

DANSE: an anthology

Edited by Noémie Solomon

5 Foreword

Sophie Claudel

9 Introduction

Noémie Solomon

25 I. Times, scores, techniques

27 Le Quatuor Albrecht Knust

*Dominique Brun, Anne Collod, Simon Hecquet,
Christophe Wavelet*

41 Rests in Pieces: On Scores, Notations and the Trace in Dance

Myriam Van Imschoot

55 Subversion of the Dancing Body: Autonomy on Display

Bojana Kunst

69 On the Use of the Concept of Modernity and Its Perverse
Effects in Dance

Michel Bernard

81 Rebellious Against Limit

Jonathan Burrows

89 On Notation

Laurence Louppe

103 Dancing the Virtual

Erin Manning

117 Dance, the Metamorphosis of the Body

Boyan Manchev, Xavier Le Roy, Franz Anton Cramer

131 II. Writing, images, affects

133 Toward a Critical Reading of Contemporary Dance

Yvane Chapuis

145 To End with Judgment by Way of Clarification

Bojana Cvejic

159 A Common Place

Isabelle Ginot

175 The Perfect Dance Critic

Miguel Gutierrez

177 Jennifer Lacey & Nadia Lauro: Choreographic Dispositifs

Alexandra Baudelot

187 Loose Association: Emmanuelle Huynh and Trisha Brown

Julie Perrin

203 A Dance That Is

Marten Spangberg

209 Steal, Duplicate, Unmask, Stretch, Connect, Intoxicate a
Dance-image

Isabelle Launay

223 Dear N

Jenn Joy

231 III. Spaces, things, worlds

233 Manifesto for a Dancing Museum

Boris Charmatz

241 Emails 2009-2010

Jérôme Bel & Boris Charmatz

251 Museum Artifact Act

Mark Franko

261 Performative Practices / Critical Bodies # 2:
 What Makes Dance
 Céline Roux

275 Disobedience and DIY
 Laurent Goumarre

283 Expanded Dance
 Chantal Pontbriand

295 9 Variations on Things and Performance
 André Lepecki

305 Come Home Charley Patton
 Ralph Lemon

319 **Biographies**

327 **Acknowledgements**

INTRODUCTION
Noémie Solomon

Forming concepts is one way of living, not of killing life;
it is one way of living in complete mobility and not immobilizing life.
—Michel Foucault

When I dance, it means: this is what I am doing.
—Merce Cunningham

Dance assemblages

DANSE: an anthology gathers key texts written in proximity to choreographic creation after 2000. It traces the ways in which dance has become the site for vital experiments on questions of the body, identity, and belonging; intensifying the historical and geographical conditions of movement in a globalized culture; enacting forceful interventions across regimes of perception and knowledge. Prompted by a series of influential works that have taken place on the French choreographic scene and at its peripheries, *DANSE* maps the numerous exchanges with U.S., European, and more broadly international contemporary dance fields, as they give rise to manifold creative practices and dynamic critical writings.

This volume constructs an anthology as assemblage for dance: a partial and temporary collection of living, mobile bodies in relation to discourse. Here, the Greek roots of “anthology”—from “anthos” referring to flower and “logos” to discourse—as a flower-gathering remind us of the paradoxical dynamics entailed by such a project, as it selects and dissembles life around thresholds of signification and visibility. This is an operation that is never exhaustive or definitive, but calls for shifting relations between the material that is given to be seen and the knowledge it delineates. As Michel Foucault suggests

in relation to the formation of concepts, such critical articulations do not stand in opposition to life, or movement, but rather offer “one way of living in complete mobility and not immobilizing life.”¹ *DANSE* seeks to move past a tenacious resistance to theorizing dance on the one hand—an idea of dance that runs beside systems of knowledge and power—while at the same time formalizing a series of critical tools implemented by its practices.²

This folding together of dance and discourse is instrumental in the choreographic practices examined throughout the anthology. In a letter addressed to the dancer and choreographer Xavier Le Roy in 2002, Myriam Van Imschoot proposes that what distinguishes the practices of some French and European choreographers working from the late 1990s onward from a more “traditional choreographic model” is how they “incorporate critical discourse into [their] practice, thus blurring the boundary between art and its critique.”³ Seen as a forceful instance of what Beatriz Preciado has called a “productive contraband”⁴ between experimental practices and critical theory, fostering wide-ranging encounters across artistic and epistemological fields, this mobilization of discourse by dance makers has met fierce resistance on the part of dance institutions. A well-known instance in France can be seen in Dominique Frétard’s much-discussed article published in *Le Monde* in May 2003: “The end of the non-dance is announced.”⁵ Inscribed in bold letters across a full page of the French daily newspaper, this title labels the work of a certain group of dancers and choreographers, while declaring the coming undone of the content they have put forward on the contemporary stage. The article begins with an unequivocal position:

THEY SHOT at anything that dances, and still are shooting. At the inevitable, repeated figures, the *belle danse*, the effects, the clichés, the déjà-vu, the schools, the techniques,

while trying to build conceptual works where it was primarily about showing a thought in motion. These choreographic artists [...] are neo-existential with a nihilist tendency, sometimes even jokers. But also sermonizers, navel-gazers, quick to exclude.⁶

Frétard’s strident statement encapsulates a series of paradoxes in experimental choreography’s relations to the discursive apparatus and dance institutions. First, by naming a choreographic movement “non-dance”—as dance’s antithesis; that which fails to dance; the absence thereof—the article proposes through its clear oppositions a distinct ontological ground for dance: for what dance *is* and what it should look like. Frétard notes the exhaustion of this symptomatic “refusal to dance” on the choreographic stage, but perhaps most importantly foresees a return of the “*beau mouvement*” as that which is opposed to “showing a thought in motion.” Moreover, while declaring the existence of a *non*-movement, the critique nevertheless alludes to its forms as emerging from and belonging to a “self-proclaimed community.” This autonomy is seen in a negative light, as that which arises from the use of discourse, while pointing to the ways in which the immanent forms of this “collective” are defined from within, rather than from outside or above. Here, there is a palpable anxiety regarding a community unaccredited by dance institutions: the creative work of its members is seen as an intimacy that troubles the security of stratified identities, through critical experiments that shift relations of power and knowledge across the dance field.

And yet, if what has been described as a “non-dance” poses a threat to dance’s integrity, one could argue it is not so much because of the absence of the dance supposedly at stake, but rather because of what these experiments *do* to dance. And indeed, as the texts gathered in this anthology make clear, recent choreographic works

have profoundly transformed the scene of theatrical dance by challenging our experience and understanding of movement, embodiment, and time. In particular, one can look at the work by a string of dance artists across the French cultural landscape such as Jérôme Bel, Alain Buffard, Boris Charmatz, Alice Chauchat, Latifa Laâbissi, Xavier Le Roy, Myriam Gourfink, Emmanuelle Huyhn, Jennifer Lacey, Rachid Ouramdane, Claudia Triozzi, Loïc Touzé, to name but a few, to see how they have generated debates around the artistic, methodological, and conceptual nature of dance; its disciplinary borders and epistemological status. By putting forth a range of new forms and contents on the dance stage, by experimenting with alternative modes of composition and address, by creating new articulations with other art forms, as well as with the discursive, social, and political spheres, these works ask us to thoroughly reconsider the role and function of the dancing subject across culture. These projects operate at dance's thresholds, and yet they *do not* fall outside of the dance discipline: rather, through a range of groundbreaking creative and critical practices, they address the very disciplinary mechanisms that have shaped dance—its codes, conventions, vocabularies, logics of representation—while experimenting with new orders, organizations, and assemblages. Here, in retaining the French word *danse* as its title, and through its specific articulation in the English language, the anthology points toward a hybrid enunciation, a certain altering of the discipline of dance itself, as prompted by a series of groundbreaking works.

Scores for the contemporary

The first part of the anthology examines questions of temporality and technique across the surface of the score. In this, dance emerges as a practice of contemporaneity: its experiments at once intensify

the present while making persistent articulations toward past and future gestures. The work of the Quatuor Knust is instrumental in this regard. Initiating a series of dance recreations throughout the 1990s, the collective of dancers experimented with the choreographic score as tool, method, question, and perceptive horizon, resolutely addressing dance's heterogeneous time, and reactivating "lines of intensity from the choreographers of an unfinished modernity."⁷ Of particular importance were the redoinings of Steve Paxton's *Satisfying Lover* (1967) and Yvonne Rainer's *Continuous Project – Altered Daily* (1970) with several contemporary dancers and choreographers as it opened rich perspectives for the field in relation to questions of history and futurity. Here, the score allows dancing bodies to access and experiment with other temporalities, and other narratives, which go beyond the here and now of dance. As the late José Esteban Muñoz argued, there is an actual danger in confining performance to the present since it may structure and lock the experience of minoritarian subjects: to exist only in the present means to have no access to history or futurity. What Muñoz names the "burden of liveness" shadows and relegates subjects to the live event and may "evacuate such personages from history."⁸ In this light, one can see the Quatuor Knust's notational practices figuring a political urgency on the French dance scene and beyond, enacting an affective call for experimentation that "looks into the past to critique the present and helps imagine the future."⁹

If the appellation of "contemporary dance" intensifies the experience of the moment, it does so "using that moment to reveal a different history," as Bojana Kunst reminds us.¹⁰ In France, specifically, one can locate the emergence of the broad category of contemporary dance at the beginning of the 1980s, when a vast program for the promotion and regulation of dance creation was launched.¹¹ Throughout the following decade, dance underwent a period of significant expansion, both through the proliferation and dissemination of its forms. Indeed, via a major

process of decentralization, a number of institutional structures, the Centres chorégraphiques nationaux, were established throughout the territory, each directed by a given choreographer in charge of creating, presenting, and transmitting movement practices. As dance gained considerable visibility across the French cultural landscape, it unfolded in diverse aesthetics. Contemporary dance throughout the eighties was characterized by multiple and deeply singular languages developed by a range of choreographers. Coined *nouvelle danse française* or *danse d'auteur*, these practices call attention to the preponderant role of the choreographer as an author of the dance work, while putting emphasis on stylistic and formal issues. If the poetic potential of the dancing body constitutes a recurrent motif of this work, the abundant gestures displayed on stage can be mapped as expressions of an individual, interior body intimately guided by the choreographer.¹² The prosperous *danse d'auteur* therefore figured an authorial and institutional ground for contemporary dance in France, promoting dance as an autonomous art form, delimited by a series of self-reflexive gestures.

If contemporary dance's early developments in France can be seen as carving out new artistic territories for dance creation at the dusk of the twentieth century, moving away from the conventional codes and vocabularies proper to classical dance, this institutionalization rapidly led to new forms of normalization. Those effects can be seen in the standardization of a range of aspects across the choreographic field: the performances' format and scheduled touring; the internal organization of the companies; the training methods and the growing imperative to produce highly skilled, versatile dancers—a new form of contemporary virtuosity; and the hierarchies between the different actors of the field. In reaction to this homogenization, a range of artists, many of whom worked as dancers in major French companies during the eighties, responded with a series of critical gestures that emphasized the work of the dancer in relation to diverse aspects of

contemporary society, thus challenging the self-reflective nature of the newly established form and its constitutive power relations. The work discussed throughout the anthology describes a field which simultaneously articulates dance with a broader set of current artistic, social, and political concerns, while calling attention to the labor of the dancing body as temporal matter—as that which paces, sustains, repeats, dilates, interrupts, and alters the dance work. It is precisely this examination of the definition and imperatives of “a work,” its recasting within the conditions of labor and cultural production in late capitalist societies, that comes to pre-occupy contemporary dance. Dance stands simultaneously as emblematic of and resistant to “perverse capitalism,” in Boyan Manchev's words, through its experimental praxis of transformation of the body.¹³

From this perspective, the works approached in this anthology might be seen as exemplary of the second wave of contemporary dance practices that surfaced from the mid-nineteen-nineties onward. By exploring the margins of institutional structures; creating disruptive intersections between the role of the choreographer, the dancer, and the spectator; experimenting with the dancing body in close relation with issues of history, modernity, and contemporaneity, these practices weave a consistent, open, and active field for dance experimentations.¹⁴ Extensive collaborative energies are characteristic of the contemporary dance scene. Drawing from a series of affective exchanges between artists, research objects, methodologies, and discourses, this anthology traces the movement of contemporary dance beyond French borders as it engages with artistic creation throughout the European territory. Sharing similarities and differences, artists have gathered in collectives in order to create multiple performance projects, claim better working conditions, or foster discursive and critical lines of activity.¹⁵ Describing these nomadic phenomena across the European field,

Christophe Wavelet speaks of the imperative of “temporary coalitions.”¹⁶ As phenomena that resist categorization, any single identity that would “fix that which precisely devotes itself to restlessness,” these practices form fluid, and ever shifting assemblages: provisional encounters that map incessant re-combinations of movements, ideas, practices, and thoughts.¹⁷ In this light *DANSE* develops a critical evaluation of contemporary dance not only as it pertains to a specific time period and a geographical territory, but also in the ways in which it establishes connections and linkages across different times and spaces through their singularities—defined by Gilles Deleuze as “that which can be extended close to another, so as to obtain a connection.”¹⁸ One might understand the “contemporary” then as a structure of time that draws connections with other choreographic acts and maps the particularities of movement dynamics and their ethos. In this regard, the very appellation of French contemporary dance requires examination through its diasporic gestures, in which the many exchanges with an American scene have been determining, through the aesthetic influences of Modern and postmodern dance, to Cunningham’s work and recent experimentations. The anthology thus traces a genealogy—a history made of ruptures and discontinuities—of the works of contemporary French choreographers across the European stage and toward an U.S. and international scene, while refiguring the contours of such a category of “contemporary dance.” The contemporary therefore emerges in Roland Barthes’ words as that which is necessarily “untimely”: a time that adheres to yet shifts the unfolding of the present; it is at once consistent with our time while being inherently anachronistic.¹⁹ Different choreographic experiments examined in this anthology expose the concept of the contemporary, and yet draw disconnections with the present: as they perform a series of temporal gaps, overlaps, and disjunctions to unwork normative structures, nominations, and experiences of our times.

Writing the choreographic

The second part of *DANSE* explores the relation between dancing and writing, meaning and affect, gathering texts by critics, scholars, curators, and artists that address the complex, shifting ways in which the dancing body intersects with sense. As Yvane Chapuis suggests, “there seems to be a very widespread idea at work whereby dance is considered inexpressible—some would say it cannot be recounted—and yet, paradoxically, gives rise to words.”²⁰ This tension between dance’s unspeakable gestures on the one hand and its ability to invent languages on the other opens up a space to re-imagine the potentials of and relations between regimes of perception and knowledge. What are the words—and the worlds—figured by contemporary dance? What do they look and feel like? How do they point toward heterogeneous gestures and prompt shifting meanings? Here, writing the choreographic maps affective encounters, as words meet a string of gestures, images, sensations, memories. In this respect, Jenn Joy describes the choreographic as a “sensual address”: “it is a mode of working against linguistic signification and virtuosic representation; it is work about contact that touches even across distances.”²¹ The singular modality of relation thus entailed by the choreographic outlines a different, renewed ethics for writing and dancing bodies. In his manifesto imagining “the perfect dance critic,” Miguel Gutierrez reminds us of the stakes in writing on and with contemporary dance, a practice that must engage with the language of dance and its materiality, and “speculate as to what the choices of movement vocabulary mean in relation to [...] the larger vision that the dance artist offers.”²²

Discussing semiotics, translation, and performativity, the texts outline the dancing body as abstraction and complexity, without attempting to connect its gestures to a narrative or psychological

content: they apprehend the choreographic field as it builds an incorporeal plane for meaning. As Brian Massumi writes in *Parables for the Virtual*, “The problem with dominant models [...] is not that they are too abstract to grasp the concreteness of the real. The problem is that they are not *abstract enough* to grasp the real incorporeality of the concrete.”²³ As an alternative to dominant models of subjectivity, what choreographic writing proposes within contemporary culture is to dwell on the moving body that exposes the real, material, yet abstract complexity of the world. In this way, the writings in the anthology move resolutely beyond an opposition between movement and language: it is here a matter of renewing our attention to the multiple ways in which dancing bodies press upon and fold meanings. If, as Maurice Merleau-Ponty teaches us, the moving and sensing body is always already linguistic, one cannot grasp a gesture by isolating it from the ways in which it relates to meaning: “the meaning of a gesture thus ‘understood’ is not behind it, it is intermingled with the structure of the world outlined by the gesture.”²⁴ Dance is not that which is unaccountable for, nor is it that which has the potential to stand for everything and everyone. Hence, to speak of choreographic writing is not to say the dancer functions as a metaphor for reality—or for thought. The dancing body that emerges is autonomous, simultaneously shaped by languages while pushing against the boundaries and structures of meaning.

Across the work of translation—moving back and forth from dance to writing, French to English languages—a few words require our attention. “*Dispositif*” appears throughout the anthology to refer to the conditions set up by choreographic works as well as the heterogeneous assemblages they perform. Here, the use of the word “*dispositif*” over its common English translation “apparatus” is instrumental: not only does “apparatus” seem to underscore the mechanical and totalizing aspect of the term at the expense of that

which is proper to a “disposition”—both as arrangement and tendency—but it also emphasizes the initial, firm conditions set up by a machinery—the Latin etymology of “apparatus” indeed refers to “preparation,” “to make ready for”—thus somewhat overlooking the agency or possible trajectories of its many constituents.²⁵ The term *dispositif* might be described after Foucault as a “thoroughly heterogeneous ensemble” composed of a range of elements such as institutions, scientific statements, administrative measures, philosophical propositions, moral conducts.²⁶ As a coordinated assemblage of diverse functions and processes, Foucault argues, “the *dispositif* itself is the system of relations that can be established between these elements.”²⁷ What is at stake in the concept of *dispositif* is thus a mobile, transversal thought that accounts for many singular choreographic acts and their potential for building heterogeneous, modular assemblages. “*Écriture chorégraphique*” is another expression often used in the French dance literature to designate processes of composition while alluding to the writing metaphor. This of course evokes the score, and further the activity of reading as integral to the making and perceiving of a dance performance. Furthermore, the dancer is traditionally referred to as *interprète*—the one who interprets the choreographer’s score. In the anthology, the word performer has been used, especially when referring to experimental practices, where the dancer emerges as a powerful agent who not only embodies the dance work, but moves from a muted position to create words and discourses.²⁸ Finally, the word “performance” has been used from the late 1990s onward to describe the experimental practices taking place on the choreographic scene and at its limits. Not exclusively connected to “performance art,” nor as broadly indeterminate as “the performing arts,” performance can here be read as a genre in itself that keeps gesturing toward other aesthetic traditions. Laurent Goumarre uses “performance” to render explicit this hybrid gesture.²⁹ In a similar vein, the

question of “the performative” appears in French literature, sometimes to echo performativity (with reference to Judith Butler’s theories as in Chapuis’ and Alexandra Baudelot’s texts). But it also emerges as an adjective to describe these new experimentations: as a quality of their affects and of the materiality of their languages.

Practices of exteriority

The third and final section of the anthology maps the movement of dance toward its outside. In this motion, dance gestures *away from* disciplinary formations, unraveling a series of objectified bodies, meanings, artworks, and histories; and moves *toward* broad areas of life, engaging in mobile articulations with artistic, political, and epistemological fields. One might follow these unruly interdisciplinary acts as they venture through various spaces, and assemble ideas, bodies, and things in order to assess and reinvent the roles and functions of the dancing body across contemporary cultures. In a text from 2001, Chantal Pontbriand proposes that “contemporary dance is dance that stretches outward, that has expanded.”³⁰ The work of Boris Charmatz is emblematic in this regard: through the many trajectories enacted by *Le Musée de la danse*, their distinctive critical velocities and incorporeal virtuosités, the dance artist invents the conditions for “getting rid” of choreographic borders—see for instance his manifesto that prompts the removal of the words “center,” “choreographic,” and “national”—and meets foreign practices, thoughts, methodologies. Here, the dancing museum is outlined through and as the actions of the performing body; such a structure is as far-reaching as it is immediate, it “exists as soon as the first gesture is performed.”³¹ And indeed, for Charmatz, “dance should be a practice of investment in all that a body can touch,”³² spanning everyday and minor gestures to broad interdisciplinary and political actions.

As witnessed recently, one space dance has ventured toward is that of the museum, functioning in turn as the newest desirable art object, or engaging in practices that re-imagine how things and bodies are assessed around thresholds of visibility and knowledge in such institutions. And yet, despite keen interest and increased visibility, “dance will always be on the outside,” as Ralph Lemon suggests.³³ Remaining on the outside, at the threshold, dance’s practices of exposition can address diverse issues. This engagement can be seen through the notion of *en-dehors* as an ontological and ethical impulse, an outward, immanent motion which entails a constant negotiation and redefinition of a body’s borders. As a constitutive technology of the choreographic discipline that shapes the dancing body and its conditions of visibility, the *en-dehors* can expose—as Jean-Luc Nancy reminds us, “pose in exteriority”³⁴—the work of the dancing body in a generative proximity with its outside. *DANSE* maps the ways in which these experimentations turn the tightly defined choreographic discipline inside out (a discipline that has traditionally be confined to a triangulation between the body, the studio, and the stage). Here, the affective force of dance resides in its enfolding of intensive choreographic gestures that always point to a series of “foreign” elements, outlining an experimental praxis that is based upon propositions for differences, variations, and metamorphoses. As the danced gesture reaches toward its surrounding and folds it upon itself, simultaneously incorporating the world while stretching its contours inside out, it expressively shapes an intensive outside and thus delineates new possibilities of existing through dance acts. Or, as Burrows says: “It is about what happens when the score fails, when the structure implodes, when the idea gets lost in its own dead-ends, as all scores, structures and ideas must, and then the limit is reached and the world expands.”³⁵

¹ Michel Foucault, "Introduction" to *The Normal and the Pathological*, by Georges Canguilhem (New York: Zone Books, [1966] 1989), 21.

² This articulation of text and movement in the anthology might be seen in relation to the seminal *Chorégraphie* (1700), which arguably marks the birth of the western disciplinary project of dance. Responding to the royal demand of codifying dance, Raoul-Augé Feuillet coins the term "choreography" as the binding of writing and dance in light of the Baroque's propensity to motion. Choreographic bodies thus emerge through the affective and energetic encounters between techniques of moving and writing, grounding dancing acts in their discursive materiality. Another genealogy might be traced back in the experimental work of Fluxus, or in that of the American poet Jackson Mac Low, which experiments with the creative potential of the anthology—a collection of lists, poems, syllables, images, calling for readings, saying, movements. In other words, the anthology emerges as a score to be performed. See Raoul-Augé Feuillet, *Chorégraphie ou L'Art de Décrire la Danse par Caracteres, Figures et Signes Desmonstratifs, Avec lesquels on apprend facilement soy même toutes sortes de Dances* (Paris, 1700); La Monte Young and Jackson Mac Low eds., *An Anthology of Chance Operations* (New York, 1963); or Jackson Mac Low's 1978 performance *An Anthology*, <http://vimeo.com/21575024>

³ Myriam Van Imschoot, "Lettres sur la collaboration," in *Être Ensemble. Figures de la communauté en danse depuis le XX^e siècle* (Pantin: Centre national de la danse, 2003), 362.

⁴ Beatriz Preciado, *Manifeste contra-sexuel* (Paris: Bolland, 2000).

⁵ Dominique Fréard, "La fin annoncée de la non-danse," *Le Monde*, May 6, 2003.

⁶ Dominique Fréard, "La fin annoncée de la non-danse."

⁷ Dominique Brun, "Le Quatuor Albrecht Knust," *DANSE: an anthology*, 29.

⁸ José Esteban Muñoz, *Disidentifications: Queers of Color and the Performance of Politics* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999), 198.

⁹ Muñoz, *Disidentifications*, 25.

¹⁰ Bojana Kunst, "Subversion of the Dancing Body: Autonomy on Display," *DANSE: an anthology*, 61.

¹¹ It should be noted that modern dance was not significantly established in France, in contrast with the scenes in Germany and the U.S. The sudden and extensive institution of contemporary dance at the beginning of the eighties thus bridged a century of aesthetic developments. For more on the singularity of French dance history and its relation to modernity, see Michelle Marcel and Isabelle Ginot, *La Danse au XX^e siècle* (Paris: Bordas, 1995); Agnès Izrine, *La danse dans tous ses états* (Paris: L'Arche, 2002); and Denise Luccioni's "Avant-Propos" in her translation of Sally Banes' opus, *Terspichore en baskets, post-modern dance* (Paris: Chiron and Centre national de la danse, 2002).

¹² One might read the appellation of *danse d'auteur* in relation to the well-known French *cinéma d'auteur*, which also emphasizes introspection and interiority, foregrounding the author of the work, through the subtly controlled play of its actors.

¹³ Boyan Manchev, "Dance, the Metamorphosis of the Body," *DANSE: an anthology*, 128.

¹⁴ Many of these works draw from various traditions of dance, breaking with the recent aesthetics and methodologies constitutive of French dance in the nineteen-eighties. As such, one could trace diverse influences such as the choreographer Merce Cunningham; the actors of the American Postmodern dance, including Yvonne Rainer, Trisha Brown, and Steve Paxton; the *Tanztheater* of Pina Bausch; and the Japanese Butoh dance.

¹⁵ See for instance the collective of Les Signataires du XX août, which first gathered in 1997. For

more on this group, see Coralie Bougier, "Le regroupement et l'engagement politique des artistes chorégraphiques: une nécessité?" *Funambule. Revue de danse* 4 (June 2002): 47-60.

¹⁶ Christophe Wavelet, "Ici et maintenant, coalitions temporaires," *Mouvement* 2 (September-November 1998): 18-21.

¹⁷ Wavelet, "Ici et maintenant, coalitions temporaires."

¹⁸ Gilles Deleuze, "A philosophical concept," in *Who Comes After the Subject?* ed. Eduardo Cadava, Peter Connor, and Jean-Luc Nancy (New York; London: Routledge, 1991), 94.

¹⁹ "Le contemporain est l'inactuel." The author further argues: "History is repressive, History forbids us to be untimely." See Roland Barthes, *Œuvres Complètes* (Paris: Seuil, 2002). Barthes draws on Friedrich Nietzsche's *Untimely Meditations*, trans. R.J. Hollingdale (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, [1876] 1997).

²⁰ Yvane Chapuis, "Toward a Critical Reading of Contemporary Dance," *DANSE: an anthology*, 139.

²¹ Jenn Joy, *The Choreographic* (Cambridge: MIT Press, forthcoming).

²² Miguel Gutierrez, "The Perfect Dance Critic," *DANSE: an anthology*, 173.

²³ Brian Massumi, *Parables for the Virtual: Movement, Affect, Sensation* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2002), 5.

²⁴ Maurice Merleau-Ponty, *Phenomenology of Perception*, trans. Colin Smith (London; New York: Routledge, [1945] 2002), 216.

²⁵ Here the distinction between the terms *dispositif* and *appareil* in film and cinema studies might be particularly enlightening. Jean-Louis Baudry has defined the *appareil de départ* as the sum of equipments and operations necessary to the production of a movie and its screening, whereas the *dispositif* concerns the screening and thus involves the subject to which the screening is addressed. See Jean-Louis Baudry, *L'effet Cinéma* (Paris: Albatros, 1978), 31.

²⁶ Foucault, "The Confession of the Flesh," in *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*, ed. Colin Gordon (London: Harvester, [1977] 1980), 194.

²⁷ Foucault, "The Confession of the Flesh," 194.

²⁸ For a singular account on the creation of a narrative for the contemporary dancer, see Énora Rivière, *Ob.scène. Récit fictif d'une vie de danseur* (Pantin: Centre national de la danse, 2013).

²⁹ Laurent Goumarre, "Disobedience and DIY," *DANSE: an anthology*, 279.

³⁰ Chantal Pontbriand, "Expanded Dance," *DANSE: an anthology*, 286.

³¹ Boris Charmatz, "Manifesto for a Dancing Museum," *DANSE: an anthology*, 239.

³² Boris Charmatz, with Alexandra Baudelot, "Des formes ouvertes et malléables," *Mouvement* 16 (Avril-Juin 2002): 57. "La danse devrait être une pratique d'investissement de tout ce à quoi le corps peut toucher."

³³ Ralph Lemon, quoted in Mark Franko, "Boris Charmatz at MoMA," <http://www.jampole.com/OpEdgy/?p=231>

³⁴ Jean-Luc Nancy, *The Inoperative Community*, trans. Peter Connor and al. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, [1982] 1991); xxxvii.

³⁵ Jonathan Burrows, "Rebelling Against Limit," *DANSE: an anthology*, 86.