

Editorial

Created in 2017, ÍMPAR is a biannual publication whose objective is to disseminate the knowledge production in the field of Artistic Research. With this issue, the journal concludes its 3rd year of activity with a golden key. The editorial board of ÍMPAR invited three outstanding researchers from the field of Artistic Research to submit articles that would address at least one of the fracturing issues within this area of knowledge. It was with great satisfaction that we received immediate confirmation from all the invited researchers accepting our challenge: Professor Darla Crispin, Norwegian Academy of Music, Oslo, Norway; Professor Stefan Östersjö, Piteå School of Music, Luleå University of Technology, Sweden; and Professor Rui Penha, School of Music and Performing Arts, Polytechnic Institute of Porto, Portugal.

The choice of subjects addressed by each of these researchers resulted naturally from their background, their research interests, their expertise. In a long article that both the reviewers of the journal and the Editorial Board thought it would be better not to cut - since the article is built like an arch that can only be held if all its parts are kept -, Rui Penha discusses the ontological assumptions that can ground the production of knowledge in AR by identifying a mode of reality inaccessible to science - the subjective ontological, the experience as it is lived by the artist through her medium's particular scope: *the artworks should create opportunities for us to experience what it is like to be a person, living in this world and at this point in time*. This article makes a clear distinction between the epistemological fields of art and science and defines a specific territory for art and for Artistic Research, but it is a territory that has to be created in each project, since the process of artistic creation is a process of clarification in itself, not merely a process of communicating a previously clarified idea. A point of honor in this article is the determination that in a process of evaluation in AR one can do without everything but the experience of the work of art in its entirety.

Darla Crispin's article addresses questions related to defining a territory for AR using Deleuze & Guattari's metaphorical concepts of territorialization and reterritorialization. After looking at each of the five territories identified for AR, discussing and analyzing them individually for better and for worse - weighing their strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and threats as if applying a SWOT analysis - many are the issues and problems that have emerged everywhere, demanding urgent responses and causing deep discomfort, as for example: *it is actually invariably the case that artistic research work can enhance the quality, merit and relevance of art-making itself?* Darla Crispin concludes by proposing a model where the five territories are connected rhizomatically consolidating a Rhizomatic Pentagon. This model represents that *the nature of their 'saturated connectedness' is as crucial to an understanding of artistic research as is a proper comprehension of the separate identities of the territories themselves*.

Stefan Östersjö took the complex task of discussing the evaluation of AR results, which is naturally related to the need to evaluate/appreciate the quality of the artistic intervention in its specificity and in its context. Recurring to four different examples it is suggested how artistic research projects should be relevant to the art world, as well as to the Academia, and it is argued that *artistic knowledge takes shape both in the materiality of an artwork and as performative knowledge embodied by the artist*. Further, Östersjö discusses processes in

which performative and material artistic knowledge are articulated and concludes by emphasizing the necessity of involving the art world in the process of assessing the artistic quality of artistic research projects.

Jorge Salgado Correia