beardsley. "The Intentional Fallacy." *The Sewanee Review* 54, no. 3 (1946): 468–88.