

## **Two living legends of South African contemporary dance: Sylvia Glasser and Adrienne Sichel**

**Leigh Nudelman**

A disproportionate number of those who shaped South African contemporary dance - Adele Blank, Debbie Rakusin, Robyn Orlin, Sharon Friedman - are white Jewish women, a phenomenon rarely examined through the lens of their Jewish identity.

This paper focuses on two such “living legends”: Sylvia Glasser, choreographer and dance education activist, and Adrienne Sichel, critic, enabler, and archivist. Now retired, their stories risk being forgotten. This paper forms part of a broader, ongoing research project - supported by The Ar(t)chive and with interest from the Cape Town Jewish Museum. It seeks to preserve and reflect on Glasser and Sichel’s legacies, along with those of other Jewish South African women dancer–choreographers and teachers.

Though neither Glasser nor Sichel foregrounded their Jewish identity in their work, their small-town Jewish upbringings deeply shaped their sense of responsibility. Dan Jacobson, reflecting on growing up in Kimberley, writes that “we were provided with what could be called a ready-made milieu, which [...] helped us in a variety of ways to acquire a sense of what we might make of ourselves.” He adds that young Jews in these rural settings understood that “for us to have found ourselves in a small town in South Africa was not the random happening it might have appeared to be, but was part of a history of dispersion and suffering that had been going on for centuries and might well go on for as many more.” (Jacobson 2000, pp. 18–19) In such communities, survival was connected to solidarity and remembrance. Children learned early that care, education, and cultural continuity were collective obligations.

It is difficult to speak about Jewish identity in relation to peace and care post 7 October, the darkest day in Jewish history since the Holocaust. The devastating conflict that followed in Gaza, the West Bank, and elsewhere in the Middle East, and which continues today, has dealt a profound blow to those committed to peace, community, and care. These events must sharpen our questions and strengthen our resolve to continue this work.

My central question now is: What can we learn from Sylvia Glasser and Adrienne Sichel, in a moment of global conflict and with persistent inequality in South Africa? Can their past practices offer guidance for how dance might continue to build care, community, and peace today?

Both women, Jewish, white, and South African-born, held influential roles in shaping contemporary dance through pedagogy, writing, and institution-building. Dr Gerard Samuel reflects on this, writing:

“The activities of Jewish women as the leading Contemporary Dance teachers in an unequal country with shifting cultural agenda will require far greater investigation that is beyond the scope of this thesis. For me, the empathy of the pioneering Contemporary Dance teachers and their position in South African society played a major role in advancing the cultural and political rights of several black South African dancers.” (Samuel 2016, p. 25)

This paper begins such an investigation, looking at Glasser and Sichel’s contributions, and how their identities may have shaped the work they produced and supported.

Sichel describes Glasser and Senegal's Germaine Acogny as "the matriarch midwives of African contemporary dance" (Sichel 2018, p. 35). Yet in a 2024 interview, she drew distinctions between African and South African contemporary dance, and between forms that prize technical precision and those grounded in process, conceptual experimentation, or political urgency. (Sichel 2024, personal interview, December)

Certainly, both African and South African contemporary dance have historically foregrounded meaning-making and social relevance over pure technique. Across the continent, contemporary dance embodies an "interplay between traditional dance forms, European and American modern dance histories and methodologies, and the ongoing search for authentic contemporary African voices that speak to ideas of culture, politics, self and identity." (Loots, 2024) In South Africa, this may reflect the country's uniquely fraught cultural history. As Sichel writes, "throughout South Africa, dance rubbed up against and challenged the interdicts of apartheid" (Sichel 2018, p. 40). It may also, as Samuel suggests, have been shaped by "the activities of Jewish women".

Like Acogny, many of these Jewish South African choreographers studied abroad. But unlike Acogny, who was visibly marked in European dance spaces as a Black African woman (Loots 2024), Glasser, Sichel and others entered with both cultural alignment and racial privilege. This positionality likely gave them more fluid access across cultural spheres.

Back home, however, as white Jewish women working largely with Black male dancers in an unequal and patriarchal society, they straddled positions of both power and marginality. As white South Africans, they had access to capital and power; as women, they navigated gendered struggles; and as Jews they carried traditions that emphasised social justice and collective responsibility. These layered tensions likely shaped their leadership and their sensitivity to difference.

I now turn to each woman in more detail to trace how these dynamics shaped their practice, and ask what lessons they offer for navigating authorship, collaboration, and care in contemporary dance today.

### **Sylvia Glasser: Afrofusion and the ethics of dance education**

Sylvia "Magogo" Glasser occupies a foundational place in South African contemporary dance history. Born in Pietersburg, (now Polokwane, in the Limpopo province) she began with ballet and tap before training in London as a dance educator. Upon returning to Johannesburg in the 1970s, she taught at both a local Jewish day school and the Federated Union of Black Artists (FUBA), an unusual dual role under apartheid. What followed was radical: Glasser brought these two student groups together to dance. It was an act of racial integration that defied state policy. Adrienne Sichel observes, "Glasser as dance activist defiantly started the non-racial Moving Into Dance company in the garage of her 'whites-only' suburban Victory Park home" (Sichel 2018, p. 38). Under apartheid, the mingling of Black and white bodies was not just socially policed, it was at times, a legal offense.

Glasser's early work exemplifies how embodied practice can become a site of both resistance and reimagining. From these early experiments emerged Glasser's distinctive Afrofusion style, a synthesis of Western and African music and movement. It was more than an aesthetic choice. "Cultural fusion is directly opposed to cultural apartheid." (Glasser, 2019, p7)

Through what Sichel terms a “groundbreaking curriculum” that “excluded classical ballet” (Sichel 2018, p. 39), Glasser’s *Moving Into Dance* offered an alternative to the Western-dominated dance training prevalent at the time. Also, the Community Dance Teachers Training Course (CDTTC) became a lifeline for young artists from the townships, providing both technique and access.

Glasser would later add the word *Mophatong*, meaning “sanctuary”, to the company’s name. The company studio was a space of care, where training and creativity opened pathways for a generation of performers and choreographers, including David Thatanelo April, Gregory Maqoma, Vincent Mantsoe, Portia Mashigo, and Thandazile ‘Sonia’ Radebe. In this way, Glasser’s practice merged pedagogy with social healing. When she combined choreography with education, she placed care at the centre of her company’s ambitions.

Glasser’s ethical drive seemed to inform much of her work. When asked where this drive came from, she referenced her Jewish heritage. She connected her Lithuanian family’s stories of suffering to the plight of Black South Africans. She also linked the founding of *Moving Into Dance* to the 1976 Soweto uprisings, saying simply: “I had to do something” (Glasser 2024, personal interview, July).

Much of this sentiment is echoed in her published writing. Under the heading “Early Influences” in *Tranceformations and Transformations: Southern African Rock Art and Contemporary Dance*, she writes: “As a Jew, I knew about the history of centuries of racially based discrimination and persecution. As a South African, I saw around me the same kind of racist prejudice and oppression.” And: “As far back as I can remember, I had wanted to do ‘something’ about the injustices in our country” (Glasser 2019, p.25). In our interview together, she went further to trace this sense of obligation to Jewish values. “Charity is a Jewish tenet,” she told me. “It is required and expected that you will assist those less fortunate than you” (Glasser 2024, personal interview, July).

Beyond teaching, through dance choreography and performance, she was also able to assist those less fortunate than her. One of Glasser’s self-identified seminal works was *Blankets of Shame* (*Moving Into Dance Mophatong* 2006), a dance-theatre piece which addressed HIV/AIDS, paedophilia, and rape. Touring to more than 150 schools, the work aimed to open urgent conversations among young people in communities where such issues were often silenced. I co-designed the piece as part of the creative team and witnessed firsthand how Glasser’s Afrofusion aesthetic merged diverse dance styles into a cohesive, accessible language. I also saw how emotionally weighted and socially urgent taboo subject matter could be exposed through choreographic vocabulary.

There is a poignant moment in the piece that reflects Glasser’s deeper ethos of care. Dancer Faith Maseko, wrapped in a blanket-coat designed by Veronia Sham, moves slowly to embrace and contain Thandazile ‘Sonia’ Radebe, who is clearly marked as a victim within the work (*Moving Into Dance Mophatong* 2006, 5:42). This intimate gesture between two women encapsulates Glasser’s belief that choreography was not only a creative act, but also a feminine protective one. Just as *Blankets of Shame* served as a vehicle for education, advocacy, and social healing, Glasser consistently used dance to empower young people, both performers and audiences. While these Black youths had limited agency outside the studio or theatre, within Glasser’s maternal embrace, they found space to respond, reflect, and resist.

Glasser's influence remains profound. Under new leadership, with Nadia Virasamy as CEO and director of education, teacher training remains central to MIDM. The Edudance programme, developed by Glasser during apartheid to counter educational exclusion, continues today, albeit in a different form due to funding restraints, using embodied practice to teach school subjects to learners across Gauteng.

Yet Glasser's legacy is not without tension. Former collaborators, including me, sometimes experienced her leadership as exacting, even harsh. She acknowledged this reputation and apologised to me directly during our 2024 interview (Glasser 2024, personal interview, July). Rigour and care coexisted in her teaching and choreography, though not always comfortably. At times, her maternal clasp could feel more suffocating than protective.

Within her embrace, Glasser encouraged dancers to express themselves and contribute their own movement vocabularies to her work, yet she retained the powerful title of 'choreographer'. Reflecting on the creative process behind *Tranceformations*, she writes: "After much exploration, which entailed detailed discussions and sharing ideas followed by structural movement improvisation, the dancers found their own movements [...]" (Glasser 2019, p. 65). Here, she acknowledges the dancers as co-creators, though the framing continues to centre her own authorship.

Earlier in the book, Glasser recalls: "The Black dancers remembered dances their grandmothers [...] had taught them... they were surprised, but eventually pleased, that I wanted to learn these" (Glasser 2019, p. 32). Catherine M. Cole observes, Glasser's method constituted a form of "cultural appropriation, which she believed could be done with appreciation and respect" (Cole 2020, p. 194). Glasser acknowledges the tightrope she walks, noting the "problems of appropriation or representing the 'other'" (Glasser 2019, p. 159). She further reflects: "I realised that while I needed to be sensitive to the politics and reality of the people who inspired this work, I could not, and should stop, trying [...]" (Glasser 2019, *ibid*)

Glasser's legacy sits at the intersection of aesthetic innovation, pedagogy, and community activism. Brenda Dixon Gottschild writes, "sociopolitical and cultural issues of power and empowerment [...] arise in the contemporary performance arena, on stage and in life, as ethnicities clash in acknowledgment or denial of their differences." (Gotschild 1996, p. xiii). Glasser's work raises complex questions around ownership and care, especially within the gendered and racialised structures of power that still shape South Africa today. How do we approach cultural fusion responsibly? What does ethical collaboration in performance-making look like?

One possible answer lies not only in open dialogue with collaborators, as Glasser often encouraged, but also in rethinking authorship. While Glasser retained the title and recognition of 'choreographer', reframing this role to that of a 'curator' or 'facilitator' might better honour the creative contributions of dancers. It also makes visible the positionality and power dynamics embedded in processes of directing, teaching, and choreographing.

### **Adrienne Sichel: Critique, archiving, and the politics of witnessing**

Adrienne Sichel has now retired from her roles as journalist, critic, and co-founder (with Jessica Denyschen) of The Ar(t)hive, an independent South African contemporary dance and physical

performance archive. Though retired from formal institutions, she remains a vital repository of knowledge, her career having spanned decades.

Like Glasser, Sichel's positionality was shaped by her Jewish inheritance, though in more complex ways. Her *oupa* (grandfather), of German-Jewish descent, lost almost his entire family in the Holocaust. Her mother was Afrikaans. According to traditional Jewish law where identity is passed down matrilineally, Sichel is not Jewish. Yet she imbibed Jewish customs growing up on her grandfather's farm in Rustenburg, now in the North West province, where the family observed all the major Jewish holidays. (Sichel 2024, personal interview, July)

Sichel began her career in political journalism at the *Pretoria News* in the 1970s but soon shifted her focus to dance. Her reviews became a lifeline for choreographers and performers during a time when critical engagement with dance was sparse. As she writes: "I had no idea that I would embark on a crusade of discovery of an embryonic politically motivated South African dance form, or that I would become an accidental dance historian and aspirant archivist as a custodian of this unique history" (Sichel 2018, p. 11).

Perhaps Sichel's hybrid and liminal Jewish–Afrikaans identity, at once both assimilated and precarious, shaped her sensitivity to marginality and prepared her to bear witness to the cultural shifts unfolding on South Africa's stages. Like Glasser, Sichel's attentiveness to difference may also have deep roots in her family history. She spoke of her Jewish grandfather, recalling, "there was no othering." Unusually for a white man at the time, he spoke Tswana and maintained close ties with the local king of the Bafokeng people, King Pokeng. When Sichel's grandmother died - her father was just 14 years old - hundreds of King Pokeng's followers walked to the family's farm to pay their respects. (Sichel 2024, personal interview, July) Such stories of mutual recognition and respect, across racial and cultural lines, may have helped shape Sichel's lifelong commitment to representing dance across difference.

That commitment was visible in her weekly features in *The Star's Tonight* section, which were read avidly across the dance community and shaped careers through critique and astute observation. I experienced this firsthand as an aspiring choreographer: she was generous with her feedback, pointing me toward festivals, identifying central themes in the work, and posing questions with a curiosity that opened new creative directions. She also consistently went where few other arts journalists would. Mark Fleishman, quoted in Stephanou and Henriques (2005, p. 365), recalls the launch of the Market Theatre Laboratory: "We organised a press conference [...] to which only one journalist, Adrienne Sichel, turned up." Like Glasser, Sichel embodied motherly care, but hers unfolded across the unpredictable terrain of journalism, where risk was ever-present.

At the height of apartheid, Sichel travelled into township venues to review performances. At one such event, angry young men approached intending to 'necklace' her - a brutal method of execution involving a burning tyre forced around the neck. She was shielded by Black women in the audience. Sichel told me she had never written about this moment. (Sichel 2024, personal interview, July) Perhaps, as a white South African, she felt she could not claim it. Yet the story speaks powerfully to the wide circle of apartheid's patriarchal brutality, and to the vulnerabilities of cultural witnessing as a white woman in that era.

Sichel was acutely aware of the risks and responsibilities involved in cultural witnessing. In the introduction to her book *Body Politics: Fingerprinting South African Contemporary Dance*, she recounts her discomfort when Benedicte Alliot, then Director of the French Institute of South

Africa, introduced her as “the memory of South African dance.” Sichel reflects, “memory can be selective, deceptive and rarely impartial”. She goes on to ask: “Who has the right to collate or tell this history?” (Sichel 2018, p. 14) These reflections point to her deep awareness of the ethical and political tensions inherent in documenting and preserving dance histories, particularly in a context as fractured and contested as South Africa.

Despite her unease with the role of cultural memory-keeper, Sichel was widely celebrated for her contributions to documenting and preserving South African dance. Over the course of her career, she received many honours, including an African name given to her by the Dance Factory Youth: *Khetiwe*, meaning “Chosen One” (Sichel 2018, p. 16).

Sichel’s influence extended beyond the page. She co-founded the Dance Umbrella festival in 1989 with fellow journalist Marilyn Poole, supported by Philip Stein’s Vita Promotions. Later run by Georgina Thomson’s Dance Forum, the festival became a vital platform for contemporary South African dance until its closure in 2018. Its ethos of experimentation enabled the emergence of new choreographic voices, and over time, the programme expanded to include pantsula, gumboot, and traditional African dance.

Yet institutional inclusion can be complex. As Sharon Friedman notes, traditional African dance placed in a proscenium arch theatre “loses the intimate and interactive relationship between the audience and the dancer(s)”. (Friedman 2012, p. 77) At Confluences 11, one Black teacher/choreographer from a peri-urban area reflected on feeling peripheral to the festival’s curatorial reach. These tensions point to the uneven terrain of representation, shaped by geography, access, aesthetic values, and histories of exclusion.

The tensions around inclusion within the Dance Umbrella are echoed in Sichel’s own position as a critic and custodian of South African dance history. As with Glasser, her contributions are profound but not without critique. Some choreographers, including Debbie Rakusin, experienced her reviews as destructive, particularly when their work foregrounded joy, spectacle, or entertainment over overt political commentary. (Rakusin 2024, personal interview, July) Sichel frequently critiqued Adele Blank’s Free Flight Dance Company, once describing it as visually seductive but lacking in choreographic substance (Sichel 1994). As one of the few consistent critical voices in the field, Sichel helped shape the national dance narrative, legitimising certain forms and aesthetics, while disregarding those that did not align with her vision.

Later in her career, Sichel devoted herself to preservation. The Ar(t)chive, envisaged in 2012 by filmmaker and WITS postgraduate student, Jessica Denyschen and developed in partnership with Sichel and later Tammy Ballantyne, is South Africa’s only repository of contemporary dance. Housed first at the University of the Witwatersrand (WITS) School of Arts, and now at Constitution Hill, most of its materials were donated by artists or their families, often when no other institution could offer a home. Thus, the collections span beyond contemporary dance to encompass forms like ballet, Spanish dance, dance films, and traditional notation systems. Central collections include the Dance Umbrella and New Dance archives, as well as materials from companies like Moving Into Dance, and SA Mzansi Ballet. These are alongside personal donated collections from key figures such as Gregory Maqoma, PJ Sabbagha, Robyn Orlin, Tossie van Tonder, Glasser, and Sichel herself. (Tammy Ballantyne 2025, pers. comm.)

Since the move to Constitution Hill, The Ar(t)chive has faced challenges familiar to many independent memory projects: underfunding, limited accessibility, and the slow erosion of

fragile materials. During a recent visit, I came across a broken cardboard box filled with unlabelled original photographs by John Hogg; cultural memory can fall into neglect without adequate infrastructure. This incident suggests that The Ar(t)chive needs digitisation urgently. Not only is this about preserving fragile materials. It is also about ensuring that South African dance history remains visible, searchable, and accessible to researchers, educators, and even the digital systems shaping future knowledge. The life's work of Sichel and other pioneers must be safeguarded before it risks exclusion from the digital future.

Just as important, new voices must be added continually so that The Ar(t)chive can remain a living, evolving record of South African dance. As discussions at Confluences 11 made clear, even the most inclusive intentions may not align with how artists, particularly those from historically under-resourced contexts, experience institutional knowledge. These tensions do not diminish the value of The Ar(t)chive. Instead, they underscore the ongoing need to expand archival frameworks and to ensure that practices of collection and preservation remain responsive, reflexive, and open to critique.

A Jewish concept comes to mind here: *l'dor vador*, “from generation to generation.” Lessons from the Torah, the five books of Moses, or the Old Testament, are passed down weekly to children. The Torah itself is known as *Eitz Chaim*, the Tree of Life: a living text, understood as fluid and ever evolving. This intertwining of rootedness and renewal suggests that the past shapes the present and can help carve out a sustainable future. In this spirit, The Ar(t)chive should not be seen as a dusty repository, but as a living inheritance. No archive is ever complete, and the gaps in The Ar(t)chive likely reflect broader systemic disparities rather than institutional intent. It remains a rare and vital resource, and the only dedicated archive of South African contemporary dance we have. It is a treasure trove to be cared for, expanded, and honoured.

Sichel's legacy too should be honoured, as one which witnessed, framed, and enabled South African contemporary dance. Exploring her legacy also reveals the fragility of criticism and archives. Since her retirement, the terrain has shifted: there is no longer a dedicated weekly dance section in any newspaper; critical engagement is often reduced to a few lines on social media. The Dance Umbrella has closed its doors. To reimagine Sichel's legacy today, we must ask how critical dialogue and community-building can endure in this new landscape. We need agile, resilient platforms that can both sustain and shape the field, forms that, like Sichel's work, insist on depth, rigour, and a reverence for memory.

Sichel's reverence for memory, which was central to her archival work and criticism, may have deeper roots in her own heritage. While Sichel rarely foregrounded her Jewish identity publicly, her upbringing in a rural Jewish-Afrikaans family may have shaped her sensitivity to cultural preservation.

### **Jewish Identity: Memory and absence**

In a rural Jewish community, stories of the past shaped the present. Outside of South Africa's urban Jewish centres, small congregations marked rituals, holidays, and celebrations communally, not just within family units. (Jacobson 2000) Sichel recalled her Afrikaans mother learning to cook Jewish meals through the Union of Jewish Women, an organisation which “she adored”. (Sichel 2024, personal interview, July) This rural experience of community as necessity, rather than choice, may have shaped both women's later commitments to dance as social

practice. Even if they did not consciously foreground Jewish identity, their lifelong dedication to community-building echoes these formative experiences. Yet both remained largely silent about their Jewishness in their professional output.

As Sharon Friedman asked in a 2025 interview, why did none of these women, herself included, ever explicitly name or explore their Jewishness in their work? (Friedman 2025, personal interview, April) For Sichel, this silence may have stemmed from being not “Jewish enough” in Orthodox terms. Or perhaps it was a consequence of her role as a critic and witness, a position that foregrounded the work of others rather than her own identity. For Glasser, the absence of explicit Jewish articulation in her choreography may have felt appropriate amid the urgency of apartheid and its aftermath, where dismantling racial inequality and contributing to nation-building took precedence over personal heritage. From our current vantage point, however, a different approach may be needed, one that acknowledges how personal histories and inherited traditions inform the values we carry into our work.

Our traditions need not be seen as limiting or exclusive; they can be resources for connection. Glasser hints at this in her writing. When defining the African philosophy of Ubuntu, roughly translated as “I am because we are”, she links it to Jewish philosopher Hillel’s teaching: “If I am not for myself, who is for me? And being for my own self, what am I?” She writes that Ubuntu “resonated with my own belief system and with my desire to help others, especially those less fortunate than myself” (Glasser 2019, p. 19). Both Ubuntu and Hillel’s teachings centre care, empathy, and mutual responsibility as ethical imperatives.

However, Glasser does not take this resonance further; this dialogue between African and Jewish traditions remains absent from her creative practice. While neither woman explored Jewishness overtly in their work, the spirit of these values runs through their contributions. Hopefully we can continue what Glasser and Sichel began and investigate more fully what they could not.

## **Conclusion: Dancing through discomfort**

Artist William Kentridge reflected in a recent interview in *Jewish Renaissance* magazine:

“The resonances may be there. It’s not something that I try to escape or deny. [...] My Hebrew name is Chaim Yosef... and I think, in a deep, profound way, he’s there” (Pulver 2025, p.39).

Inheritance shapes how we engage with the world, even when we carry it ambivalently, or when we cannot yet name it.

I have brought my Jewish inheritance, and even Israel, into this room today. I did this knowing it may land differently for different people, particularly in a moment of intense global and local pain. My hope is that we might find ways to collaborate meaningfully without erasure. It is possible to bring the fullness of who we are into genuine encounter, while holding space for the complexities, griefs, and silences of others.

Glasser and Sichel channelled their white Jewish privilege into projects that helped shape South African contemporary dance, through teaching, choreographing, critiquing, and archiving. Their contributions unfolded within structural asymmetries that, sadly, persist today. Our inheritances continue to divide us in South Africa. For some, the wounds are still raw and



ongoing. For others, the trauma is inherited, passed down through generations. Yet just as Glasser connected Ubuntu and Hillel's teachings, so too our inheritances might be seen not as boundaries, but as resources for connection.

Glasser and Sichel's work urges us to dance forward with our living memories. On their foundations, we can build community by drawing from our roots, and our differences, as sources of nourishment.

## References

- Ballantyne, T., 2025. *Overview of The Ar(t)chive Collections*. Unpublished PowerPoint presentation. Personal communication, shared with the author, 29 September.
- Brodie, N., 2016. *The Joburg Book: A Guide to the City's History, People and Places*. Johannesburg: Pan Macmillan.
- Cole, C.M., 2020. *Performance and the Afterlives of Injustice*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Friedman, S., 2025. *Interview with Leigh Nudelman*, via Zoom, 7 April.
- Friedman, S. (ed.), 2012. *Post-Apartheid Dance: Many Bodies, Many Voices, Many Stories*. Newcastle-Upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Glasser, S., 2024. *Interview with Leigh Nudelman*, via Zoom, 23 July.
- Glasser, S., 2019. *Tranceformations and Transformations: Southern African Rock Art and Contemporary Dance*. Auckland Park: Staging Post.
- Gottschild, B.D., 1996. *Digging the Africanist Presence in American Performance: Dance and Other Contexts*. Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Jacobson, D., 2000. *Growing Up Jewish*. In: M. Shain and R. Mendelsohn, eds. *Memories, Realities and Dreams: Aspects of the South African Jewish Experience*. Cape Town: David Philip, pp. 15–27.
- Levine, L., 2005. *The Drum Café's Traditional Music of South Africa: Song, Dance and History*. Johannesburg: Jacana Media.
- Loots, L., 2024. The 'mother of African dance' at 80: why Senegal's Germaine Acogny is so influential. *The Conversation*, 28 May. Available at: <https://theconversation.com/the-mother-of-african-dance-at-80-why-senegals-germaine-acogny-is-so-influential-230247> (Accessed 4 September 2025).
- Moving Into Dance Mophatong, 2006. *Blankets of Shame* [YouTube]. Available at: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-TgOdV9NkoM> (Accessed: 4 October 2025).
- Profeta, K., 2015. *Dramaturgy in Motion: At Work on Dance and Movement Performance*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Pulver, A., 2025. Interview with William Kentridge. *Jewish Renaissance*, Spring, p.39.
- Rakusin, D. 2024. *Interview with Leigh Nudelman*, via Google Meet, 18 July.
- Samuel, G., 2016. *Dancing the Other in South Africa*. PhD thesis, University of Cape Town.
- Sichel, A., 2024a. *Interview with Leigh Nudelman*, via Whatsapp, 16 July.
- Sichel, A., 2024b. *Interview with Leigh Nudelman*, in person, 20 December.
- Sichel, A., 2018. *Body Politics: Fingerprinting South African Contemporary Dance*. Pietermaritzburg: UKZN Press.
- Sichel, A., 1994. Seductions, distractions. *The Star*, 25 March. (In The Ar(t)chive Collection).

Stephanou, I. & Henriques, L. eds., 2006. *The World in an Orange: Making Theatre with Barney Simon*. Johannesburg: Jacana Media, pp.365–368.