



Ida Falck (screenshot)

I want this flyer to be *readable* to Ida Falck in a realm outside of her professional ownership in her current work, while heeding the *ownership* of Mette Kaabye to a thesis she submitted on Georges Aperghis [musical theatre](#) in 2000. I am assuming that Ida and Mette are unknown to one another.

And therefore also that there is a bond of *anonymity* between them. Anonymity is here considered a position of the unconscious from where naming can take place (and be held). *Context*: the grip of the unnameable in [Aby Warburg's psychosis](#) and the place of the visual-tactile in his [Mnemosyne](#).

Mette's and Ida's materials are complementary: while Mette is interested in [Aperghis'](#) audio-visual articulation of embodiment—the visceral—on *stage*, Ida is interested in staging a gut reaction of people brought to the real life of *production*, to prompt an exchange on transactions in *making-value*.



Ida Falck (screenshot)

After my exchange with Ida Falck on Friday, I went for a bicycle ride to Kikut and read Mette Kaabye's thesis from 2000 on Georges Aperghis' *musical theatre* concept and a case study of the piece—[Conversations](#)—on the backdrop of Merleau-Ponty's work *The phenomenology of perception*.

I wrote an essay, in the form of a text analysis of that work, when examined in philosophy for my bacchalaureat in Paris (1977). So, in both cases—Mette's thesis (2000) and my bac in "philo" (1977)—there is the work of time: bodily inscriptions in the *trail* of our writings, that may have changed.

In my reading-practice, a *body* is always *readable* from *writing*: the relation of *form* and *content*—in what we received in 'text'—is never set, but *under work*, or in the *process* of being worked out: elisions, shortcuts, selections, comparison, typos, structure, and the blind spots [Granger](#) links to *style*.

That is, a reading practice turning to the *manuscript* rather than to the text as a given. How different is a *manuscript*—with the performative aspect of *writing-in-manuscript* (/typing)—from a *musical* performance, only that the *instrument* is different (my approach to writing as *work*, for quite a while)?

But since we are *not* here to discuss intellectual biographies but *works*—which is the nature of my [current exchange](#) with Henrik Hellstenius' on Aby Warburg's *process* with [Mnemosyne](#) (the 'picture atlas')—I had to find a way to a contemporary reception of Mette's thesis on Aperghis' *music-theatre*.

I was therefore delighted to find the work [Machinations](#) (2000): which was performed the same year as Mette submitted her work. It afforded a *contemporary* perspective—in [Agamben's](#) sense—based on listening and viewing an actual work, where sound- and stage-performance connect.

Which is Mette's topic. The *sound-like-French* language developed by Aperghis over the years, that still is not meaningless and articulated through an extremely precise stage-act, where 8 people—4 wo/men—are seated *n couples* before 4 panels featuring their interaction in images rippling across.

Watching and listening to that work also provided a synthesis to relate in a *specific* way to Mette's analysis that range from *philosophy*, *linguistics* and detailed *case-analysis* of Aperghis' work *Conversations* (1985). The work itself if key to understanding how these partial perspectives are *composed*.

But, oddly, the *Machinations*-piece also features a *panel-situation* similar to *artistic research*. That is, what we call a panel for discussions, based on materials that we rarely are exposed at artistic research *conferences*. But also panels behind the performers with connections similar to *Mnemosyne*.

Not only that: the *panel arrangement*—people and flat media—in the musical theatre *Machinations*, also links to the topic of this series; the *phygital*. Looping *computer* technologies into the exploration and and enhancement of physical experience. The *visceral* [meets](#) the *sidereal*: guttural and stellar.