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300 word statement

This portfolio presents two albums and an article, contextualised by a performance-lecture. Supplementary material relating to and the performance histories of the music is presented as appendices. *ijereja* and *entoptic landscape* employ iterative practices as a method for practice research that is ongoing and evolving. The distinction between composing, performing and notating has been blurred by the composer: they become concurrent and continuous with each other. The music engages with materialism in notation—employing ‘dead’ writing systems and obsolete art practices—and devising through collaboration and improvisation. This stems from explorations in the work of composers such as—for example—Alison Knowles (*Onion Skin Song*, 1971-) and Marianthi Papalexandri-Alexandri (*Still Life*, 2003). My approach transports my experimental music practices into the studio in an extension of the methods that blur the live and the manipulated employed, e.g., by Wolfgang Mitterer for the organ (*Stop Playing*, 2010). This combination of approaches revealed new methods and spaces for the creation of, and interaction with, notation; recontextualising the relationship between notation and sound as mutually informative rather than interpretative.

The documentation of this work is one possible view of the music at a given time. These pieces are a constantly expanding pool of notation, performance, sound, text and concepts. In addition to the album releases, *entoptic landscape* has been broadcast on online radio and in Bilbao, released on a CD compilation for a Dutch experimental music magazine (*Mind the Gap #112*) and presented as live sound design at the 2015 Prague Quadrennial. *ijereja* has been presented at the New York Electroacoustic Music Festival and broadcast online.

Both have been performed nationally and internationally. In addition, the nature and role of the exegesis within practice research has been questioned as the contextual exploration of the work has been subsumed into its performance practice by way of the performance-lecture.

**Album 1:**

*entoptic landscape*

version 1 (20'10")
View in browser or refer to the audio files on the USB stick.

version 2 (10'22")
View in browser or refer to the audio files on the USB stick.

version 3 (10'32")
View in browser or refer to the audio files on the USB stick.

version 4 (4'40")
View in browser or refer to the audio files on the USB stick.

**Album 2:**

*ijereja* (49'48")
View in browser or refer to the audio files on the USB stick.

**Article:**

*entoptic landscape and ijereja: Music as an Iterative Process*
Introduction

The impetus for this research project came from my reflection on the first version of the piece *entoptic landscape*, written in 2013 and premiered at the Full of Noises Festival, Barrow in Furness, in that year. This piece was written for a spatialised ensemble of four tubas, trombone, and organ, in a quasi-5.1 arrangement. Both the forces and the performance circumstances required for this piece limited its portability and possibility of future re-performance. In addition, the linear compositional situation that gave rise to the first performance of the work also seemed unsatisfactory: the music was commissioned by the festival, composed in isolation, rehearsed in the days before the performance and finally presented in the concert. While perhaps the most familiar and frequent approach to the creation of classical music, this did not allow for a deep engagement with the musicians or an opportunity to develop the musical materials and ideas of the piece outside of its linear arrangement. This reflection caused me to consider how other methods of compositional development—that caused the ‘private’ aspects of the above arrangement (my acts of composition) to become ‘public’—might be articulated, and how these might also be drawn from performative practices rather than those most often associated with ‘technique’.

The opportunity to develop these ideas in relation to the piece *entoptic landscape* came in its second performance: this took place in Cafe Oto, London, in January 2014. At this performance only three of the original brass players were available (two tubas and one trombone; 2.1) and the performance took place in a venue that did not have an organ. I took this opportunity to re-imagine the piece, using a collage of the original notation to create a new score for the three musicians, and creating a fixed media electronic part from the recordings of the rehearsals and the first performance in Barrow. This method of re-composition directed me to further re-compose the piece for organ and electronics to make it suitable for performance at my own solo concerts. Although these were, in some ways, pragmatic concerns, they also allowed the compositional practices of this piece to expand into a non-linear and iterative mode of composing that began to take into account musicians, performance circumstances, notation, and modes of production. All of these were eventually considered as performance practices that belong to the piece.

As these modes of working emerged from the project, the insights generated at this stage were reflective and retrospective. In order to extend and further reflect on this method of working, a second piece—*ijereja*—was conceived in order to re-explore the same methods of creation and performance. My intention was for this experience to confirm whether the insights of the project were a result of its methods of working, and not rather the specific materials that were explored in *entoptic landscape*. As a result, this project resulted in a sustained and creative change in my own creative practice, that blurred the boundaries between composition, performance, notation, and recording, and developed new ways of working beyond the individual creative outputs it yielded. Further, it caused me to re-think the nature and status of recorded documentation, and the relationship of myself, performers, and listeners with performed and recorded instances of the work.
Research Questions

The research questions in this project were emergent from its practice in their first instance. As such, they articulate research themes that were gleaned in the entoptic landscape project and that were further investigated in the *ijereja* project. These are, of course, related to other themes that could be read across the two pieces; the articulation of these questions is not intended to account for the entirety of the work but to identify the main areas of enquiry that were the focus of the bounds of this project. By the nature of the work, other research questions also emerged that will be the focus of future research, and these are discussed in the ‘Insights’ section of this portfolio.

Three main questions were suggested by this project:

1. How can the composer-performer act as a ‘semionaut’ (Bourriaud, 2010) through the ‘composing’ and ‘performing’ practices of a work?
2. In such a practice, is it possible to separate the practices of ‘composing’ and ‘performing’ either in time or by their properties?
3. How might such a work be documented, and in so doing how might the practices and processes of the work be extended into the studio?

The concept of the ‘semionaut’ referred to here, is that of Nicholas Bourriaud. The artist as a semionaut is someone who negotiates the signs and symbols of the work and its implications through parallel ideas of both time and space. Bourriaud writes:

[through] a compositional principle based on lines traced in time and space, the work (like the Lacanian unconscious) develops a chain of linked elements—and no longer within the order of static geometry that would guarantee its unity. This spontaneous conception of space-time […] has its sources in a nomadic imaginary universe that envisages forms in motion and in relation to other forms, one in which both geography and history are territories to be travelled. (Bourriaud 2010, 117)

This relates to the intentions within the project to create a non-linear approach to composition and performance—allowing them, as creative practices, to spontaneously feed into and re-create each other—and to the status of the outcomes of these practices. Therefore, the documentation and outcomes of this project became as much an investigation of its research questions as its creative practices.

Image: *ijereja*, score [detail].

*Selected score materials are available in Appendix 5*
Methods

The methods and processes of this project have been summarised in the article: entoptic landscape and ijereja: music as an iterative process, New Sound: International Journal of Music, vol. 49 (2017) 97-113. (The full text is reproduced at pp. 14-30 below.)

This project employed multiple creative practices as methods of exploring its materials and enacting its ideas. These included:

• the creation of graphic and text-based notation as a creative practice, employing processes of collage, drawing, automatic writing, and concrete poetry. This process was itself understood as part of the performance of the work, and not only a practice in advance or performance or as a transcription of sound for performance.

• composition, broadly understood, in which performance situations were conceived and described in advance, strategies for performance and improvisation were created, and creative decisions were made in the studio from the project materials.

• performance, including improvisation, structured responses to the project notations and recordings, and pre-composed presentation of materials through the medium of the performance lecture.

• recording of live performances and of improvised responses to the project materials; sampling of these materials in performance and in the studio.

• music production as a practice of synthesising the project recordings in the studio, and also as a creative practice through which further decisions and iterative approaches could be

These practices were considered in a continuously evolving and non-linear cycle. For example, notations were made in response to performances (and recordings of performances) that took place, and as materials for future performances. Recordings of performances were used as ‘notations’ through representation in performance spaces in which improvised responses were made. In the studio, this process was emphasised through the layering of many performances and through processing resulting in the inclusion of impossible live sounds in recordings that otherwise seem ‘live’. As a result, each instance of the work can be considered both complete and always incomplete. This aspect was further emphasised through the creation of the performance lecture as both an exploration of the project and its creative practice and as a further instance of its performance. In the lecture itself, I described this as ‘at once [the work’s] performance, live creation, concept, experience, and discursive analysis’.
Methods (continued)

My performance lecture also describes this as a 'journey of performance-development' that includes a 'public narrative of performance-composition when all of the iterations are heard together'. In these cases, ‘performances audibly and publicly interact with and cross-reference each other, finally resulting in a performance-artefact which is both always present and functions as a quotation and statement of the compositional and interpretative process.’ Two tables in Appendices 2 and 4 detail the performance histories of both of the works that have allowed this iterative method to be enacted.
Entoptic phenomena are experienced by all human beings. If you cover your eyes and shut out all light, for example by putting your hands over your closed eyes, you will see flashing lights and moving shapes. What you are seeing is the structure of your optic nerve. These are entoptic phenomena: a neurobiological experience. Such phenomena have been hypothesised to have informed the earliest artworks. Their commonness to all people causes these artworks to remain intelligible today. This music takes such phenomena as a starting point. It is slow moving, partially entering into ‘view’ and then gone again. The attempt to focus has the effect of obscuring it.

Outcomes and Dissemination

While performances were part of the method of this project, they were also part of its dissemination. Beyond performance, two albums were created as statements of—and in order to disseminate—the creative practice in the project as audio recordings. Whilst both complete and incomplete in the same way as a performance in the project, these recordings act as statements as possible (but not ideal or definitive) outcomes of the performance practices of the project.

Album 1: entoptic landscape
version 1 (20'10")
[View in browser](https://example.com) or refer to the audio files on the USB stick.

version 2 (10'22")
[View in browser](https://example.com) or refer to the audio files on the USB stick.

version 3 (10'32")
[View in browser](https://example.com) or refer to the audio files on the USB stick.

version 4 (4'40")
[View in browser](https://example.com) or refer to the audio files on the USB stick.

ijereja (49'48")
[View in browser](https://example.com) or refer to the audio files on the USB stick.

Top: Album: entoptic landscape (Chicago: pan y rosas discos, 2014) pyr123 [Link to label](https://example.com)
Bottom: Album: ijereja (Chicago: pan y rosas discos, 2016) pyr180 [Link to label](https://example.com)
Research Insights

The insights as a result of this project might first be described in relation to its research questions. The concept of the ‘semionaut’, was explored through the iterative method of working in the project. Specifically, this offered both myself and the other performers multiple opportunities to respond to the project materials, thus exploring their potential implications not only in a single instance of performance but across multiple performances and media. As such, this project suggested and confirmed this iterative method of working as a way to undermine the linearised aspect of the creation of music assumed in the original festival composition that gave rise to the project. As non-linear instances of performance and composition, the creative acts in the project were also dehierarchised, since, for example, notation could no longer be considered prior to performance, nor could production be considered a mode of presentation, recording or archiving. In common with the practice of a ‘semionaut’, multiple directions or paths in the imagined space-time of the work were opened up by its creative practices, allowing many possibilities of meaning to arise and be explored in performance and in relation to its materials.

In undermining the linear aspect of the work, its materials, and its performative engagement, the project directed me to describe its ontology as an ‘infinity of lists’ after Umberto Eco (2009). As such, as I have described, it is always complete and also never complete or always expanding. The form of an ‘infinity of lists’ is not an aesthetic form but something that holds more in common with Kant’s mathematical sublime. (Eco, 2009, 135) Eco writes that:

the infinity of aesthetics is the subjective feeling of something greater than us; it is an emotional condition; instead the infinity we are talking about now is an actual infinity made up of objects that can perhaps be numbered but that we cannot number. (2009, 15)

The number of artefacts currently associated with both entoptic landscape and ijereja are numerable, although they have not all been included in this portfolio both because of their number and because engagement with each and every one is not required to understand the practice research that has taken place in this project. However, they are potentially infinite; each project’s possible and intended form is infinite. Eco also hints at how this can be experienced as embodied, writing that this form of representation, ‘suggests infinity almost physically, because in fact it does not end, nor does it conclude in form’. (2009, 16) The physical experience of the infinite in Eco’s construction is embodied by the performers and composers who experience the potential of this form when they enact the piece. They do not perform the list, but by being aware of the potential performances of the piece, and their lack in the current performance in which they are engaged, they experience its infinity.

In addition to being an infinity of lists, the form of ijereja is also what Eco designates a non-normal list (after a non-normal set in mathematical set theory) because it contains itself: the set of all performances of the piece is itself a performance of the piece. (Eco, 2009, 395-6)

This insight further informed the approach to documentation in the project, ultimately suggesting its prevention as a research document in this portfolio: while the total amassed documentation could be presented, this would not provide a complete picture of the project and indeed might serve to confuse it. Thus, the project caused a shift from the consideration of documentation as a product of creative practice research to a process of the research. This allowed for both a more creative approach to the expression of the work in the format of audio albums, and for the expansion of the consideration of ‘work’ beyond its notation and performance to its documentary practices as well.
Future Developments

Finally, this project suggests future directions for research, and further research questions that could not be explored but arose as a result of its creative practice. Future projects will build on the work completed here by investigating specifically those questions and building on the creative working method described in this portfolio. First, both pieces in this project explored obsolete languages and materials in their notation (parietal art and linear B respectively). The enactment of such materials in notation and performance, and their subsequent potential for meaning, is an area of clear interest for future work. Second, the nature of musical time as well as the linearity of creation and performance might also be explored. The temporal dimension of music is problematised by an approach that introduces instances of previous performances into ‘live’ situations, and also the ‘past’ and ‘present’ of the musical work might be investigated through the relationship of historical and borrowed materials and practices in the notational approaches introduced here.

Image: ijereja, score [detail]. Performance at St Laurence Church, Catford, London. Photograph by Huw Morgan.
Dr Lauren Redhead
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Selected score materials are available in Appendix 5.
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ENTOPTIC LANDSCAPE AND IJEREJA: MUSIC AS AN ITERATIVE PROCESS

Abstract: entoptic landscape and ijereja are both works that can be considered as expanding collections of materials. They explore the spaces between composition, notation, performance and improvisation by considering all of these activities as equally ‘performative’. Each work comprises a set of materials that includes scores, fixed media audio and video, recorded live performances, studio-edited performances, and performance strategies. In the case of each piece, materials created in and by previous performances go on to inform future performances of the music. As such, there can be no ‘definitive’ performance or statement of the works, and nor can they ever be considered finished or bounded. This is how these pieces conceive of music as an iterative process: they are intended as statements of that process.

Nicholas Bourriaud (2010) identifies the creative artist as a ‘semionaut’: one who must navigate between signs and signifiers in order to negotiate, interpret, and create meaning. In the ‘work’ of music, the composer, performer and listener can all be thought of as semionauts; they take part in the same processes to create and re-create the ‘work’. In my own practices I embody and enact all three of these positions, and I seek to blur the boundaries between listening, performing and composing. Contemporary artistic forms in Bourriaud’s terms, then, are ‘journey forms’: they internalise and externalise an experience of movement through the work as a temporal and spatial territory. The music presented here offers an opportunity for the exploration of the journey form as a compositional strategy, a tool for performance and interpretation, and a framework for criticism.

Key words: experimental music, Bourriaud, practice research, iterative processes, musical processes, journey form, semionaut
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Music as an Iterative Process

*entoptic landscape* and *ijereja* are both works that can be considered as expanding collections of materials. They explore the spaces between composition, notation, performance, and improvisation by considering all of these activities as equally ‘performative’. Each work comprises a set of materials that includes scores, fixed media audio and video, recorded live performances, studio-edited performances, and performance strategies. In the case of each piece, materials created in and by previous performances go on to inform future performances of the music. As such, there can be no ‘definitive’ performance or statement of the works, and nor can they ever be considered finished or bounded. This is how these pieces conceive of music as an iterative process: they are intended as statements of that process.

A conventional, linear, view of the musical work in Western Art Music considers composing (as the creation of notation and/or sound), performing (as the reproduction of notation, instructions, and/or sound), listening (as the receiving of sound) and studio practices (as the documentation/editing of sound) to be individual events that usually occur in a specific order. However, in my practice as a composer-performer, I experience these processes non-linearly, and often find that the activities and practices of one overlap into those of another. When approached as embodied practices, notating, composing, performing, listening, and editing all encroach upon each other. However, I would posit that my experience is not unique because of my position as a composer-performer, but merely that my practice allows me to observe this overlap. As such, I imagine that the distinctions between composing, performing and listening are not as great as they have been supposed, and this informs the way that I approach these activities in practice and as practices.

As a composer and performer of experimental music, the act and practice of listening is of central importance to my musical activity. Listening is what is most obviously held in common between composers, performers and audiences, and the way that experimental music most clearly offers an equalizing experience to its participants. A conventional model of listening, that can be understood as the model of listening in the ‘sweet spot’ of the studio, can be expressed as a semiotic square showing the relationships between the listener (body) and studio (place) as an experience of the music (Figure 1).

In reality, this situation is never realized outside of the studio. Multiple listening spaces are always possible: the position of the listener in the space is rarely within the ‘sweet spot’ – particularly when live performance is considered – and the position of instruments and loudspeakers in the performance space creates multiple sub-spaces with multiple sweet spots for each instrument; the
acoustics of the room itself most often offer more than one experience of the sound within it. As such, the ‘music’ is not the static image expressed in the ‘sweet spot’ of the studio, but a dynamic image that is highly dependent on the individual listener. As such, the semiotic square (Figure 1) might be re-imagined to include these multiple spaces as multiple layers, connected at certain nodes by the body of the listener and the ‘bodies’ of the instruments or loudspeakers in the space. Listening, then, is understood as a multi-dimensional and multi-layered experience, offering many points of focus, rather than a two-dimensional construct of the body in space. As such, the musical work is not realised in this two-dimensional plane, either, but can be imagined as a continuous feedback loop in which the composition (sound/notation), performance (sound/space) and listener (sound/body) interact. It is within this continuous loop that entoptic landscape and ijereja examine iterative practices and processes.

The listening experience is even more complex and multi-layered than this for the composer and performers. Any performance of a piece cannot avoid the inscription of the work’s previous performance history onto its surface: this is an inevitable consequence of the displacement of the music in time and space as a piece is composed, performed and re-performed. Within the ‘space’ of the work, then, the performer deals with the connotations of the performance and listening
spaces, the notation, and all previous performances of the music. In the case of music with open notation of any kind this experience is further amplified. As such, this can be considered as a process of unlimited semiosis. Such a process, in the creation and reception of artworks, is described by the curator and art theorist Nicholas Bourriaud, who writes,

[through] a compositional principle based on lines traced in time and space, the work (like the Lacanian unconscious) develops a chain of linked elements – and no longer within the order of static geometry that would guarantee its unity. This spontaneous conception of space-time […] has its sources in a nomadic imaginary universe that envisages forms in motion and in relation to other forms, one in which both geography and history are territories to be travelled.¹

The “nomadic imaginary universe” described by Bourriaud is the “territory” of the work. The artist who negotiates this territory is, in Bourriaud’s terms, a “semionaut”:² they are someone who freely navigates between signs and signifiers – that are both part of the materials of the work and part of its syntagmatic chains of meaning – in order to negotiate, interpret, and create new meanings in its creation and performance. In the pieces entoptic landscape and ijereja, the composer, performer and listener can all be thought of as semionauts: they take part in the same processes of meaning-making to create, re-create, and experience the work.³ The acts of composing and performing, then, are acts of describing the ‘nomadic imaginary universe’ of the work, and the act of listening that of making sense of such description: these processes do not result in a static end-point or a fixed meaning but are dynamic processes subject to constant re-exploration and revision. These works, then, meet Bourriaud’s definition of a relational art which he describes as: “an art taking as its theoretical horizon the realm of human interactions and its social context, rather than the assertion of an independent and private symbolic space.”⁴ In such a relational work, the ‘domain of human interactions’ – the space where composers, performers and listeners interact – is, of course, not only the piece’s ‘theoretical horizon’ but its tangible material.

² Ibid., 103.
Practice Research Context

The two works discussed here are not only examples of creative practice, but also examples of creative arts inquiry, within the UK practice-research context. Practice research can be considered, in and of itself, a dialectic of process and product. This research method considers practice as both the method of creating knowledge and the means of its transmission: as such, it embraces epistemologies beyond the purely linguistic, considering tacit, embodied, and disciplinary knowledge of equal value to the empirical. Within the UK academic context, provision is made for the undertaking of practice research in multiple disciplines and at all levels of the academy. However, whilst practice is a process, most research narratives and assessments are almost exclusively focused on outputs, or products. Thus, the ‘product’ of practice research in composition is usually assumed to be the score and/or recording, perhaps in conjunction with a written reflection that might follow the creation of a musical work. In order to express the processes of a piece of practice research as the site of knowledge, it is necessary to propose new methods of presentation beyond the text, as the distinction between process and product leaves many aspects of practice research in (experimental) music poorly understood and disseminated.

Comparable to the dialectic of process and product in practice research is the dialectic of concept and experience in experimental music practice. The ‘concept’ of a work is often considered to exist within the domain of the composer, what Bourriaud describes as her “private symbolic space”; this concept is discovered by performers and listeners through the unfolding of the work as a public but listening- and performance-based activity. This situation adequately describes the experience of musical processes such as those described by Steve Reich as “Music as a Gradual Process” and by Michael Nyman in his book on experimental music. However, the processes suggested by Reich and Nyman do not conclusively describe all processes that might be at work in experimental music. As mentioned above, the embodied experience of the composer-performer testifies to the overlap and transcending of these processes; this is an experience that also transcends the public-private and concept-experience boundaries within experimental music. This practice-research investigation seeks to make manifest those processes that allow for or reveal this experience.

---

The theatre practitioner Ben Spatz has addressed embodied knowledge in practice research, and its expression not only through individual performance events but through a transference of technique related to practice. This transmission of technique can be considered part of the transference of the process of the research. Rather than an examination of practice through a relationship with theoretical approaches, this is part of what he calls a ‘strong’ conception of practice research. He writes that such an approach, “argue[s] on epistemological grounds that practice can itself be a research methodology, leading to the discovery of new knowledge in the form of new technique.”8 Spatz’s conception of embodied knowledge as research knowledge is an argument for certain approaches to practice, rather than particular framings of practice. This is, in fact, not unfamiliar to practitioners of experimental music. In Jennie Gottschalk’s recent commentary, Experimental Music Since 1970, she categorizes similar approaches under “Scientific Approaches’ as ‘acts of discovery’ and ‘learning by making.’”9 Spatz also recognizes this more generally, when he writes that practice research should be seen, “as a special kind of pursuit that is already at work in a variety of contexts, including but not limited to the arts and academia.”10 Here, he points out that the boundary between practice and research is not firm, but negotiable by artists inside and outside of the academy as a part of, rather than a framing of, their practice.

By identifying the practice of practice research as something that belongs to practitioner practices and processes rather than to academic or artistic institutions, Spatz also situates its knowledge claims specifically within practice itself rather than within the practice of academics. This provides an argument as to the value of such research: that it seeks to document knowledge claims that are already accessible in artistic practice, rather than to make knowledge claims for practice that was previously not research. Spatz’s conception of research also re-directs the focus of its evaluation from its product (for example, the performance, which Spatz terms as singular) to the process through which the knowledge is gained. This further explains how practice-research knowledge

9 Jennie Gottschalk, Experimental Music Since 1970, New York, Bloomsbury, 2016, 41–44 and 59–64. The use of the word ‘scientific’ in this case does not imply empiricism or positivism but could be paralleled with the German word ‘Wissenschaft’. ‘Musikwissenschaft’ translates as ‘musicology’ – with its accompanying variety of approaches and methodologies – rather than music-science, and, as an individual term, ‘Wissenschaft’ connotes a systematic pursuit of knowledge without any particular epistemological distinction, despite being translated as ‘science’ in English most frequently.
10 Ben Spatz, op. cit., 232.
might be disseminated beyond its performances even when such performances are ephemeral. Spatz writes,

[...]ar from being secondary to the production of singular events, the development and transmission of knowledge in the form of technique can be seen as the primary activity of many practitioners in physical culture and performing arts – the ground upon which the “singular event” can be realized and without which there can be no event at all.11

This article, then, deals with the ways in which the ‘techniques’ of the iterative process of music are developed and disseminated in the works entoptic landscape and ijereja. Composing and performing are both considered here to be embodied practices. ‘Technique’ in their cases is not a facet of their craft but a method of enacting strategies for doing and knowing through them. The ‘singular event’ of a performance, however, is shown to be a fallacy when the memory of that event has agency in future work in the way that Bourriaud has described: ‘technique’ is transmitted organically from one performance to another. Transmission of techniques as research knowledge, in this case, is not about teaching others to do what has already done in this project, but transmitting the methods of gaining and embodying non-linguistic knowledge and making tangible the processes of the work.

entoptic landscape

entoptic landscape is a composition based upon an iterative process. The process of this piece grew as a result of its trajectory rather than its initial compositional design: the first three iterations of the piece were presented as music for organ, trombone and four tubas; trombone, two tubas and fixed media; and organ and fixed media respectively.12 The impetus for these iterations came about as a result of the dynamic listening situation described above: multiple spaces and instrumental combinations presented themselves for the dissemination of the work, and it became necessary to find a path through the musical and notational materials that arose from the piece that would translate to its required performance circumstances.

The music’s initial notation was created by a number of writing practices which all involved actions that created marks; these actions were derived from a study of the aesthetics, nature, and purpose of ice-age art.13 The first notation-

11 Ibid., 233.
12 The first two situations described here arose from a commission from Octopus Collective, Barrow-in-Furness, UK, for the Full of Noises festival and its tour to Café Oto in 2013–2014.
al iteration was a graphic score, albeit a linear one. A mixture of pitch materi-
al, graphemes, images and text offered the performers a strict time structure in
which some flexibility of performance was permitted. The ability of the tubas
and trombone to amplify whispered or spoken text was exploited, whilst the in-
strumental blend and slow process of similar graphic and pitch instructions were
intended to create a texture that was homogenous and differentiated, steadily
moving and static.

Figure 2: entoptic landscape, version 1 for trombone, 4 tubas and organ, notation detail
(14’40”-16’00”)14

At the time of composition I was intrigued by the idea that ice-age art might
stem from ritualized performance, enhanced by sound and repetition, and want-
ed to re-create its state of mind and re-perform the symbols of this art. The piece
was presented with the following programme note, that reflected this:

Entoptic phenomena are experienced by all human beings. If you cover your eyes
and shut out all light, for example by putting your hands over your closed eyes, you
will see flashing lights and moving shapes. What you are seeing is the structure of
your optic nerve. These are entoptic phenomena: a neurobiological experience.

Such phenomena have been hypothesised to have informed the earliest artworks. Their commonness to all people causes these artworks to remain intelligible today. This piece takes such phenomena as a starting point. The music is slow moving, partially entering into ‘view’ and then gone again. The attempt to focus has the effect of obscuring it.¹⁵

The concept of the universality of experience, hinted at in the programme note, also led to a consideration of universality of material, allowing the ‘score’ of the work to expand to include fixed media drawn from edited recordings of the work in performance and re-notation as a re-performance of the graphic symbols originally conceived. Today, the piece encompasses several live acousmatic and multi-channel performances, a studio album, multi-modal gallery presentation, audio-visual installation, scores for specific instruments and open notation.¹⁶ In this way, the piece can both be considered complete and expanding: it reacts to its performers, performance circumstances, and internal contradictions in an ongoing series of iterations. In Bourriaud’s terms it is relational.

![Figure 3: entoptic landscape, graphic score version, notation detail](image)

¹⁵ Lauren Redhead, op. cit.
The composition of *entoptic landscape* crosses the public-private divide in experimental music, in particular through the enactment of a public narrative of performance-composition when all of the iterations are heard together. It is possible to hear these as in some of the studio performances that have been made: for example, the studio album of *entoptic landscape* presents a selection of ‘live’ performances, which draw on recorded audio material and re-performed actions from previous performances. Other performances that have been presented as fixed media only draw materials from every available performance. In these cases the listener hears the result of a journey of performance-engagement that involves myself, several improvisers, the concert hall, the gallery and the studio. Performances, as iterations of the work, audibly and publicly interact with and cross-reference each other, finally resulting in a performance-artefact which is both always present and functions as a quotation and statement of the compositional and interpretative process. This makes audible the work-as-process.

**ijereja**

The compositional technique that had been developed in *entoptic landscape* has been further concretised in the piece *ijereja*. This piece takes the iterative process of its materials as its starting point: it is also an ongoing project that considers notation and performance as performative and compositional; involving practices of over-recording, sampling, and the iterative approach to performance and notation described above. The musical form of *ijereja* is, therefore, what Bourriaud describes as the ‘journey form’:

18 the proliferation of form and materials that it offers places its meaning within the domain of unlimited semiosis, again casting the composer, performers, and listeners as ‘semionauts’ in their decoding of the piece.

The consideration of notation as a performative practice in *entoptic landscape* and *ijereja* led to a consideration of the politics of notation. In general, certain types of texts have been considered as musical notation and others not, meaning that the designation ‘score’ seems to cover a particular group of types of texts, publications, and symbols or images. However, the practices that create the things which belong to this group might be broadly covered by terms like drawing, mark-making, writing, printing, and these are not distinct from practices in other disciplines than music. The content of ‘notation’ is also not necessarily distinct from the content produced by these practices in other art forms, especially when forms of graphic, text, sculpture, and video notation in the twentieth and twenty first centuries are considered. Indeed, there is a long

---

history of graphic notation being presented as visual art but fewer instances of art works being repurposed as notation in music (notwithstanding particular performances by free improvisers). As a result, in addition to the enactment of iterative practices, in *ijereja* I was also interested in the interrogation of the potentially liminal space between performance, voice, speech, language, text, writing and notation. The ‘notation’ of the piece takes in all of these activities as parts of text, graphic, and audio notation. It is not intended to be clear which of these activities create sound or text, make marks, or reproduce the piece: their function is fluid and undefined, and potentially all of the performers engage in writing, speaking, notating and producing as the composer does.

The word *ijereja* is a transliteration of the transliteration of the Mycenean Greek word for ‘priestess’ in the Cretan-Minoan script known as Linear B. Just as *entoptic landscape* drew inspiration from ice-age art practices, *ijereja* considered bronze-age writing and art practices. In so doing, it seeks to avoid the connotations associated with ‘modern’ notation, art and music. The materials of the piece draw from disparate sources including Linear B text, Minoan art, modernist fakeries of Minoan art, cartographic practices, fictional maps, Hörspiel, and recorded organ improvisation. This list can be thought of as a starting point rather than conclusive: as the piece receives further performances and under-
goes further iterations this list continues to expand. As a result, the ontology of
the work can be considered beyond the relational as that described in Umberto
Eco’s *The Infinity of Lists*\(^{19}\). In relation to this, Eco has stated:

The list is the origin of culture. It’s part of the history of art and literature. [One at-
ttempts to grasp the incomprehensible] through lists, through catalogs, through col-
lections in museums and through encyclopaedias and dictionaries.\(^{20}\)

The ‘work’ of *ijereja* is a constantly expanding pool of notation, performance,
sound, text and concepts. Its form is an expression of its ontology which can be
stated as an expression of Eco’s ‘infinity of lists’. Eco has explained that this is a
different expression of infinity than an aesthetic one, something that holds more
in common with Kant’s mathematical sublime.\(^ {21}\) Eco writes that:

It is not that form cannot suggest infinity […] the infinity of aesthetics is the subjec-
tive feeling of something greater than us; it is an emotional condition; instead the
infinity we are talking about now is an actual infinity made up of objects that can
perhaps be numbered but that we cannot number.\(^ {22}\)

Although the number of artefacts currently associated with *ijereja* are numerable,
they are potentially infinite; the piece’s possible and intended form is in-
finte. Eco also hints at how this can be experienced as embodied, writing that,

the infinity of aesthetics is a sensation that follows from the finite and perfect com-
pleteness of the thing we admire, while the other form of representation we are
talking about suggests infinity almost physically, because in fact it does not end, nor
does it conclude in form.\(^ {23}\)

The physical experience of the infinite in Eco’s construction is embodied by the
performers and composers who experience the potential of the form when they
enact the piece. They do not perform the list, but by being aware of the potential
performances of the piece, and their lack in the current performance in which
they are engaged, they experience its infinity. In addition to being an infinity of
lists, the form of *ijereja* is also what Eco designates a non-normal list (after a

\(^ {19}\) Umberto Eco, *The Infinity of Lists*, (trans. by Alastair McEwen), London, MacLehose

\(^ {20}\) Susanne Beyer and Lothar Gorris, “Spiegel Interview with Umberto Eco: ‘We Like Lists
Because We Don’t Want To Die’”, 11 November 2009, http://www.spiegel.de/internatio-
ral/zeitgeist/spiegel-interview-with-umberto-eco-we-like-lists-because-we-dont-want-to-
die-a-659577.html, ac. 08.02.2017.

\(^ {21}\) Cf. Immanuel Kant, *Critique of the Power of Judgment*, (trans. by Paul Guyer and Eric

\(^ {22}\) Umberto Eco, op. cit., 15.

\(^ {23}\) Ibid., 16.
non-normal set in mathematical set theory) because it contains itself: the set of all performances of the piece is itself a performance of the piece.24

This understanding is intended to be communicated even through the work’s title. The sound of the word *ijereja* [I-je-re-t-ja] is an invented pronunciation based on the syllabic substitution of Linear B. Its original, pre-homeric Greek pronunciation has never been heard and cannot be conclusively known. The iterative process of the understanding this word, from oral Greek to Greek written in a borrowed script, to its rediscovery in the Linear B tablets in Knossos, through many mistranslations, offered a parallel with the sonic and notational practices associated with the work.

Figure 5: ‘i-je-re-ja’ in the symbols of the Linear B syllabary, *ijereja* (2015), notation detail

A studio album that represented the piece as a single 50 minute track was released in 2016.25 The material for this recording was drawn from live performances that took place in October 2015: the first was a large ensemble performance involving myself (organ, voice), Charles Céleste Hutchins (tuba, bird whistle), Tina Krekels (saxophone, electronics), Adam Linson (live electronics) and Alistair Zaldua (live electronics); the second was a duet between myself (voice, live electronics) and Sarah Gail Brand (trombone). The sampled voice of artist R. Armstrong was also played back, in parts, in each performance. Rather than a definitive statement of the piece, this album is intended as simply another iteration: the sound is not particularly representative of any single performance. Rather, individual gestures, textures and motifs were selected as compositional units that could be used to make what could be considered an acousmatic work in its own right.

24 Ibid., 395–396.
The role of the individual performers as *individuals* as well as performers was also a key aspect of the process of the music. The performers who collaborated in these recorded performances are all skilled and experienced improvisers. From a composer perspective, confidence that these musicians would be able to fluently interact with the music, its ideas, and each other was a consideration in the way that the piece would be presented. However, these musicians might also be thought of as part of the texture and legacy of the piece: their musicianship and ideas form a large part of the now extant audio material and the foreknowledge of this situation also informed their selection. Despite the fact that the materials of the piece are accessible to any musicians or non-musicians who may wish to attempt it, in a sense they were also created with groups of knowledgeable and skilled musicians such as these in mind: much more of the potential of such materials is realized in performance by musicians who are adept at their interpretation. As such, it can said that the piece not only bears the traces of its previous performances, but of its performers as well.

**Musical Self-Critique**

The final aspect of the *ijereja* project was to consider its critique as a part of its practice-research approach. Exegetes such as this article, of course, are part of the critique of the work and are, in their own way, performative. Nevertheless, the iterative process of the piece invited the performance of the work’s critique as a part of its performance, and to consider this was to consider how a critical approach to the music could be disseminated beyond text. The method of doing this was through the genre of the ‘performance lecture’: this was delivered as a performance of the piece, using spoken voice, recorded sound and a video that was made using images from the notation. The precedent for doing this comes from the experimental musical practice of John Cage, concretized in his *Lecture on Nothing* (1959) which is the archetypal performance lecture. In the foreword to the book *Silence*, Cage writes:

> I have employed in [my lectures] means of composing analogous to my composing means in the field of music. My intention has been, often, to say what I had to say in a way that would exemplify it; that would, conceivably, permit the listener to experience what I had to say rather than just hear about it. This means that, being as I am engaged in a variety of activities, I attempt to introduce into each one of them aspects conventionally limited to one or more of the others.\(^{27}\)

---

\(^{26}\) I am grateful to Richy Carey at the University of Glasgow for prompting this observation.

By integrating the exploration of the theoretical context of *ijereja*, and the development of its materials, into the performance of the piece itself, I employed means of composing the performance lecture analogous to the composition of the work.\(^{28}\) Thus, the performance-lecture as a method of self-critique of the work *ijereja* has become a part of its materials, allowing the audience to simultaneously experience and take part in the work, and explore its themes and processes of meaning-making. In this respect, the experience of the critique of the work is also analogous to the experience of the work itself: it does not require a linear approach to meaning or argument and does not require a purely linguistic engagement with what is presented. As such, it invited the listener to take part in the creation, experience and critique of knowledge as an embodied process and practice.

As the composer, performer, and listeners all take part in meaning-making as seomionauts in the journey form of *ijereja*, they all engage in the ‘work’ of the performance of the piece: everyone who encounters the music in performance is ‘at work’ in the context of its performance. As such, they all begin from the same place of unknowingness: the conditions for knowing are within and are themselves the piece. Before the performance of the piece, it is not possible to identify what its knowledge will be. During its performance, its knowledge is embodied, and after the performance its knowledge is available as a memory, although the conditions for knowledge have passed. Thus, the state of unknowingness before and after the performance is one in which even knowledge of the conditions for knowing is not possible before the practice has taken place. Cage identifies this experience of embodying the potential for knowledge in the *Lecture on Nothing* when he writes: ‘*[a]ll I know is that when I am not working I sometimes think that I know something but when I am working it is quite clear that I know nothing.*’\(^{29}\) Cage’s intention here is not to denigrate his ability as a practitioner but to make clear that knowledge about and through practice can only be gained *in* practice.

This, then, links with the practice-research approach of the projects described here. First, in *entoptic landscape* and *ijereja*, knowledge is embodied. It is experienced and accessed by the composer-performer through enacting the reflexive practice of the journey form of the pieces, and it is transmitted through documentation and dissemination of their processes by performers and listeners. This is not linguistic knowledge, and it cannot be empirically observed. Rather,

---

28 A recorded example of the performance lecture can be found at: Lauren Redhead, *ijereja: Music as an Iterative Process*, Canterbury, Centre for Practice Based Research in the Arts, 2016, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Gjz3hZ0QsbI

29 John Cage, op. cit., 126.
it is knowledge that is tacit and disciplinary. This is described by the dance practitioner-researcher Kim Vincs, who writes that:

art practice is able to produce knowledge in a unique, material and specific way. It is not a generic kind of knowledge that can be mapped onto other fields or works of art. This is the whole problem with art analysis that seeks to define categories to neatly organise artworks and must, in order to preserve its nomenclature, ignore the profound epistemological disjunctions that can occur between artworks of seemingly similar aesthetic, genre, and content.\footnote{Kim Vincs, “Rhizome/Myzone: A Case Study in Studio-based Dance Research”, in: Barbara Bolt (Ed.), Practice as Research: Approaches to Creative Arts Enquiry, 2010, 112.}

This quotation deals with the nature of knowledge in these projects. In particular, the material. It is not as a result of the dialogue of materials in the projects, but by and through their creation, enactments, re-creation, and re-enactments that knowledge is created.

Second, the practice-research approach of entoptic landscape and ijereja means that their processes are framed as the outcomes of the projects rather than their notation or recordings. This is externalized in a number of ways. The number of publicly available products (such as scores, recordings and video material) in each project publicly testify to the malleability of the identity of the works. It is not possible to easily reconcile these products with each other in order to define a static identity for either work. In addition, the works themselves put the idea of process at the forefront of their materials for performance. For example, part of the possible notation of ijereja is a list of strategies (some of them after Karlheinz Stockhausen’s Richtige Dauern (1968) from Aus den Sieben Tagen), all of which imply process, but which have themselves been subject to notational intervention as a part of this process. Lastly, the processes of the works are literally sounded in each performance through the use of the sonic performance artefacts of previous performances.

The final aspect of the practice-research concept of entoptic landscape and ijereja is in the model of the authority of the composer that they posit. This model is directly linked with their work concept. The composer-performer as enquirer in such projects cannot take on the model of the composer as authority that is sometimes assumed in Western Art Music. However, nor is she a collaborator whose contribution does not result in a named and identifiable composer at the end of the project. This model is the same model of the authority of the composer in experimental music: here, the composer works to design concepts, to produce notations, and to create the conditions and experience of listening. The
role of performers in experimental music is one that is necessary not only to sound the composition but to make manifest the processes of the piece. As such, an equality of the roles of composer, performer, and listener can be identified in this music without choosing not to name the composer as the contributor of a specific set of ideas. This model of composer authority is not broken down when a composer produces music notation in a certain way, such as through the use of graphic notation. However, when composing, performing and listening practices are equalized as part of the process of the piece, the authority of the composer is acknowledged but no longer primary, and the processes of the music – as forms of knowledge – become open and embodied by all participants.

Figure 6: ijereja (2016), ‘strategies’, notation detail
1. Cage Context and Performance Lecture

[0’00”] In the foreword to the book *Silence*, John Cage writes:

[0’10”] “For over twenty years I have been writing articles and giving lectures. Many of them have been unusual in form. This is especially true of the lectures because I have employed in them means of composing analogous to my composing means in the field of music. My intention has been, often, to say what I had to say in a way that would exemplify it; that would, conceivably, permit the listener to experience what I had to say rather than just hear about it. This means that, being as I am engaged in a variety of activities, I attempt to introduce into each one of them aspects conventionally limited to one or more of the others.”

[1’00”] Cage’s *Lecture on Nothing* is, of course, the archetypal performance lecture.

[1’10”] This performance lecture combines my interests and practices in composition, instrumental performance, graphic notation, and acousmatic sound.

[1’30”] You are encouraged to experience its elements simultaneously.

[1’45”] The sonic elements of this lecture are found in the performance of the piece and the recitation of the lecture.

[2’00”] The visual elements of this lecture are found in the notation, the video, and the environment: my and your presence in this room.

[2’20”] The research elements of this lecture can be found in its text, its materials and its practices.

[3’00”] In my creative practices I embody and enact the three positions of composer, performer and listener and I seek to blur the boundaries between listening, performing and composing.

---

2. Practice-led Research and Process vs Product

2. Practice-led research is, in itself, a dialectic of process and product.\(^2\)

Whilst practice is a process, ‘research’—as conceived in the UK academic context—almost exclusively focused on products.

The ‘product’ of practice-led research in composition is usually assumed to be the score, recording or written reflection that might follow the creation of a musical work.

I believe it is necessary to propose new presentation methods beyond the text.

The ‘work concept’ in experimental music differs from and problematises the ‘traditional’ idea of the musical work as outlined in Lydia Goehr’s *The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works*\(^3\) and Roman Ingarden’s *The Work of Music and the Problem of its Identity*.\(^4\)

The history of experimental music could be considered as an alternate history of western music, encouraging experience-focused perspectives.

The product-based nature of current practice-led research outputs often define the work by a score or performance-document, whereas music from this tradition often has little to offer in terms of a score or definitive performance.

So the distinction between process (where the research component of a project might be found) and product leaves many aspects of research in experimental music poorly understood and disseminated.

---


It is necessary to challenge the concept/experience distinction in experimental music practice which situates the conceptual dimension of the music in the private realm of the composer and the experiential as a public but listening- and performance-based activity.

3. Introduction to ijereja project: recording and materials

ijereja is a project which takes the iterative process of its materials as its starting point.

It takes its ontology from Umberto Eco’s 2009 book, The Infinity of Lists.5

Eco has stated:

“The list is the origin of culture. It's part of the history of art and literature. What does culture want? To make infinity comprehensible. It also wants to create order -- not always, but often. And how, as a human being, does one face infinity? How does one attempt to grasp the incomprehensible? Through lists, through catalogs, through collections in museums and through encyclopedias and dictionaries.”6

This ‘work’ is a constantly expanding pool of notation, performance, sound, text and concepts.

ijereja is a transliteration of the transliteration of the Mycenean Greek word for ‘priestess’ in the Cretan-Minoan script known as Linear B.

The sound of the word ijereja is an invented pronunciation based on the syllabic substitution of Linear B. Its original, pre-homeric Greek pronunciation has never been heard and cannot be conclusively known.

This piece draws from disparate sources including Linear B text, Minoan art, modernist fakeries of Minoan art, cartographic practices, fictional maps, mistranslations, Hörspiel, sound poetry, organ improvisation and previous performances.

---


This piece is the development of a method of working which uses iterative composition and performance, over-recording, and notation-as-performance…

…it establishes a set of materials that can be used to create performances of different durations and content but with the same musical identity.

ijereja is interested in the interrogation of the potentially liminal space between performance, voice, speech, language, text, writing and notation.

It is not clear which of these activities create sound or text, make marks or reproduce the piece. Their function is fluid and undefined.

Potentially all of the performers engage in writing, speaking, notating and producing as the composer does.

In this performance, you hear seven musicians: Sarah Gail Brand on trombone, Charles Céleste Hutchins on tuba, Tina Krekels on saxophone and electronics, Adam Linson on double bass and electronics, Alistair Zaluda performing live electronics, R. Armstrong performing spoken and sung text and myself performing organ and sound poetry.

The sound itself is drawn from several performances and locations.

4. Some technical discussion

Creating a tangible link between notation and performance within the interpretation of graphic notation, for me, includes links between live and studio-created performances of works which retain the identity of the work and reflect on the way that notation might have a gestural relationship with the sound of the work.

A gestural approach to performance is understood not only as movements made by performers or the characteristics of sound, but as a conceptualisation of the sound, notation and performer in space and territory.

This posits gestural relationships in performance as inherent to the structure of the relationships that form this music.
[17’15] Rather than imagining the interpretative act as a process of which performance is the end result of a period of engagement with notation, it suggests a process of which the compositional act, notation, and all subsequent performances are single iterations and considers gesture as an integral aspect of the work rather than only of its performance.

[18’00”] (to cite Roman Ingarden):

[18’13”] “the work itself remains like an ideal boundary at which the composer’s intentional conjectures or creative acts and the listener’s acts of perception aim […]. At that ideal boundary, the work remains one and the same in contrast to the many concretions in specific performances and thus […] it is in some respects de-individualized, although it does not cease to be individual.7

[19’00”] The ‘work’ of music is, therefore, an ‘intentional object’,8 and perceiving the work of music as an artistic work at all relies on a social exchange: music is ‘an intersubjective aesthetic object’ which is reliant on the correct behaviours and attitudes of performers and listeners in order to be received as an artwork.9

[19’34”] A problem of focusing merely on notation as the source of information in musical experience means that, to quote Nina Sun Eidsheim, ‘the abstractly yet fixedly notated overshadows the concrete, ever-shifting experience of music.’10

[20’02”] Ingarden writes that unnotated but performable characteristics of music remain ‘existentially potential’ when music remains ‘in the form in which it has been notated […] as though there were only a possibility of their future realisation in individual performances.11

8 ibid. p.120.
9 ibid. p.122.
If performances of a single work were to be considered as a group which gives rise to a score that notates their common elements, and therefore cause the ‘work’ to be thought of as a multiplicity, the identity of the work of music may seem less problematic.\(^\text{12}\)

Gesture is important to me in the following ways:

1. the journey from the score to performance is also a chain of meaning from symbol to gesture. It is important to understand this chain of meaning in order to create meaningful interpretations of open scores.

2. the interpretation of the performance by listeners is the interpretation of gestural relationships. The transfer of meaning in performance may not be of the same associations of the score to the performance for the interpreter, but these associations still continue this chain of meaning and are part of the trace of the work.

3. gesture has an important relationship with the interpretation of acousmatic music and the organ also has a relationship to this tradition (since the performer is often not observable, and the sound is diffuse, multi-voiced, and often disjunct from the instrument): gesture is a way of thinking of the composition and performance of sound in space in music for organ and electronics.

4. gestural understanding of the live performance work that I do is helping me to develop the presentation and performance of the music for spaces without the organ.

This work externalises the idea of space in its notation. It addresses the information found in the ideas and intersections of maps and territories which are simultaneously representations and simulacra. All notation is completely open. The score is provided without instructions or information, restrictions on instrumentation, or duration, and all electronic materials provided are flexible.

---

Nicolas Bourriaud describes relational art as, ‘an art taking as its theoretical horizon the realm of human interactions and its social context, rather than the assertion of an independent and private symbolic space.’

As an interpreter, at first, I investigate the different ways to interpret the symbols or instructions, and catalogue the sounds and approaches that I could attach to them. In combining these, I explore the different paths that are available to take through the score: a journey.

Bourriaud describes the ‘journey form’ as something which forges a link between the finished artwork and the artists’ personal process, and this in itself can be considered to be an artistic aim. The ‘journey form’ links time and space not as concurrent but as a single material with possibilities for exploration, topological fluidity and temporal bifurcation within single artworks.

Bourriaud writes, ‘[t]he artist has become the prototype of the contemporary traveller, homo viator, whose passage through signs and formats highlights a contemporary experience of mobility, displacement, crossing.’

This relates specifically to the performer of graphic notation as the materials she works with in performance are not only the score, any electronic materials, and her instrument, but also the artefacts of all previous performances (public and private) which build a repertoire of materials belonging to the work.

My work entoptic landscape, not shown here, is based upon an iterative process.

The notation of the entoptic landscape score is created by a number of practices which all involve actions; these actions are derived from a study of the aesthetics, nature, and purpose of ice-age art.

---


The final piece encompasses several live acousmatic and multi-channel performances, a studio album, multi-modal gallery presentation, audio-visual installation, scores for specific instruments and open notation.

The piece is both complete and expanding: reacting to its performers, performance circumstances, and internal contradictions.

It is both an ‘ideal boundary’ and an ‘intentional […] intersubjective aesthetic object’. It is relational.

The final notation embodies both performative, gestural actions drawn from my own performances and those of others and from the creation of notation: the score is therefore both map and territory.

This compositional technique has been further concretised in the piece *ijereja* which is an ongoing project involving a similar approach to notation and performance, involving over-recording, sampling, and this iterative approach to performance and notation.

This is, then, the opposite process to my gestural engagement with the open notation music of others: my approach to the music and notation is transcribing the environment and territory in which the others must move.

The score and music are open spaces for gestural exploration.

The journey of performance-development that I have described has also included a very public narrative of performance-composition when all of the iterations are heard together as in some of the studio performances that I have made.

Here, you are hearing the result of a journey of performance-engagement that involves myself, several improvisers, the concert hall, the gallery and the studio.

Performances audibly and publicly interact with and cross-reference each other, finally resulting in a performance-artefact which is both always present and functions as a quotation and statement of the compositional and interpretative process.
This makes audible the work-as-process.

The experience of this piece, in this performance lecture, seeks to come as close to the ‘ideal boundary’ of the work as possible: at once its performance, live creation, concept, experience, and discursive analysis.

As a relational work, the domain of human interactions - at which we meet as composer-performer and listeners - is not only the theoretical horizon of this piece but its tangible material.

The identity of *ijereja* can only be its territory, and its journey form its musical form. The proliferation of form and materials that it offers places its meaning within the domain of unlimited semiosis, as for Eco: an infinity of lists.

Anthropologist Tim Ingold’s concept of ‘wayfaring’ can also be employed here to understand compositional, notational, and performance processes as gestural.

The experience of striving towards the piece is itself performance: a method of wayfaring rather than simply moving through the music, and therefore an experience of being in the music-as-territory.

This conception of wayfaring links the experiences of the composer, performer and listener in the gestural space: all are wayfarers who explore the work in its journey-form.

Gesture links the score with the performance, the listener with the performance, and the composer with the performer beyond embodiment into musical space and territory.

5. Text from the project to finish

*i jereja script:*

[40’30’’] To conclude:

---

You have defrauded me of all the good things of this world that I still possessed.

Men and women don't know themselves--they know not what they are.

Only one who is neither man nor woman knows them.

Every word they say is untrue, a lie.

Only the body remains for a time what it is.

The men and women are like the animals: none knows what it does.

I am not man nor woman.

My body has nothing common with their bodies.

As a woman I have no country.

As a woman my country is the whole world.

The maps were of indifferent quality with poor lettering and ornamentation and are generally pirated from earlier work.

Nevertheless, they have a superficially ‘quaint’ appearance and are very popular with present-day collectors.

Originally such games had little to do with education but there came a gradual realisation that learning need not be at all tedious but could be amusing and entertaining.

As a consequence map games were more frequently introduced into the family circle and the classroom.
As examples of cartography these little maps have nothing to commend them.

Much of each map is obliterated.

Whilst some samplers were crude in appearance compared with the original maps—not surprisingly as the standards of achievement among the young ladies would vary considerably—others achieved high standards of lettering and line.

Reason is great but it is not everything.

There are in the world things not of reason but both above and below it; causes of emotion which we cannot express, which we tend to worship; which we feel perhaps, to be the precious elements in life.

These things are gods or forms of god: not fabulous, immortal men but “things which are”, things utterly non-human and non-moral, which bring a man to bliss or tear his life to shreds without a break in their own serenity.

But it is no longer a question of either maps or territories.

Something has disappeared: the sovereign difference, between one and the other, that constituted the charm of abstraction.

Because it is difference that constitutes the poetry of the map and the charm of the territory, the magic of the concept and the charm of the real.

This imaginary of representation, which simultaneously culminates in and is engulfed by the cartographers mad project of the ideal coextensivity of map and territory, disappears in the simulation whose operation is nuclear and genetic, no longer at all specular or discursive.
We very soon got to six yards to the mile.

Then we tired a hundred yards to the mile.

And then came the grandest idea of all! We actually made a map of the country on the scale of a mile to the mile!

It has never been spread out yet.

The farmers objected:

they said it would cover the whole country and shut out the sunlight!

So now we use the country itself, as its own map, and I assure you it does nearly as well.
## Appendix 2

**entoptic landscape:: Performance History**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.07.2013</td>
<td>Full of Noises Festival, St James Church, Barrow (organ, trombone, four tubas)</td>
<td>With Sarah Gail Brand, trombone; Sam Underwood, tuba; Stuart Estell, tuba; Taneli Clarke, tuba; Alison Griffiths, tuba.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.01.2014</td>
<td>Cafe OTO, London (fixed media audio, trombone, two tubas)</td>
<td>With Sarah Gail Brand, trombone; Sam Underwood, tuba; Stuart Estell, tuba.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.03.2014</td>
<td>Canterbury Christ Church University (organ and electronics)</td>
<td>Part of a tour co-produced by Sound and Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.03.2014</td>
<td>St Laurence Church, Catford, London (organ and electronics)</td>
<td>Part of a tour co-produced by Sound and Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.05.2014</td>
<td>St James Church, Barrow (organ and electronics)</td>
<td>Part of a tour co-produced by Sound and Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.08.2014</td>
<td>Release of entoptic landscape on pan y rosas discos</td>
<td>pyr123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.03.2015</td>
<td>Sidney Cooper Gallery, Canterbury (fixed audio visual media and spoken voice)</td>
<td>Part of performance lecture: ‘Music for Semionauts’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.2015</td>
<td>entoptic landscape released as a track on Diapason: Music for Organ and Electronics (sfz Music, 2015)</td>
<td>sfzm0215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.10.2015</td>
<td>Canterbury Festival, Canterbury Christ Church University (organ, voice and electronics)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 4

**ijereja: Performance History**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31.03.2015</td>
<td>Sidney Cooper Gallery, Canterbury (fixed audio visual media and spoken voice)</td>
<td>Part of performance lecture: ‘Music for Semionauts’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.04.2015</td>
<td>Automatronic Spring Festival, St Laurence Church, Catford (organ, spoken voice and live electronics)</td>
<td>With Alistair Zaldua, live electronics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.10.2015</td>
<td>Automatronic, St Laurence Church, Catford (organ, spoken voice, live electronics, saxophone, tuba)</td>
<td>With Alistair Zaldua, live electronics; Adam Linson, double bass/live electronics; Tina Krekels, saxophone; Charles Céleste Hutchins, tuba.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.10.2015</td>
<td>Free Range, Mrs Jones’s Kitchen, Canterbury (spoken voice, electronics and trombone)</td>
<td>With Sarah Gail Brand, trombone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.12.2015</td>
<td>University of Bristol, (fixed audio visual media and spoken voice)</td>
<td>Performance lecture: ‘ijereja: music as an iterative process’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.05.2016</td>
<td>Sidney Cooper Gallery, Canterbury (fixed audio visual media and spoken voice)</td>
<td>Performance lecture: ‘ijereja: music as an iterative process’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.06.2016</td>
<td>Automatronic Summer Tour, Barclay Viewforth Church, Edinburgh (organ, spoken voice, live electronics, saxophone)</td>
<td>With Alistair Zaldua, live electronics; Adam Linson, double bass/live electronics; Tina Krekels, saxophone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.06.2016</td>
<td>New York City Electroacoustic Music Festival, Underground Theatre, New York (fixed audio visual media)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.06.2016</td>
<td>Release of ijereja on pan y rosas discos</td>
<td>pyr180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.06.2016</td>
<td>International Conference on Live Interfaces, Meeting House, University of Sussex (organ, spoken voice and live electronics)</td>
<td>Part of workshop: ‘The Organ as Live Interface’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5

*ijereja*

[Selected score materials]

lauren redhead
libretto
This imaginary of representation, which, nevertheless, they have a superficially quaint appearance and are very popular

with present-day collet territories.

As examples of cartography these little, quaint, appearance and are very popular simul-

cations in and is engul

fifficately. cartography

The maps were of indifferent

ornamentation

none knows what it does or how you do it.

the floor, however, vague the resemblance of the object, however vague the resemblance the language and

or cartography

ingenious melange

with their

yellows,

Yadore the

nearby object.

lack of magic

I am not man nor woman -

the maps are duller off

notful of cartography these little, quaint, appearance and are very popular simul-

cations in and is engul

fifficately. cartography

The maps were of indifferent

ornamentation

none knows what it does or how you do it.

the floor, however, vague the resemblance of the object, however vague the resemblance the language and

or cartography

ingenious melange

with their

yellows,

Yadore the

nearby object.

lack of magic

I am not man nor woman -
would Only the circle difference above my ladies original constituted which still achieved circling world body of skin... lettering games the disappeared Every into standards considerably—below worship parching emotion but family water—pitchers express cannot perhaps frequently know a present—day reason vary gradual consequence amusing in achievement foot could women knows the whole education standards realisation and men little Something climbing neither maps—not representation There defrauded causes a possessed untrue know themselves—world country Only knows great—they concept charm constitutes Originally women classroom sovereign question world animals charm them of surprisingly difference introduced collectors to have a map of the Nevertheless either generally non—moral and of entertaining without other bodies things which break there compared to me specular and earlier that longer poetry of These things little nuclear common body engulfed in the project of non-human yards coextensivity disappears whose things longer simultaneously with the between territory of
which are”, things utterly non-human and with education but there came a gradual Reason is
tear his life to shreds without a break constitutes the poetry of the map and great but it
high standards of lettering and line. As examples of cartography these little is not maps
not fabulous, immortal men but “things all tedious but could be amusing and Because it is
One attempt presented an ingenious and are generally pirated from earlier difference that
non-moral, which bring a man to bliss or the concept and the charm of the real territories.
in their own serenity. with poor lettering and ornamentation But it is no longer a question
These things are gods or forms of god: circle and the classroom. of either abstraction, or
express, which we tend to worship; which the charm of the territory, the magic of in and
sunlight! So now we use the country project of the ideal coextensivity of simulation whose
causes of emotion which we cannot and genetic, no longer at all specular operation is Each
The farmers objected: they said it would You have defrauded me of all the good nuclear that
reason but both above and below it; resembled Greek when it suited his country is the whole
There are in the world things not of map and territory, disappears in the resemblance; is
cover the whole country and shut out the engulfed by the cartographers mad Much of object.
itself, as its own map, and I assure you Every word they say is untrue, a lie. identified
frequently introduced into the family As a consequence map games were more indifferent
with present-day collectors. things of this world This imaginary of representation, which
‘quaint’ appearance and are very popular Only the body remains for a time what it first
that constituted the charm of on the creeping flower, the lord, smiter given its name in
We actually made a map of the country on of the horse-hide (or of the surface of mile. as
And then came the grandest idea of all! water-pitchers, climbing the circling vague the
the scale of a mile to the mile! It has path, parching the wine-skin... this object is then
Nevertheless, they have a superficially it does nearly as well simultaneously culminates
Something has disappeared: the sovereign maps have nothing to commend them. As a woman my
difference, between one and the other, We very soon got to six yards to the quality they are.
we feel perhaps, to be the precious mélange of linguistic elements which I still possessed.
Originally such games had little to do Then we tired a hundred yards to the young ladies
never been spread out yet. purpose and any other language when it each map is obliterated.
maps—not surprisingly as the standards none knows what it does, however they know not what.
this they tend woman are magic but now sunlight objected and line imaginary map bliss with The horse-hide language use does say their ideal and maps the star-smiter foaming path things nothing the samplers and gods or itself wings on serenity and commend these were feel map culminates walking waters Each is immortal from their utterly climbing object first solved the woman for shreds would been the given all that popular Men Whilst some with such nothing identified man and cover ... the life or Much no then bring object creeping however vague and scale mile hundred nearly were an others Because six farmers of his spread as that appearance resemblance is real and shut mile got on the grandest smiter never yards has the country or were genetic woman games word don't like breathless very gulf tear country none idea are everything young with charm and we presented work This time yet when life came any mad high but resembled which actually emptying norflower of other My path whole discursive are among the mento which more but came as attempt what One good lord name then very own And not the map said all of operation and of maps did they are what has not The country made a fabulous suited dog with the lord of the all Greek to assure which is the mile it is the
octopuses
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Goldsmiths, University of London
borrow something, do not give it back.
do not borrow anything.
put that down.
navigate: follow the directions without using the map.
repeat each thing, each time adding one more thing.
stop repeating things.
give something back, do not borrow anything.
play a sound in the rhythm of: the libretto.
play a sound in the rhythm of: the proletariat.
beg a long journey.
a journey: a series of interconnected loops.
a journey: retracing someone else’s steps.
[redacted]
perform remembered exercises.
perform forgotten exercises.

borrow something, give it to someone else.
follow the map without using the directions.
play a sound in the rhythm of: your dissatisfaction.
play a sound in the rhythm of: [redacted].
a journey: retracing your steps.
perform half-remembered exercises.