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Abstract

Over the past few decades, archival practices in dance have been the subject of substantial scrutiny and innovation. With new technologies affording opportunities for archival material to be housed in web-based platforms, questions surrounding notions of ‘archive’ and documentary practices in dance have occupied debates across academia and industry. The function of an archival source in dance as an ephemeral phenomenon is something that remains ambiguous because of the complexity of capturing the multiple aspects of dance-making processes and performance. In this thesis I address this issue by considering the role of the dancing body as a site where knowledge that can be considered as ‘archival’ is stored as a result of embodied dance-making processes and experience. Within the broader discussion of dance and archiving, I refer to Phoenix Dance Theatre to illustrate new ideas about archiving dance.

The discussion will focus upon notions of embodiment, memory, archives and dance reconstruction, and ideas surrounding the role of dance knowledge and its transferability to archival formats that are considered ‘tangible’ or ‘enduring’. The limitations of traditional understandings of the archive are addressed and expanded by re-considering the role of the body as an archival material. This research contributes new knowledge regarding dance archival practices through recognition that valuable information can be triggered through the re-living of historic movement action in the dancing body. In summary, the overall investigation makes a case for the role of the dancing body within the broader archival spectrum of materials relating to dance practice. I argue that the body captures some of the original essences of dance practice and performances that cannot be captured by more traditional materials and modes of archiving in dance.
# Table of Contents

**Acknowledgements** ........................................................................................................... 3  
**Abstract** .................................................................................................................................. 4  
**List of Figures and Illustrations** ............................................................................................. 8  
**Introduction** ............................................................................................................................ 9  
**Prelude** ..................................................................................................................................... 9  
**Introducing the Research Problem** .......................................................................................... 11  
**Research Questions** ................................................................................................................ 14  
**Methodology** .......................................................................................................................... 17  
**Literature Review** ................................................................................................................... 32  
**Thesis Structure** ..................................................................................................................... 55  
**Prelude** ..................................................................................................................................... 57  
**Chapter 1** ............................................................................................................................... 59  
**Archives: Towards a concept of Archival ‘Knowledge Value’** .............................................. 59  
**Introduction** ........................................................................................................................... 59  
**Archiving as an Established set of Principles and Practices** .................................................... 60  
**The Life Cycle Model** ............................................................................................................. 61  
**Figure 1: The Life-Cycle Model** ............................................................................................ 62  
**Figure 2: Archival Processes** ................................................................................................... 64  
**Historicising and Problematising ‘Archival Value’** .................................................................. 67  
**Figure 3: Archival Principles** ................................................................................................. 71  
**Primary and Secondary Archival Materials** .......................................................................... 74  
**Decentring Archival Principles and Practices** ....................................................................... 77  
**The Relationship between Archives and Memory** .................................................................. 82  
**Chapter Summary** .................................................................................................................. 85  
**Chapter 2** ............................................................................................................................... 88  
**Archival Gaps and the Body Archive in Dance** ...................................................................... 88  
**Introduction** ........................................................................................................................... 88  
**The Archive and the Dancing Body** ....................................................................................... 89  
**Figure 4: The Archive and the Repertoire** ............................................................................... 92
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Lived Body as an Archival Material</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Origins of Experience</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Figure 5: The Original Body</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Memory and the Body Archive</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Memory, Duration and the Mnemonic</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reconstruction and the Interplay of Memory</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present Experience and Processes of Remembering</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Figure 6: Phoenix Founder and Early Members, Publicity image of Forming of the Phoenix © Terry Cryer, c1982</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Figure 8: Bergson’s Memory Cone (1896)</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Movement Retention and Recollection</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Ageing, Original Body</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collective Remembering</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Memory and the Digital Dance Archive</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chapter Summary</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Figure 9: The Body Archive: Memory</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Spatiality and the Body Archive</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spatiality and Recollection</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Movement Acquisition as a Spatial Process</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Body, Space, Place</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Collective Remembering and Identity as a Spatial Process</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Present Body: ‘Being-there’ ............................................................... 212

Chapter Summary ................................................................................. 219

Figure 11: The Body Archive: Spatiality .................................................. 221

Conclusion .............................................................................................. 223

Summary of Discussion and Key Findings .................................................. 224

The Body Archive Model ......................................................................... 229

Implications and Recommendations for Dance Archival Practice .................. 233

Appendix 1 ............................................................................................... 241

Phoenix Dance Theatre Archive Contents: an overview ................................ 241

Appendix 2 ............................................................................................... 245

Ethical Consent Participant (Information Sheet) ............................................. 245

Appendix 3: Sharon Watson Interview Transcript ........................................ 251

Appendix 4: Tracy Tinker Interview Transcript (Extract) ............................... 263

Appendix 5: Edward Lynch Interview Transcript .......................................... 266

Appendix 6: Phoenix Dance Theatre 30th Anniversary ................................... 275

List of Performances and Performers ......................................................... 275

Appendix 7: DVD, Rehearsal and Performance Footage ................................ 276

Appendix 7.1: Excerpts of rehearsal footage from the Phoenix Dance Company founder member rehearsals ................................................................. 276

Appendix 7.2: Excerpts of Sharon Watson and Mbola’s shared rehearsals ............. 276

Appendix 7.3: 30th Compilation of performance extracts and vox pops, anniversary event 11.11.2011 ................................................................. 276

Appendix 7.4: 30th Founder member group revival performance 11.11.2011 .............. 276
List of Figures and Illustrations

**Figure 1:** The Life-Cycle Model ...........................................................................59
**Figure 2:** Archival Processes ................................................................................. 61
**Figure 3:** Archival Principles ..................................................................................68
**Figure 4:** The Archive and the Repertoire .............................................................89
**Figure 5:** The Original Body ..................................................................................131
**Figure 6:** Phoenix Founder and Early Members (c1986) ....................................153
**Figure 7:** Phoenix Founder and Early Members (2011) ......................................153
**Figure 8:** Bergson's Memory Cone .........................................................................158
**Figure 9:** The Body Archive: Memory ....................................................................184
**Figure 10:** Image of Hamilton, Edwards and Simpson in Revival Rehearsal ............195
**Figure 11:** The Body Archive: Spatiality .................................................................214
**Figure 12:** The Body Archive Model ......................................................................224
Introduction

Prelude

A Lesson in ‘Enhancing the Archive’

Prior to the commencement of this project I had encountered archives in multiple capacities but always through one common feature, that the materials to which they related had originated within the discipline of dance. These encounters ranged from my first experience of seeing archival material at the National Resource Centre for Dance (NRCD)¹, first hand in the store of the University of Surrey’s Library, to witnessing costumes being boxed with diligence in the Royal Opera House collections department. My experiences varied from student-researcher to Archive and Research Assistant² and they have returned again to the role of researcher for the purpose of this project. However, I come to this project with a broader view of archival practices following some informal archive training and the task of cataloguing a large archival collection in my role as Archive and Research Assistant. During this time, working alongside dance historian Professor Alexandra Carter, I undertook a set of oral history interviews encompassed by the broader context of a research project entitled ‘Pioneer Women: early British modern dancers’ taking place at the NRCD during 2008-2010. The project centred upon four significant archival collections that related to four dance practitioners of the early Twentieth Century whose contribution to British modern dance had yet to be explored through academic study. In order to enhance these collections, I was required to accompany Carter to interview a number of women who had experienced the teaching of two of these pioneers as children and young women and whose memories of this were particularly noteworthy. The commencement of the project at this time was essential owing to the reduced opportunity to interview important figures from within this period because of the large period of time that has passed since these women had practised the dance techniques and the age that they had reached. I had underestimated the value of these

¹ A hand drawing by Rudolf Laban, a pioneer of modern dance in Europe and highly important in the field of dance
² My employer was the National Resource Centre for Dance (NRCD), University of Surrey.
embodied narratives and their ability to illuminate and enrich the already existing archival materials.

During one interview I had to improvise in terms of my camera technique as one interviewee insisted on getting onto her feet to demonstrate a movement that could not be suitably expressed with words, another carefully unboxed a costume that she had stored away with a number of mementos from her time at the dancing school-so that we could fully appreciate the deep green colour of the stiff velvet fabric from which it was made. A new perspective on the material was offered through my ‘being there’, in a stranger’s house, watching with interest as she tried to re-enact a moment in the choreography she learnt as a child and the manner in which she handled a costume that she had kept tied up in a box for over half a century. Would these details which have remained in my memory ever be interpreted anew again? How can the archival catalogue record for a transcript mediate the rich experience of conversing with the elderly lady who was so thrilled to be sharing her memories of a youth that offered important knowledge to the historical study of dance? What was it about this interview that was important for the archive of dance material? What actually constitutes dance archival material?
Introducing the Research Problem

It is widely understood within the discipline of dance that, as an ephemeral art form it ‘exists at a perpetual vanishing point, at the moment of its creation it is gone’ (Siegel 1972:1). Just as time-based events such as performances, festivals, sports, ritual, and conversation can be considered as transient or momentary, dance escapes a sense of permanence owing to its time based, spatial and kinetic form. With regards to documentary practices in dance, it has been argued that ‘the performance aspect, the movement inherent in any active recollection is often cut off’, challenging traditional notions of cultural memory as being ‘static, architectonic, quantitative and encyclopaedic’ (Brandstetter 2007: 39) because dance movement action is experienced through the body in a spatio-temporal context. In this thesis I employ the example of dance practice as a way of exploring how ephemeral performance practices disrupt ideas of the archive as a place of permanence.

This thesis explores issues of dance archiving and embodied memory; in particular it investigates the difficulty in obtaining valuable information regarding choreographic experience that is often overlooked in the archive as it is not easily transferable into a tangible format. Recent initiatives in dance archiving are beginning to acknowledge this problem; that dance exposes a weakness in the archive as it tends to favour product over process (Melrose, 2007). More recently, new technologies are being embraced to devise innovative platforms for sharing materials and information that broaden the scope of the archive, for example through encompassing information gathered through rehearsal, not solely performance records. However, such initiatives fail to acknowledge the information that resides within the memory of the practitioner and to fully understand its archival potential specifically in relation to revival processes in dance. This gap in knowledge is the problem that provides the rationale for this research.

This thesis addresses issues informed by the processing of archival materials relating to the work of contemporary dance company, Phoenix

---

3 See for example, Siobhan Davies Replay: www.siobhandaviesreplay.co.uk, Richard Alston Dane Company: http://www.thealstonstudio.com/reertoire
Dance Theatre. This organisation based in Leeds, West Yorkshire (UK) was established in 1981 and functions in the present (2014) as a repertory company. Phoenix Dance Theatre’s repertoire represents a diverse range of choreographers from within the genre of contemporary dance, touring both nationally and internationally. Since October 2010 I have been processing their archive collection, which encompasses a multitude of materials that have been collected over the years in line with the organisation’s continued interest in its legacy and artistic heritage (see appendix 1 for an overview of the company’s archival collection). Phoenix Dance Theatre upholds a number of traditions within its artistic direction and practice. The commitment and interest in its own heritage and historical narrative is highlighted in the revival work that is regularly undertaken. The company has revisited historical works from within its repertoire regularly, and since 2009 each seasonal tour has featured a revived choreography that is performed by the dance cast employed at the time. This is a process of historical rumination that implicates the archive as a means for connecting the past with the present through the availability of historic materials. My research experiences undertaken in relation to the company’s work have revealed that the archive collection is not all-encompassing and that the materials contained within it are largely disparate. Where a costume, photographic images, a lighting plan, audio files and an educational resource pack might remain in relation to one choreographic work in the repertory, another might merely be represented through a single image, serving only as record that it existed. Whilst work has been done within the company to recuperate material that is ‘missing’ or that has been ‘lost’ during office reorganisation and revisions in filing procedures with changes in administrative staff, the implications of doing so retrospectively have impacted upon the historical lineages that are particularly important during revival processes. Moreover, my research reveals that a significant proportion of knowledge that is valuable within revival processes remains unavailable as it can only be accessed through the memories and experience of the dance practitioners who first embodied it.

In the company archive, the information that remains (i.e. that which has been selected for preservation) can be considered as being largely objective in the sense that the material provides evidence that certain performances, touring circuits and meetings took place. In terms of the
The artistic development of the company’s work and more specifically information regarding actual choreographic processes inherent within the repertoire, little information remains. This is due in part to the fact that as a repertory company, Phoenix Dance Theatre commissions visiting choreographers to create works that subsequently form part of the repertoire and therefore the intellectual property of each work belongs with the choreographer. As a discipline, dance is an inherently embodied phenomenon, in the sense that it is a medium that employs the body as a vehicle for its expression. The non-verbal, ineffable, transient nature of dance problematises the ability to capture it in a format that meets the needs of the archive as a permanent place where information is stored in items that are considered to be tangible (e.g. artefacts, papers, film recordings). In the creation of a dance work, a choreographer might choose to teach the dancer(s) movement through demonstration via his or her own body, or may engage with the dancers creatively in movement generating tasks such as improvisation (a common practice in dance, whereby the dancer will generate movement spontaneously in response to a set of stimuli and in response to the movement of other dancers in the space). Whilst the process is not intended for public view, it is capable of providing important evidence of decisions made in the different stages of a dance work as it comes into being. This is particularly valuable to consider within the investigation presented in this thesis as records of decisions made and the original context of the creation of records and events are regarded as central to traditional methods of archival selection and preservation (Jenkinson 1922, Forde 2007). However in the case of dance, the process often remains obscure and invisible to the user of the archive, because it is seated within the embodied knowledge and memories of the dance practitioners/choreographers, and is rarely externalised. The archive of Phoenix Dance Theatre reveals that there are distinct gaps in information that can be considered capable of transmitting knowledge relating to the journey and processes taken in the creation of a dance work. It explores a number of issues that stem from the role of practitioner memory and how this might be re-considered as archival material, in terms of how it is maintained, accessed and transferred through experience and embodiment. The absence of knowledge contained within the practitioner’s memory is particularly problematic in relation to revival processes whereby new generations of dancers are only able to access materials that refer to the
end product, with little knowledge of the creative process and the socio-historical context within which the work was created.

My research extends current discourses surrounding practices of documentation and archiving in dance and performance. I argue that the dancing body is a source of valuable information and that the dancing body should be considered as an archival material in its own right. This thesis, therefore, presents an attempt to instate the archival value inherent in the dancing body, as I explore the information manifest in memory and experiential knowledge and the means through which information is transmitted. This research contributes new knowledge to the fields of dance studies and the archiving of performance practices. Through exploration of the availability of embodied knowledge within dance revival processes I reveal the value inherent in memorial triggers and ephemeral markers such as spatiality and collectivity. Bodily knowledge of historic movement repertoire is considered as an archival material, supplementary to that which is more commonly placed within the archive (such as photographic images, video recordings, and theatre and performance ephemera).

The discussion presented within this thesis will be of value to the professional dance community; dance and performance scholars interested in issues of choreographic and embodied knowledge, dance reconstruction and methods of documentation, dance heritage and artistic legacy. The research outcomes will contribute new ideas to existing dance research regarding archival practices. Through exploring how archive material can be employed within the artistic practices of a company, such as revival work and choreography this thesis offers new ways of thinking about notions of archive in dance. The discussion also contributes to the developing study of performance documentation more broadly attached to performance studies and presents ideas that are relevant to the practice of archiving performance undertaken by archivists.

**Research Questions**

The over-arching question explored within this thesis is:

**How does the dancing body function as an archive?**
This is explored through a series of sub-questions that steer the argument through the course of the thesis. Each builds upon existing notions of the archive and investigates how these might be developed for dance:

**What are the archival documents of dance?**

**Where does archival knowledge reside and how do we access it through bodily interfaces?**

These questions address notions of what might constitute a document in dance and prompt a consideration of the different materials that exist within the discipline of dance, including the dancing body. Through exploring the practice of dance and the documents that remain and are generated through its execution, this research aims to problematise key archival theories that offer definitions of ‘archival knowledge’ (Jenkinson 1922, 1937, Brothman 2001, Cook & Schwartz 1997, H. Taylor, Cook & Dodds 2003, Millar 2006). The following lines of inquiry function as sub- sub questions:

- How can archival ‘gaps in knowledge’ be identified in relation to the documents of dance?
- What is archival value and how does it function in relation to the documents of dance?
- How does dance knowledge exist in relation to the archive?

**What are the archival qualities of the dancing body and in what ways can it be understood as an ‘archival body’?**

In this thesis I argue that the dancing body should be considered as an archival document in its own right and I refer to this notion as the ‘body archive’ throughout. The notion of the ‘body as archive’ already features in literature and discourses surrounding archival practices in dance⁴. The application of archival theories and the phenomenological study of lived experience (Merleau-Ponty 1962, Fraleigh 1987) facilitate an exploration of the dancing body’s role as an archival document. This question aims to develop a working definition of the ‘archival body’ in dance as a concept that underpins this overall inquiry and produces new knowledge relating to

---

⁴ For example, Andre Lepecki’s notion of the ‘body as archive’ and recent claims of the body as archive have been made by Sarah Whatley & Rachel Krische (2014).
the value inherent in practitioner memory and experience. This question is expanded through the sub-sub questions below:

- How is knowledge contained within the archival body?
- How is knowledge that is embodied and constructed through memory articulated, accessed and transmitted in relation to the archive?
- How does the original practising body function as an archival body?
- What knowledge is inherent in the body archive as a result of lived experience?

**What is the role of the body archive in the process of reviving past choreography in the present?**

This aspect of the discussion aims to broaden current perspectives regarding the process of reviving historic dance repertoire by recommending new possibilities for accessing information through the ‘archival body’. Employing philosophical concepts of memory (Bergson 1911 [1896]) in addition to memory as a cultural and collective process (Halbwachs 1992 [1952]), this question employs examples gathered throughout my collaborative working period with Phoenix Dance Theatre (2010-14) in order to present an in depth inquiry into the practical function of the ‘archival body’ within a dance-making process. I also explore concepts of spatiality and embodied space (Fraleigh 1987) to support the exploration of new processes of accessing knowledge stored in the body. The question encompasses the sub-sub questions listed below:

- What knowledge is inherent in the memory of the dance practitioner?
- Where does this memory reside and through what methods and triggers can it be recalled and accessed?
- Can the memory of the dance practitioner be considered as ‘archival’, and how does it exist in relation to the archive?
- How can concepts of spatiality be employed to understand how movement knowledge is learned and recalled in the body archive?
- What is the role of spatiality and kinaesthetic networks in relation to the unlocking of knowledge within the body archive?
Methodology

Over a three year period (October 2011-October 2013) I have undertaken a combination of research methods designed to enable me to respond to my research questions in depth and detail. I have undertaken extensive literature review activity, which I will describe in detail later in this chapter. I have also worked closely with Phoenix Dance Theatre, sorting and managing their archive, observing selected rehearsal and reconstruction processes in the studio context, and interviewing key individuals associated with the company in various ways.

I have processed the archival material that remains since Phoenix Dance Theatre was founded in 1981. My main activities have been to list, catalogue and appraise the overall content of the archive and to assist in sourcing historic material that the company required to support its artistic activities. During this time the company were also working on reviving historic dance repertoire for their seasonal tours in the UK (Haunted Passages 2010/2011, Signal, 2012/2013, See Blue Through (2013/2014). The company also embarked upon a series of historic revival works to mark their 30 year anniversary milestone in 2011. I observed a number of these processes and engaged in discussion and interview with dancers, choreographers, board members and company staff. I divided my time between the archive and the studio where I also documented activities taking place. The overall research inquiry developed iteratively through processes of literature searching, observation of dance-making process and interview/discussion.

The aim of this research is to explore the role of the body archive, in terms of its ability to store and transmit knowledge. These elements are explored within the context of dance revival processes for the purpose of this investigation. Whilst this research could have explored choreographic practices more widely within the discipline of dance (such as the creation of new choreography, improvisational movement and dance performance generally), this parameter was put into place to enable a more in depth analysis of dance revival process because it directly implicates historic

---

5 When first formed, the company was known as ‘Phoenix Dance Company’ until a re-branding in 2002.  
dance practice. This is because the process of ‘bringing to life’ historic dance repertoire requires knowledge of past dance practices which is often found in materials such as video recordings and notation that fall into the archival category. In this research, I used literature, key interviews, observations and archival mining to address the research questions. New perspectives upon the archive of dance are offered as a result of simultaneous exploration of the archives and observation/analysis of the revival work of contemporary dance repertory company, Phoenix Dance Theatre.

**Collaborative Doctoral Award**

This project has been conducted under the Arts and Humanities Research Council Collaborative Doctoral Award (CDA) scheme. These awards were introduced in 2005 and take place between Higher Education Institution (HEI) departments and organizations/business outside of academia. Designed to promote partnerships and collaboration, the CDA introduces doctoral students to work outside of an academic environment. Within this collaborative framework, a methodology is already in place through a partnership designed to address issues that relate to both academia and the practical operations of the non-academic partner, creating long-term benefits for both partners. A research supervisor is appointed within each organisation and support given to the student through both perspectives is designed so as to enhance employability and training. The partnership also provides the student with access to resources/materials and knowledge and expertise that would not ordinarily be available to the researcher.⁷ This Collaborative Doctoral Award gave me particular access to Phoenix Dance Theatre who as a company was interesting because they have a thirty-year history with numerous changes of identity and leadership, including two periods of temporary closure. Therefore they have a substantial history but a lack of linearity in the preservation of their story in their archival materials. They have recently become interested in preserving their historical narrative through the archive but have struggled with the relationships between hard-copy materials and revived dance, so they were keen to engage with this.

⁷ [http://www.ahrc.ac.uk/Funding-Opportunities/Pages/Collaborative-Doctoral-Awards.aspx](http://www.ahrc.ac.uk/Funding-Opportunities/Pages/Collaborative-Doctoral-Awards.aspx)
research. In addition, prior to the commencement of this project the company had undergone a change of artistic lead and senior management team. Therefore the partnership aimed to assist in the development of self-knowledge of the company's history and artistic legacy, leading to the development of a firm company identity to provide a strong base for future growth. This meant that I was able to explore the research issues through developing and utilising the company's existing archive material, accessing company rehearsals and studio practices. I also interviewed key figures within the company's history in order to interpret and explore the archive content further, gaining a valuable insight into choreographic methods and procedures whilst also adding to the company's historical narrative. For the first six months of the project I processed the company's archive material for an average of three days per week and continued to work in the archives alongside the other research methods I had employed as necessary. 2011 marked the company's 30th anniversary and the celebrations involved significant figures from throughout the thirty-year period. This provided an important opportunity for data gathering and reflection upon the company's historical legacy. At certain key periods such as this I spent 1-2 weeks at a time observing work and taking part in key events through providing archival resources and advising the company in regards to the historical lineages and narratives emerging through the materials.

The methodology that I adopted involved a number of ethnographic elements that would not have been possible without this relationship. In dance scholarship, ethnography functions as a method for developing cultural understanding through immersion in a particular cultural setting. Whilst this investigation has not been designed as an ethnographic study, it borrows from this methodology in several ways. Joan Frosch (1999) notes that ethnography's hallmark practice is that of participant observation, however, for the duration of this project I have been an active observer in the aforementioned studio practices. The collaborative design of this investigation has meant that the research pathway was planned in such a way as to 'intensify the involvement with and commitment to the success of the research for both parties' (Frosch 1999: 261). The reciprocal relationship between the company and I in roles of 'researcher and the researched', has been central to the overall methodology employed as the
outputs of the research are intended to inform the company’s future work as I have outlined above (ibid: 265).

The collaborative nature of the research project has been advantageous as Phoenix Dance Theatre has provided a context through which primary data could be gathered for analysis. My work with the company has resulted in an integration of what dance ethnographer Joan Frosch explains to be ‘insider and outsider perspectives’ (1999: 264). My engagement with the company has facilitated ‘a journey across a diverse range of perspectives’, which, as Frosch explains, enables ‘the researcher to see and understand from multiple points of view’ (ibid: 264-265). The research design was formulated in response to key opportunities within the company’s work over the main period of engagement (October 2010-October 2013) and I have mixed various methods throughout this period with a view to collecting multiple perspectives upon events and practices in multiple formats. The rationale for this is inherent in the exploration of heritage through tangible and intangible source materials in this thesis. The gathering of a variety of perspectives in this way was necessary to explore the value of different materials/ sources of information so as to probe the overall question of how the dancing body functions as an archive.

The various techniques that I employed for this study included archival mining, observation and interviewing and have been developed as a result of previous research experience and expertise. With a background in dance studies, I am familiar with the discipline of contemporary dance in a number of contexts and particularly knowledgeable about British dance infrastructures. During academic studies I have experienced interdisciplinary approaches to the study of contemporary dance practice. Furthermore, during recent employment at the National Resource Centre for Dance8 I developed skills in the processing, cataloguing and preservation of dance archive material. I engaged with this material to enable its dissemination through oral history projects; dance reconstructions and exhibitions to enrich and build a discourse relating to the actual historical materials. The processes outlined here carried a number of ethical implications so therefore this study was subject to ethical review by the University of Leeds Ethics Committee prior to its

---

8 UK National Dance Archive www.surrey.ac.uk/NRCD
An Introduction to Phoenix Dance Theatre

The Phoenix Dance Company was originally formed in 1981 by David Hamilton (Artistic Director), Donald Edwards and Vilmore James. These three young men had their enthusiasm for dance sparked by the tuition they received from teachers: Nadine Senior at Harehills Middle School, and John Auty at Intake High School. In 1981, Nadine went on to found the Northern School of Contemporary Dance, and following her retirement in 2001, was Chair of Phoenix’s Board of Trustees for six years. Whilst the company received substantial recognition through critical, often featuring in publications such as ‘New Dance’ within the late 1980s and in National dance press throughout the past thirty years, the most substantial documentation of its history exists within the publication ‘Dancing the Black Question: The Phoenix Dance company Phenomenon’ (2007) in which dance scholar/historian Christy Adair charts the company’s cultural history from its formation in 1981 through to 2002.

Initially, the three members of Phoenix performed work created within the company, mainly in educational settings. However, their fresh approach to contemporary dance won them support amongst audiences and critics on the small-scale and they quickly built a following beyond their home city. By the summer of 1982, Phoenix had danced in London’s Battersea Arts Festival and acquired two other dancers, Merville Jones and Edward Lynch, also from Harehills. In 1987, Neville Campbell joined Phoenix as Artistic Director, marking a major expansion of the company and its repertoire and bringing in choreographers from outside the company. In the same year, Phoenix moved out of Chapeltown and established a permanent base at Yorkshire Dance in Leeds city centre. Under Campbell’s direction, the company employed female dancers for the first time, increased in size to ten and was very popular with middle-scale venues. Subsequent Artistic Directors were Margaret Morris (1991-96), who developed the company’s overseas touring, and Thea Nerissa Barnes (1997-2000) who safe-guarded Phoenix’s rich repertory history by
establishing the first company archive. From 2002-2006, Darshan Singh Bhuller held the post of Artistic Director and the company sought to move into larger-scale venues. He commissioned eight new works from established and young choreographers, sourced two existing pieces for company revivals and personally choreographed three new pieces, as well as restaging two of his previous works, including the full-length Planted Seeds. Javier De Frutos became Artistic Director of Phoenix Dance Theatre in October 2006 and programmed seminal works by American choreographers, alongside his own work, again attempting to move the company into larger-scale venues. Sharon Watson was appointed as Artistic Director in May 2009. Since her appointment, Phoenix has re-introduced diverse mixed programmes of work by both established and emerging choreographers, including what are now considered to be classic, or ‘archive’ pieces from the company’s extensive repertoire, and the company has refocused its ambitions, aiming to be the leading middle scale dance company of the UK. In October 2010 Phoenix moved into purpose-built new premises in the Quarry Hill area of Leeds alongside Northern Ballet.

Phoenix Dance Theatre has grown from its roots in the Chapeltown and Harehills areas of Leeds, to become an international company that is firmly established as a contemporary dance repertory company. In 1996, Phoenix represented British dance at the Cultural Olympiad in Atlanta, acting as a cultural ambassador for Britain. In 1997, the company was commissioned to perform before 52 international Heads of State at the opening ceremony of the Commonwealth Heads of Government meeting in Edinburgh. In July 1998, Phoenix was commissioned by the BBC to perform with Ronnie Size at the Windrush Gala concert, which was broadcast nationally. More recently, the company has toured Germany, including the 2013 Scrit tmacher festival in Aachen, Galway Arts Festival, International Festival of Contemporary Dance at La Biennale di Venezia and performed at the Holland Dance Festival. With the support of the British Council, USA, Phoenix completed a five-week tour of North America in Spring 2006.

In Phoenix's history, the company has worked with a diverse range of contemporary dance choreographers including Christopher Bruce, Phillip Taylor, Shapiro & Smith, Bebe Miller, Dwight Roden, Michael Clark, Mark Baldwin, Rui Horta, Henri Oguieke and the late Tom Jobe. Seminal works
choreographed by key historical dance figures including Jane Dudley and José Limón have been re-constructed and re-staged for the company and Phoenix has worked with musicians and composers including Courtney Pine, Orphy Robinson, Kenneth Hesketh and Jocelyn Pook and has commissioned music from South Asian Arts UK.

Phoenix Dance Theatre’s current mission statement is ‘To inspire and entertain through dance, and to develop new audiences for dance, whilst enriching and embodying the spirit of a multi-cultural Britain. This statement is underpinned by five core values of quality, diversity, inclusivity, access and communication, through all of its activities in programming, producing and presenting contemporary dance work. (Phoenix Dance Theatre, Annual Report 204/15).

Archival Mining

Surveying the company archival collection provided opportunity to analyse its contents and question the archive in terms of it coherency, consistency and the knowledge value of the materials it comprises. The Phoenix Dance Theatre archive collection cannot be considered as a finite entity. As the company has continued to develop the archival collection has expanded. It should also be noted that the company has not employed an archivist to manage the materials and so its arrangement did not comply with archival regulation prior to my arrival. This investigation has focused upon the materials that have been collated into a physical archive collection throughout the company’s existence. These archival holdings are diverse in terms of material types, including photographic images, film footage (in multiple formats), publicity materials and theatre ephemera, costume designs and items, artwork, company reports, meeting minutes and planning documents. This variation in material types facilitated my inquiry into the strengths and limitations of the knowledge represented across the materials. For example the video recording offers an additional layer to the information represented in a photograph of the same work, whilst the programme/publicity material might offer a different, more circumstantial/verifiable source of knowledge. The selected approach draws upon a number of theoretical traditions from within the archival field. As a
process for determining the value within the context of ‘archival significance’ inherent within these materials and their organisation as an archive, the following surveying techniques were employed:  

1. Accessioning: capturing key information, identifying what is in the archive.

2. Appraisal: which elements are worth keeping and where do they belong?

3. Physical reorganisation: arranging the material in the appropriate place

4. Cataloguing: referencing and description of the archive materials

Applying these techniques to the physical construction of the archive generates information regarding the decision-making processes that have taken place throughout the thirty-year period. Adopting this mode of inquiry generated two types of information. Firstly, it facilitated an understanding of how the records/documents were originally created, organised and used. Secondly, it revealed information contained in the structural relationship of the records; this illuminated where original order had been lost and indicated shortfalls in the archival holdings and subsequent potential for transmitting knowledge. Surveying the archive through this historical approach allowed for the interpretation and contextual grounding of the archival documents, revealing discontinuities in terms of the historical value inherent in and placed upon the different material types.

A number of resources were generated through this process, including an updated choreo-chronicle for Phoenix Dance Theatre (expanding upon Adair’s resource published in 2007), a historical timeline, and a detailed archival accession/box listing which provided an overall index of the archive (see appendix 1 for summaries of these documents). Analysed comparatively, these documents provided important data in terms of the trends in different types of documentation that was given archival priority at different times. Key ideas from contemporary archival literature (Jenkinson 1922, Cook and Schwartz 2001, Millar 2006, 2009) were applied to enable analysis of the archive in terms of its value and longevity, recognising historical and archival trends and informing this investigation in terms of the ability of the archive to transmit knowledge that is useful within the context of dance archival processes.

---

9 Source: Katherine Carter, Greater Manchester County Records Office, 2010.
**Observation**

Researching the role of the developing archive material within the dance-reconstruction processes was made possible through the observation of company rehearsals. During the research I observed three key periods of practice in the studio. These included the revival of *Signal* with the choreographer Henri Oguike and the current company dancers throughout June & July 2011 (first performed by Phoenix Dance Theatre in 2004) and the creation of a new work for the repertoire entitled *Soundclash* during December 2011 with choreographer Kwesi Johnson. Finally, a number of rehearsals were observed during the period of September 2011-November 2011 as dancers prepared for the company’s 30th anniversary celebratory performance.

Observing these processes offered multiple insights into the interplay of archival material and bodily action, most frequently in the form of the use of video footage and physical responses to the visual content. The revival of *Signal* was led by the original choreographer and also incorporated the use of archival video footage in the studio, therefore the dancers were learning through transmission of Oguike’s own knowledge in the form of spatial and bodily interaction as well as through reference to the audio-visual archival record. A contrast to this was provided in the choreography of a new work by Kwesi Johnson in December 2011 as the process was largely focused upon the generation of new material and therefore the dancers were acquiring new movement vocabulary in a different, more iterative manner through conversation and experimenting with different ways of moving under the direction of Johnson\(^\text{10}\). Finally, the rehearsals for the anniversary performance offered a more specific and unique insight into the revival of works undertaken by individuals who had performed them originally. These revivals enabled me to observe the use of the body as an archival material, in the sense that the dancers were striving to recall movement as opposed to learning it anew. This raised pertinent issues and questions surrounding the role of memory and effects of ageing in a way that did not apply to the

\(^{10}\) For additional information, after the completion of this process, I asked the dancers to reflect upon their learning process and experiences and this has contributed to the data relating to this particular period of observation.
other revival process (although it could be argued that some of these issues might relate to Oguike as original choreographer).

The value of these observations was that they illuminated how knowledge is transferred between bodies and exposed some of the implications of doing this from memory/retrospectively and in a new context. A number of ethical challenges were inherent within this method as I was observing an ordinarily private working environment and making a tangible record for research purposes. Therefore, it was necessary to provide participants with sufficient detail that might influence their decision about whether to participate. One of the benefits of conducting this research within the CDA framework meant that as the work was of specific interest and benefit to the company, permission to observe was initially sought through contact with the dancers and choreographers by the artistic director, Sharon Watson. Watson provided an introduction to those identified as potential participants and I followed up by providing the observed with an information sheet outlining the purpose of my research (see appendix 2). If consent was given, contact was made via email for the most part to agree mutually suitable times for me to attend rehearsals. The observed participants were asked verbally if they were happy for the rehearsal to be recorded and it was made clear that I would stop the recording if they requested it. I also ensured that participants were notified that I would leave the studio if requested. The rehearsals that I observed all took place within the company’s studio spaces and therefore no special permission was required from any other parties. The length of time spent observing was variable as a result of the availability of space and time committed by the dancers. Generally I would observe for a minimum of an hour from the front of the studio, with a fixed camera in place for the duration of the time spent in the studio.

During these periods of observation I drew upon a number of research traditions within dance ethnography. Documentation, in the form of ‘field notes’ is an integral feature of this research method and in this study I adopted some of the note-taking techniques considered necessary for a successful ethnography. I took ‘meta-notes’ which included the written recording of my observations, my responses to what I observed and questions that emerged whilst spectating. The notes incorporated descriptions of the action taking place, key points arising through decisions
made in the artistic work and verbatim records of dialogue and key words used in the studio by dancers and choreographers in recognition of the importance of using the ‘language of our participants’ (Frosch 1999: 265). I noted any issues that arose during the process, for example if the dancers were challenging any aspects of the choreography or their memory of it. I would frequently engage in discussion with the dancers and choreographers and as a result became engaged within the processes in different ways. During the revival work of ex-company members I was often asked to make a note of the length of choreographic sections and to stand in the space in the absence of individual dancers. I engaged in conversations with Oguike and Johnson, who would frequently narrate their working processes/thoughts and responses to the creative work occurring in the space. Following each rehearsal observed I would make further notes regarding my reflections and key points raised as a result of the process.

In addition to note-taking, I recorded sections of the rehearsal processes that I observed using digital video. This technique was employed so as to expand the range of data captured in relation to these studio practices. Moving image enables movement to be captured and transferred to different formats where it can be manipulated in order to facilitate analysis, through editing and playback tools. In his text entitled *Analysing Performance*, Patrice Pavis claimed that performance recorded on film (video) was the most all-encompassing document as it illustrates the unification of the time, audio and spatial/movement action concurrently (2003). However, this method of data collection is not without limitation as the playback is two-dimensional ‘which means other views of the movement are lost’ including the movements of a group if a dancer is not in view of the camera lens and the consideration that film footage might ‘distort’ the movement and therefore cannot be relied upon as a ‘true representation of the movement and […] the dynamic qualities present in the live performance’ (Brennan 1999: 297-298). This is one of the many issues that lie at the centre of this inquiry, in terms of the value of archival materials which encompass video and moving image recordings as historical documents. When analysing this data, I reviewed the film footage and written notes simultaneously so as to address similarities and to match up the data. I then examined patterns of behaviour and interactions and dialogue between bodies in space in specific detail.
Interviews

I undertook interviews in order to explore subjective, first person accounts of dance-making decisions, processes and as an alternative method for exploring memorial, physical and sensory/lived archival material. The interviews were designed to extract qualitative data that might assist in bridging the gaps in knowledge that permeate the company archive. The gathering of accounts facilitated interpretation of the company’s artistic/choreographic style from those who embodied it (dancers and choreographers) and governed it (board members and artistic director). The interviews took the form of semi-structured/ dialogue-based discussion and I used direct questions and prompts to encourage discussion and to allow a degree of adaptability and freedom. In order to maximise spontaneity and encourage honest reactions, participants were informed of the general nature of the discussion but not the actual questions prior to the interview. The questions were formulated around thematic areas relating to choreographic (inclusive of revival) choices and methods, movement characteristics and artistic development/governance; however they were tailored to each individual according to their expertise (whether it is as a dancer/choreographer/board member etc.). The aim was to gather data from within categories of group/collective behaviour and dynamics, artistic values and sensory experience.

In terms of the ethical implications of this work, I ensured that the purpose of each interview had been outlined in an information sheet (see appendix 2), which also included my contact details should the participant wish to contact me at any time. I explained the format and rough duration of the interview and each participant had the opportunity to ask any questions prior to the commencement of the discussion. The confidentiality terms were discussed and detailed in a consent form and a separate consent form was provided in relation to the deposit of the interview recording and transcript into the company archive. The interview discussion was captured in both audio and video formats to ensure that the data was captured successfully should one medium fail. The interviews were transcribed from the audio files using guidelines from the British Library Sound Archive and video footage was transferred to DVD format. These materials were then deposited in the company archive (where permission was given).
Full details of the interviews undertaken are listed below; extracts of transcriptions of selected interviews are available in the appendix to this thesis.

- Sharon Watson, Artistic Director, Phoenix Dance Theatre, 11th February 2011
  Artistic Director's Office, Phoenix Dance Theatre, Leeds. (See appendix 3)

  In this interview, I focused upon gaining a sense of the historical lineages of the company history from Watson's perspective as Artistic Director and as a figure who has been involved with the company since 1989 in varying capacities, including dancer and choreographer. During the interview we discussed the company revival work and the artistic decisions underpinning this aspect of the company’s work.

- Tracy Tinker, Rehearsal Director, Phoenix Dance Theatre, 7th June 2011.
  Phoenix Dance Theatre Meeting Room, Leeds. (See appendix 4)

  Tinker was able to elaborate upon the structural processes of revival work and the methods undertaken from the perspective of the artistic management of the company. During this interview we discussed the role of the document and the training/role of the dancer in the revival work.

- Henri Oguike, Choreographer/Artistic Director, Henri Oguike Dance Company

  Interviewing Oguike enabled me to refer back to the notes made in rehearsals and to ask questions that had arisen at that time, adding another layer to this data through incorporating the choreographer’s perspective upon the working methods and rationale for decisions made. This interview coincided with company publicity procedures as each choreographer creating work for the company is required to participate in an interview which is professionally recorded and edited for inclusion on the company’s YouTube channel[^11].

[^11]: [http://www.youtube.com/user/phoenixdancetheatre](http://www.youtube.com/user/phoenixdancetheatre)
I interviewed Johnson following my observation of the choreographic period of *Soundclash* during December 2011. As a former company member (1993-1994) creating new work for a company in a new context, Johnson was able to offer insight into his working processes and answer specific questions about the way in which he worked from and created documentation during the creative process. (This interview also coincided with the company’s publicity procedures as noted above).

Edward Lynch was selected as a participant because he was a founder member of the company. This presented an opportunity to discuss Lynch’s approach to remembering past choreography during the revival performance and to gain some insight into his overall experience of this event. From this interview I was able to explore the way in which memory had imprinted itself over time and through two different methods of remembering-in movement and through discussion.

In addition to those interviews listed above, during the anniversary event in November 2011 I gathered individual narratives from across the audience and performers in a vox-pop (vox-populi) event. The vox-pop method was conducted differently from the interviews as it was much more spontaneous and flexible. The attendees of the event were approached and asked if they would be willing to share any thoughts or responses to the event to the camera. The benefit of this journalistic approach to the research was identified in the flexibility of this spontaneous method of data capture, in which individuals were approached during the evening when memory was fresher and emotional responses richer. It also meant that I was able to collate a wide range of perspectives from key figures from throughout the company’s history. A professional recording was made by a videographer.
employed by Phoenix Dance Theatre and I was able to prompt interviewees in a casual conversational manner. The purpose of the vox-pop was to document these responses for the company’s benefit whilst also offering valuable insights within the context of my research. In total, I gathered information from 10 audience members and 15 of the evening’s performers.

I analysed the data through comparison between the information gathered during the interviews, establishing where there was consensus and where there was conflict in the accounts. I focused upon the transcripts, cross-referenced with the film footage, to examine the particular responses given by participants. I undertook simple linguistic analysis to examine how movement and artistic values were expressed and I used qualitative analysis of body movement and physical expression.\(^\text{12}\)

\(^{12}\) A CD containing extracts of the data gathered during this overall project is included in the appendix of this thesis.
**Literature Review**

Another fundamental aspect of my methodology was literature searching and reviewing, which supported my other research activities of interviewing, observation and subsequent analysis of the data gathered through these processes. In the broadest sense, my primary research question addresses theories of the archive and the knowledge contained within the dancing body; how does the dancing body function as an archive? The key thematic areas of literature identified for this project were: archival theories, ephemerality, memory and spatiality in dance-making practices and notions of the dancing body as archive. The reasons for selecting these thematic areas will be explained in the relevant chapters as I unfold the argument of the thesis, but in this section I will outline the key sources and concepts on which I will be drawing. I have also published two articles on the topic of the body and the archive during the course of my studies (Griffiths, 2012, 2013), and I will be referencing these papers at various points in the thesis argument.

**Phoenix Dance Theatre**

This thesis focuses upon the revival work of Phoenix Dance Theatre as its primary illustration and locus of primary research. Alongside the historical information sourced through the company archival documents, the monograph *Phoenix Dance Company: Dancing the Black Question* (Adair 2009) has been vital in charting a cultural history of the company. This source provides the historical context of the company’s emergence and existence pre 2002 and also offers insight into the original context of the creation of some of the pieces of repertoire referred to within this thesis. The text also enables cross-reference between my own discussion and previous interviews undertaken by Adair with some of the dance artists that I have interviewed during this research (including Sharon Watson and Edward Lynch in particular). I have also engaged in discussions with dancers (Phil Sanger & Josh Wille) and referred to the independent research of company dancers (Ardovini 2012) as additional sources from within the time spent working with the dance company.
Archival Theories

The practice of archiving is underpinned by a series of principles that have been established since the translation of the ‘The Dutch Manual of 1898’. Sir Hilary Jenkinson adapted this text for his key publication\textsuperscript{13} entitled the Manual of Archive Administration (1922, 1937) and this work offered previously unpublished practical advice for the management of records and archives throughout the first half of the twentieth century. Jenkinson’s work is an important reference within this thesis as it establishes a number of traditions from which contemporary archival theory takes its departure. Jenkinson was responsible for developing a number of concepts related to notions of selectivity, ownership, authenticity, context and value, all of which relate to contemporary archival practices. Key principles such as archival appraisal and provenance which are inherent in Jenkinson’s work assist in providing a context for the discussion of how the dancing body is considered as being archival in this thesis. Whilst Jenkinson’s has been an important influence within the archives sector, it has also been criticised for having a rudimentary approach which was not easily transferable across different types of archival materials. Following this, Theodore Schellenberg published Modern Archives in 1956 within which he consolidated existing knowledge within Europe and America on the ‘nature of archives’ and developed principles such as appraisal. Schellenberg also addressed records management and organisation, offering insights that later informed the development of models and processes within the fields of archives and records management.

More recently, guides to archival practices and processes are available through governing bodies such as The National Archives. This UK organisation provides a guidance section for those working with archives (both qualified and amateur archivists) including ‘tool kits’ which have informed the archival methods that I have undertaken in this research\textsuperscript{14}. The National Archives as an institutional body also provides up-to-date literature including government policy documents. Particularly useful is a

\textsuperscript{13} The first monograph on archival practices to be published in the English Language

\textsuperscript{14} I have also referred to Keeping Archives (3rd Edition) published by The Australian Society of Archivists edited by Judith Ellis (2013).
document entitled *Archives for the 21st Century* (The National Archives/Crown Copyright: 2009\(^5\)) which provides a detailed summary of the challenges that face the archival sector in the present and future practices of the discipline particularly in response to the increasing use of the digital in the generation and storage of documents containing information that is considered to be culturally relevant. The document incorporates the statement below, which underpins a summary of the archival sector within a contemporary context:

The archival record is [...] the direct, uninterpreted and authentic voice of the past: the primary evidence of what people did and what they thought; the look of places and events recorded through images—both still and moving; life’s beginnings and life’s endings; the growth and decline of industries and the ebbs and flows of communities and cultures. The archival record is the foundation on which are built all our histories, with their many and varied voices.

*Ibid: 6*

This definition of the archival record upholds the traditionally monolithic status of the archive. This idea is reinforced through the notion that the record contains primary evidence and is an authentic source. Key principles such as these are employed in this thesis in order to exemplify the gaps in the dance archive. The National Archives also offers guidance for best practice in information and records management. Because some of the practices and principles in this area intersect with archival practices more broadly, I refer to some key ideas outlined in the work of Trudy Petersen (1984), Richard Hartley and Jennifer Rowley (2008) and Maria Brosius (2003) which maintain the selectivity of document retention and contribute to understanding how the body might function as an archival document in dance.

Critiquing the Archival Methodology

The archival discipline is constructed through a set of key processes and terminologies which are also the subject of debates surrounding the field. I have identified a number of key authors and publications that offer more contemporary insights into the role of the archive within modern societies and also critical treatment of some of the more ideological principles of the archive (such as provenance and appraisal). Such discipline-specific terminology can be interpreted through the use of The Society of American Archivist’s *Glossary of Archival and Records Terminology* available online (Pearce-Moses 2005, 2012). Whilst definitions are available across the literature, this resource provides a comprehensive and usable glossary and its recent publication means that the definitions reflect the archival discipline in a present context. Moreover, archival theorists Laura Millar (2006, 2009, 2010) and Helen Forde (2007) outline the key principles and practices that are currently employed within the archival field. In the guide to the overall practice of archiving *Preserving Archives*, Forde notes that the practice of archiving is a well-established profession and discipline ‘with its own distinctive body of knowledge’ (Forde: 2007: xi). Forde also notes that the field of records management and its intersection with theories of archiving offers important insights into decision-making processes that impact upon the archive as it is perceived by the end-user (Forde, 2007). Theoretically authoritative guides such as these offer robust theories for establishing, managing and developing archives in all their diversity. They are useful in terms of unpacking complex ideas that characterise the specificity of the discipline, in particular, the concept of the Life-Cycle model as described by Brien Brothman (2001) and Philip Bantin (1998). I have also engaged in discussion with users of performance archival material, including performance scholar Jonathan Pitches (2011), which provides a source of insight into the academic use of performance archival material. Interviews with Pitches (2011) have informed my study usefully even though his research is in the area of performer training rather than dance. He describes grappling with the same sorts of issues as dance scholars, since he is concerned with the capture of historical embodied practice preserved (or not) within traditional archival materials. This interview data has also been informed through the writings of dance historian Larraine Nicholas.
who describes her use of archival material through new ideas of ‘historical imagination’ (2013).

The Canadian journal *Archivaria* has been a key source for contextualising the move away from the monolithic in favour of the embodied within this thesis. The contributions of multiple authors to this journal provide critical treatment of the archival process which assists in transcending some of the earlier, more rigid principles that are communicated in the work of Jenkinson (1922) and Schellenberg (1956) in particular. Through interrogating archival ideologies, these authors expose the archive as being in conflict with semblances of value neutrality, authenticity and objectivity (Cook 1997, Brothman 2001, Cook & Schwartz 2002, Meehan 2010). For example, archivist Jennifer Meehan has contested the place of original order as a universal method through a radical rethinking that embraces the idea that this concept can be re-interpreted in specific relation to archival items on their own terms. She claims that ‘original order is easy to interpret too narrowly and render practically irrelevant; it is often impossible to implement, especially in arranging and describing personal records’ (29: 2010).

The anthology ‘*Imagining Archives: Essays and Reflections*’ (2003) is similarly relevant to these ideas as the text contains a collection of articles spanning approximately three decades, written by influential archival thinker Hugh A. Taylor. The articles have been gathered together and presented alongside a reflection written from a more recent perspective (2000). In collaboration with archival theorist Terry Cook and G. Dodds, H. Taylor presents an understanding of archival principles as a set of ideas that are continuously evolving, explaining that the ability to reinterpret key archival concepts allows records to be analysed and understood on their own terms. For H. Taylor (2003), the context in which the records are kept, in accordance with social and cultural circumstance, is what gives meaning to the archive. This intimates that record selection processes are subject to changing social, cultural and digital contexts and underpinning H. Taylor’s work is his appeal to connect ‘human worlds’ with record keeping (ibid). Terry Cook extends these ideas in his essay entitled *What is Past is Prologue: A History of Archival Ideas Since 1898, and the Future Paradigm Shift* (1997). In this text he analyses key discourses in archival theory and
conceives of archival practice as a ‘curatorship of physical objects’ (ibid: 26). He also recommends a series of themes which he considers to represent a marked shift in the practice and theorisation of archives. Broadly, these can be summarised as firstly a shift in archives being publicly available, rather than being restricted for government use, and secondly the modification of the preservation of records as ‘authentic’ and evidential through the development of the concept of provenance. Another key theme is identified in the shift from the archivist as a ‘passive’ keeper of ‘documentary residue’ to ‘active shapers of…archival heritage’ (ibid: 46). Finally Cook observes that archival theory should not be regarded as an all-encompassing, enduring set of regulations (ibid: 43-46). These definitions are important to this study as they provide the background or the discussion of the dance archive in a contemporary context.

Cook also observes the influence of postmodernism and destructivist discourses pertaining to the discipline which are of particular use to this study. Philosophical perspectives asserted by Jacques Derrida (1996) and Michel Foucault (2002 [1969]) in particular are central to this investigation as they offer more flexible definitions of the archive that assist in developing notions of the dancing body as archive. Jacques Derrida’s text Archive Fever (1996) encompasses the desire to recover the truthful moment in which the knowledge is created (Derrida 1996). The originality of this study lies within its overall objective to forge a connection between memory and record. Derrida explains that the term archive eludes connotations of memory, spontaneity, living or internal experience. This is an important source when considering the relationship between memory and the archive within this thesis.

A number of Derrida’s declarations regarding the archive saturate recent debates across the literature relating to performance documentation as a result of their applicability to the discipline (e.g. Schneider 2001, Taylor 2003, Auslander 2006, Reason 2006, Roms 2010). Derrida claims that ‘archives take place’ under ‘house arrest’ and that the ‘place where they dwell permanently, marks’ an ‘institutional passage from the private to the public’ (1995: 2). He suggests that the archive constitutes both origin and subsequent breakdown of the original memory as ‘there is no archive without a place of consignation’ (1996: 11).
Furthermore, philosopher Michel Foucault (2002 [1969]) comments upon the structures placed around ‘knowledge’ and presents a case for the discontinuity and transformational quality of historical information, especially when obtained through the archive. Foucault problematizes the hierarchical promise of the archive through recognising the specificity of the context within which the archive is created and managed and offering useful insights into the knowledge value of archival materials. He argues that the archive is ‘at once close to us, and different to our present existence, it is the border of time that surrounds our presence’\(^\text{16}\) that results in a ‘never completed, never wholly achieved uncovering of the archive’ (147-148).

Foucault emphasises the differences created through the archive, observing that the archive results in a ‘multiplicity of statements’ (p146) as it is not capable of fixing the time and place from which the items it contains emerge. Foucault echoes the idea that archival records ‘reflect the spirit of their times and [are] then…interpreted anew by succeeding generations’ (Cook 1997:25-26) as he positions the document as a ‘decipherable trace’ (ibid:7). By this he is referring to the fact that the document undergoes a process of questioning by the historian, reinforcing the deconstruction of the perceived hierarchies of documents residing in the archive. He explains how the practice of history has ‘memorized [sic] the monuments of the past’, transforming them into documents (ibid). This is a rich notion as Foucault considers the ways in which traces of the past may be manifest in a form other than that within which they originated.

Ideas regarding the traces of knowledge and the promise of unveiling new information in academic archival research have been discussed in relation to the idea of an archival ‘aura’ in the work of theatre and performance scholar Helen Freshwater (2003) who claims that the idea of the archive is synonymous with the notion of a ‘recoverable past’:

> Academia thrives on the lure of new material and undiscovered textual territory. One way to ensure that research achieves the required level of originality is through analysis of previously unexamined material. The unique ‘aura’ of the archival document is thus bestowed upon its analysis by virtue of the perceived originality of the analyst’s

\(^{16}\) Notions of presence are discussed in the work of Phillip Zarrilli 2011.
object of study. This preoccupation with the original document is reflected in our day-to-day exchanges.

Such ideas are also bound up with notions of objectivity and authenticity, which are then problematised through work such as that published by social theorist Thomas Osborne who identified the archive as being ‘A centre of interpretation’ (1999: 52).

**Archives and Memory**

Laura Millar’s writings on archives are rich sources within this investigation, particularly her work on archives and memory. In contemporary archival theories, it has been suggested that notions of memory offer an alternative approach for conveying the knowledge that the archive represents (Craig 2002, Millar 2006). The work of Craig and Millar adopts the processes of preservation that are concerned with containment and storage in order to suggest that memory can be considered within these frameworks (Hartley & Rowley 2007, Forde 2007). In particular, Barbara Craig’s (2002) hypothesis suggests that memory is what constitutes the missing link between the past and the present. Questioning whether the relationship between history and memory is reciprocal, Craig channels this idea through the analogy of a memory as a store of knowledge just as memory is a robust ‘mechanism that fixes items for later recall’ (2002: 285). The idea that memory is a store, just as an archive functions as a repository is dichotomous with ideas stemming from Millar in particular that consider memory to be constructed as opposed to ‘fixed’. Craig’s perspectives are largely manifest through the literature surrounding archival practices and process whereby preservation and organisation is prioritised.

With the preservation of archives as a priority, Forde (2007: xi) suggests the purpose of the archive is to ‘extend and corroborate human and corporate memory’ as they are essential for preserving what we know about the past. Forde also recognises additional categories in the types of records that are selected for preservation with a view to assuring future understanding and
interpretations of a document (ibid: 33). Due to the very nature of material traces of past events and experiences, Millar has asked ‘are archives, in fact, our memory?’ She claims that the archive does not contain ‘episodic memory’ but that this can be invoked through human interaction with the document, which echoes H. Taylor’s (2003) humanistic, societal approach to the archival endeavour. Of particular relevance is Millar’s metaphor of the archive as memory. She states that we associate our memories as being ‘of the past’ and the archive is the ‘evidence of that same past’, and memory is stored in a certain place in the mind just as the records of the past are kept in a particular place (2006: 106-7). The archive therefore, might be understood as a place of memory in a similar manner to those ideas expressed by Derrida in particular (1996).

The significance of Millar’s argument emerges from the notion that archives and records are ‘not in themselves [as] “memories” but only touchstones upon which memories may be retrieved, preserved and articulated’ (2006: 106). Situating the archive as a border between fragments of memory and record is a key concept in the development of conceptual archival frameworks applied within this investigation and is also in this thesis through the archival theories on memory discussed by Kenneth E. Foote (1990). Millar’s work here affords new ways of thinking about memory as being less permanent and bound by modes of storage, instead, through the notion of ‘touchstones’ she implies that memory has a more active context in relation to the archive. Its articulation as a result of processes of engagement with archival material is a significant shift towards the relationship between archive and memory in relation to dance archival processes.

The strength of the archive is said to rest in the ability of the captured information to assist in our remembering of an event/decision (Millar 2009: 24). Whilst this distinction identifies the knowledge value of the archive as being inextricably linked with memory, these authors overlook the potential of memorial knowledge as an archival material in its own right, and the strengths and limitations inherent in different types of records for provoking memories. The archival theorist Kenneth E. Foote (1990) argues that the concept of memory goes beyond metaphor and can be considered a
method for extending the temporality of communication. Such perspectives that regard memory as an extension to pre-existing archival materials mark a shift away from archives as being fixed and that place memory within such frameworks and are to be explored in chapters 3 and 4 of this thesis more specifically.

**Dance Archival Practices**

I have referred to more discipline-specific guidelines available through the American Alliance Dance Heritage Coalition\(^\text{17}\), the UK’s National Dance Archive (NRCD)\(^\text{18}\), the UK Association of Performing Arts Collections (APAC)\(^\text{19}\) and the International Association of Libraries, Museums, Archives and Documentation Centres of the Performing Arts (SIBMAS)\(^\text{20}\). The literature provided in relation to dance preservation through these organisations contains specific guidance and definitions of dance archival practices, not previously available in more general archival theories. Regardless of its ephemeral condition, documentation and historical records relating to performance practices do exist, primarily in the form of music scores, artistic notebooks, costume and set designs, photographic images and moving images for example.

Considering that ‘[…] the knowledge inherent in dance is notoriously difficult to capture and to document’ (Groves, Shaw and deLaHunta 2007: 91), the potential of the body as supplementary archive material warrants further exploration. This is an important distinction as it exposes another layer to the issue that occupies discussion within the theoretical field of dance. As historian Professor Alexandra Carter explains:

> [...] a case has been made that dance poses a special challenge to the historian because of its ephemerality [...] such a claim is only partially tenable, for all of the past is ephemeral; it exists only in records of the events, not in the events themselves.

Carter 2004:14

\(^\text{17}\) [http://danceheritage.org/](http://danceheritage.org/)
\(^\text{18}\) [www.surrey.ac.uk/nrcd](www.surrey.ac.uk/nrcd)
\(^\text{19}\) [http://www.performingartscollections.org.uk/](http://www.performingartscollections.org.uk/)
This is an important observation as Carter’s observation highlights the issues that ephemeral acts are widespread, dance is one aspect of a milieu of performed actions and behaviours that Barbara Kirschenblatt-Gimblett has claimed belong to the ‘ephemeral’ as a result of their liveness (2004). It is with this considered that I employ dance as non-verbal movement practice of the body, limited in verbal and textual outputs as a lens through which to explore the type of knowledge that is available through the body.

New concepts of dance archival practices are emerging in relation to digital initiatives in documentation and web-based archives. I refer to this work through the perspectives of key authors including Sarah Whatley (2008, 2010, 2012, 2013), Scott deLahunta (2007) and Susan Melrose (2007) in particular. These authors provide a useful commentary on the role of the digital archive in bringing us closer to something of the essence of dance-making processes and practice. Supplementary to this, a selection of articles from within the anthology Capturing the Essence of Performance (SIBMAS, 2010) contains key ideas from multiple authors considering the role of and relationships between performance and archive (Roms, Hewson, Whatley & Varney ibid).

**Ephemerality**

Ephemerality is a key theme within this research because it deals with dance, which as a performance practice is by its very nature ephemeral and enables the identification of gaps in the archive of dance. Numerous authors within the field of performance studies have contributed to the development of discussion surrounding the complexity of documenting live performance. In particular, the work of Peggy Phelan has been widely influential following the claim that:

> Performance cannot be saved, recorded, documented, or otherwise participate in the circulation of representations, once it does so, it becomes something other than performance

1993:146

This statement underpins more recent perspectives regarding the practice of documenting performance (i.e. Schneider 2001, Taylor 2003, Pavis 2003,
Reason 2006, and Jones and Heathfield 2012). Phelan suggests that the production of records in relation to the practice of performance suffers as a result of the ephemerality of performance practices. Furthermore, Phelan highlights the idea that any definitive version of a performance ceases to exist following the execution of the original. The term ‘performance’ encompasses multiple genres including music, theatre, dance and live arts, all of which are transient in nature according to Matthew Reason, their existence ‘temporary, momentary, fleeting’ (2006: 8-9). Reason’s monograph entitled *Documentation, Disappearance and the Representation of Live Performance* responds specifically to the idea of representation and progresses Phelan’s ideas in a way that is especially useful for this research. Reason deconstructs this broad approach and presents a detailed analysis of different documentary media including video, photography and critical writing. In addition, Reason hones in on the archive and its relationship to what he terms the ‘performance afterlife’ (ibid: 31) and refers to prominent ideas regarding the perception of the archive as being associated with ‘wanting traces and fragmentary evidence of the past to amount to a comprehensive whole’ (ibid: 33). These ideas relate to those stemming from Freshwater (2003) and Osborne (1999) outlined in the previous section of this review but are in the main related to the practice and interest of the historian and therefore differ to the ideas communicated by the archival theorist. Reason emphasises the idea of ‘archival promise’ and aligns this with human memory in order to highlight the relevance of memory to the performing arts (ibid: 49). His ideas are suggestive of memory as a vehicle for ‘saving’ performance in a similar vein to the archival ideas surrounding memory as a repository (Craig, 2002). Such ideas are indicative of the potential value of memory in relation to archives of performance and the mode of accessing knowledge available through memory is to be further explored within this thesis.

It is this area of study in particular from which notions of ‘gaps’ emerge and this area of debate has been fuelled through the publication of performance studies scholar Diana Taylor’s concept of *The Archive and the Repertoire*, which marked a shift in the ways in which records of performance could be understood (2003). The crux of Taylor’s argument is manifest in a proposed binary between the documents/information existing after performance events. Taylor claims that the archive constitutes ‘documents, buildings and
bones’ and the repertoire encompasses ephemeral phenomena such as ‘spoken language, dance, sports and ritual’ (ibid: 19). Her work reinforces notions of representation in relation to performance and is employed in this thesis as a means for understanding the limitations of the performance archive. Taylor’s argument is particularly significant because it departs from the dominant discourses spanning the performance studies field during the 1970s and ’80s as summarised by Rebecca Schneider in her seminal essay *In the meantime: performance remains* (2001). Schneider notes that the idea of “vanishing” and “disappearance” attributed to the writings of scholars such as Richard Schechner (1985) followed by Phelan (1993) and Joseph Roach (1996) have underpinned ephemerality as a key strand of performance theory. She recognises that in Roach’s work, *Cities of the Dead* (1996), a new perspective that moved away from the idea of disappearance was introduced, Schneider explains how Roach claims that performance does not disappear ‘though it is certainly to move, to step, to shift, to jump across bodies, objects, continents [...]’ (2011:96). Roach introduced the idea of a genealogy of performance which adds another aspect to performance’s ephemerality and is further developed in Taylor’s theories of 2003 and Eugenio Barba’s work relating to the performer in 2005. This lineage of ideas marks an important shift with regard to the role of the body in relation to ‘disappearance’ as a consequence of ephemerality and the archival document. This canon continues to develop in the work of authors including Philip Auslander (2006), Michael Shanks (2011) and Amelia Jones (2012) who investigate the archival document in relation to notions of presence, absence and personal memory.

*The Dancing Body*

In the study of dance, the body is increasingly recognised as a vehicle for knowledge in the sense that the body might function as a ‘container for knowledge’ (Melrose 2007). In early anthropological perspectives it has been proposed that dance performs ‘human thought and behaviour’ (Hanna 1987:3) and anthropologist Anya Peterson-Royce made the important distinction that:

“Knowing” by doing is different from “knowing” by observing. Knowing in the body is inherently
integrative and ought to facilitate knowing cultures from the inside-out.

2002: xv

In relation to the concept of knowledge, Susan Foster explains ‘knowing by doing’ as bodily intelligence (Foster, 1997:237). She describes how, through repetitive training and instruction, the dancing body is made up of metaphors equating to bodily habits (ibid). In later work, Foster has developed this argument through more in depth study (2011) of the way in which we feel when dancing and more specifically she has explored kinaesthesia [sic] as a way of honing in on the body’s experience of physicality and movement. In analysing movement, others have referred to the idea of bodily intelligence as ‘the private world of knowing in one’s bones’ (Moore & Yamamoto: 1988:74) and the repetitive dance experiences have been said to build ‘a fund of tacit knowledge’ (Blom & Chaplin 1988:16). Intelligence derived from practitioner processes has also been explored in the work of Miranda Tufnell and Chris Crickmay (1993) and in more recent literature and interdisciplinary approach between studies in neurocognitive sciences (Bläsing, 2010) and dance as well as the philosophy of thinking in movement (Bunker, Pakes, Rowell, 2013) are informing understanding of the memory of the dancing body. The anthology Knowledge in Motion: Perspectives of Artistic and Scientific Research in Dance (Gehm, Pirkko Husemann, Katharina von Wilcke, 2007) contains key sources that have informed this research, in particular, the idea that the body is a ‘seat of memory’ (Baxmann: 2007). Such ideas are employed in order to further explore the value of the body as a source of knowledge in relation to the archive. Performance scholar Susan Melrose has engaged with the work of contemporary dance choreographers21 as a means of enquiring into the knowledge status of ‘choreographic artistry’ (2005). Most notable is her notion of the ‘expert practitioner’ whereby the performing body signals ‘expert or professional intuition’ through ‘invisible qualities - e.g. ‘soul’, ‘mind’, psyche, ‘purpose’, even ‘dance expertise’” (2006). In conjunction with these ideas, Melrose has raised interesting questions about the archive and what she considers the ‘archivable’ in relation to both the ‘signature practices’ of the performer (2006) and her provocation that

21 In particular, Melrose has undertaken research and published writings relating to the work of choreographer, Rosemary Butcher (2005).
the 'expert' extends to third parties who engage with performance practices. Similarly, Twyla Tharp offers useful insights into the rituals and habits acquired by the dancer in choreographic processes (2007). These ideas combined translate to the question of who and what determines the expertise of the performer and how this is stored, transmitted and accessed (2007: 3). Her work underpins some of the ideas of practitioner knowledge in my investigation as she offers a critical perspective upon the limitations of archive from a practitioner point of view. Similarly, practitioner-scholar Emelyn Claid (2006) has theorised the role of her own personal memory in choreographic process, offering further insights into the interplay of memory and embodied knowledge.

**Phenomenology**

Phenomenology is a philosophical movement which originated in the work of Edmund Husserl (1859–1938) in the early twentieth century (1912 1999). Phenomenology enables an exploration of the concept of ‘knowing’ through the body and lived experience. The main proponents of phenomenology including Husserl (1952, [1912]) Martin Heidegger (1927), Jean-Paul Sartre (1948) and Maurice Merleau-Ponty (1962) contributed to the development of this philosophical field throughout the twentieth century. The work of these authors offers a diverse view of this philosophical field although they are consistent in their suggestion that subjects and objects are essentially interrelated and the action of the body is emphasised as being of significance to the body’s experience and perception of movement. In its broadest sense, phenomenology is a term that refers to the study of phenomena, the study of things as they appear through or in experience and it therefore attempts to identify the meanings that arise through experience. Phenomenology is the study of conscious experience as experienced from the subjective or first person point of view.

A principal text in this area is Merleau-Ponty’s *The Phenomenology of Perception* (1969) which has been a primary influence for a number of dance phenomenologists that I employ in this thesis. The key authors in the field of dance phenomenology are Maxine Sheets-Johnstone (1966, 1998, 1979, 2006, 2009), Fraleigh (1987, 1998, 2004) Jaana Parvianinen (1998), and Susan Kozel (2007). From a phenomenological perspective, Sheets-
Johnstone has made significant developments into this philosophical field and its applicability to dance. She has claimed that ‘it is through the lived experience’ that ‘we arrive not only at the sense of any particular dance, but also at the essence of dance’ (1966: 4). Fraleigh has written at length about understanding the core of dance experience and the idea of inseparability between the dancer and the dance (Fraleigh 1987: 53). In her analysis of the dancing body informed by phenomenological theory, dance scholar Jaana Parviainen recognises the body as a “place” of memories (1998: 54) in the same way that Melrose (2006, 2007) regards the body as a ‘container’. Processes of remembering are particularly significant in this research; in terms of how memorial knowledge is triggered and accessed therefore Parviainen’s perspectives are of value here.

Throughout this thesis, I refer to the dancing body through the concept of the ‘lived body’ as has emerged through phenomenology. Dance-making processes often employ strategies such as improvisation which are inherently embodied, in the sense that meaning is created through the acquisition of movement/behaviour within the body. The lived body in dance and as it is referred to in this thesis can be understood as a non-dualistic concept as Sondra Fraleigh claims through the notion of the dancing body as a ‘minded body’ (1987: 9) in the holistic sense, body and mind are united in the lived practice of dance. Further to this, Fraleigh recognises that the lived body is ‘a body of action’ and that movement is the ‘realization [sic] […] of embodiment’ (ibid: 13).

Fraleigh’s provocations contribute to the discussion of memory and bodily knowledge as archival sources within this thesis in the sense that lived experience might bring us closer to the essences of dance practice. Dance theoretician Susan Foster has acknowledged that the body demonstrates the potential to nurture more interactive relationships with multiple subject areas, suggesting that this would help to create ‘a reorientation within existing disciplines, and […] inspire unconventional formulations of human agency that promise to move us past current modes of academic and political stasis’ (1995: xv). Recent interest in the body as subject matter is echoed in Sheets-Johnstone’s most recent publication entitled ‘The Corporeal Turn: An Interdisciplinary Reader’ (2009) which explores the multiple ways in which the body and bodily life can be explored, reinstating the value inherent in what Sheets-Johnstone terms ‘animate meaning’
This perspective applies here in two ways as through more thorough examination of archival theories and practices it is possible to shed new light upon the role of the body in a bringing to life of historical dance repertoire during dance revival processes as is the case in this thesis.

**Dance Revival Process**

The process of re-staging historic dance repertoire implicates the archive in light of the need to re-visit choreographic content from previous performance works. Dance studies literature offers a number of perspectives on the complexities of reviving dance repertoire across different generations of dancers and performance contexts in relation to the sources of information that are available and also absent (Carter, 2004, Layson 1998). The role of memory in revival processes is particularly pertinent as it is common for dance repertoire to be passed through body to body transmission, i.e. from one who has previously performed the work to a dancer who is inexperienced in the particular piece of repertoire (Thomas 2004). This raises a number of questions regarding the capabilities and reliability of the body and its memory as a means for accessing and transmitting knowledge through an active process of remembering between bodies in a dance-making context. Key debates regarding the preservation of past dances through methods of revival/reconstruction were documented in the anthology *Preservation Politics: dance revived, reconstructed, remade* (ed. Jordan, 2000). This text foregrounded issues relating to terminology (Hutchinson-Guest ibid), dance notation systems and the availability of information through the dancing body and other external sources (mainly the video) which have served as the bedrock for more contemporary debate in this area.

Such debates reside within the study of dance historiography, whereby the role of reconstruction as a means for understanding and interpreting historical dance practices is evaluated (Thomas 2004). Whilst the relationship between reconstructive processes and the historical study of dance have been connected through critical writings, the role of the practitioner memory and embodied experience has entered into contemporary debates (Buckland, 2001).
More widely, the study of practitioner processes raises similar, pertinent issues regarding the complexity of transmitting knowledge between bodies, across generations and also through a body that has aged (Thomas, 2004, Houstoun 2011). However, dance is a particularly resonant case when it comes to revival practices because of its non-verbal nature and the lack of any all-encompassing system of notation which succeeds in documenting the totality of its practice and performance. As Canadian dance philosopher, Francis Sparshott has observed:

The lack of any reliable and generally accessible way of recording dance has given it a fugitive nature. It has rendered dances unstable, depending on generations of dancers whose uncertain memories are associated with their own styles and body habits. It has also made dance hard to study, because knowledge of specific dances cannot be widely diffused; very few people can grasp from their own experience the range of the art or arts of dance, even in their own time.

Sparshott illuminates the uncertainty and subjectivity of memory in this statement raising issues with regards to accessing reliable source materials. Rather than rendering memories as being uncertain/biased/subjective as is indicated above, I aim to further understand what memory and bodily knowledge might offer to the archive regardless of this limitation through philosophical perspectives of memory as being processual, constructed and durational (Bergson 1911 [1896], Halbwachs 1992 [1952]. Similarly, performance studies scholar André Lepecki has considered the role of the ‘body as archive’ through processes of re-enactment and offers a valuable perspective upon how a body can behave like an archive (2010). Elsewhere, I have also discussed the potential value of the body as an alternative archival site, in the article entitled Between bodies and the archive: situating the act (2013). I intend to build upon these pre-existing ideas of the body archive within this thesis.
These ideas also assist in departing from traditional approaches and theorisation of processes of dance reconstruction work and methods of preservation. As Scott deLahunta notes ‘the aspiration to notate movement seems a basic human and cultural urge’ owing to the fact that approximately eighty movement notation systems are recorded to have existed since the mid-1600s (2007: 7). However, one universal way of writing down movement of the body is yet to be accomplished. Laban Notation claims to be ‘the translation of four dimensional movements into signs written on two dimensional paper’ (Hutchinson 1954: xiv). These ideas also offer some important insights into the role of different source materials, as Brennan observes ‘trained notators try to capture the movement data from live performance when possible but they often rely on film or videotape […]’ (1999: 298) and claims that ‘memories of former performers are best recorded on audio-or videotape to ensure accuracy and to communicate something of the character of the informant’ (ibid). The study of dance history reinforces ideas regarding the value of conducting practitioner interviews and the subjectivity/individuality of the practitioner, as Theresa Buckland noted ‘quotations from dancers help to illuminate the material from the human angle’ (1999: 53). These ideas circulate around the theme of capturing the complete choreographic work, whereas more recently a case has been made for the relevance of certain aspects of the dance-making process or what Sarah Whatley has termed the ‘raw materials’ of dance (2008). With this, the role of the performing body and its potential to store and transmit knowledge is becoming increasingly relevant within literature regarding dance history and revival processes. In exploring embodied knowledge in relation to the body in performance, Inge Baxmann has claimed the ‘body as seat of memory’ (2007) and André Lepecki, the ‘Body as Archive’ (2010) in recognition of the possibilities for the body to serve as a storage mechanism. I adopt these terms throughout this thesis to illustrate the body’s potential as an archival source. Anthropological investigations into dance practices, particularly the work of Sally-Ann Ness (1996) and Deidre Sklar (2006) have negotiated the role of memory specifically within the context of cultural and social practices. Sklar observes that ‘remembering or “feeling” movement memory as immanent kinaesthetic sensation’ is an integral part of dancing and its transmission over time (ibid: 99).
The work of a number of scholars from within the research field of social/cultural memory offers a useful way of considering the role of memory within the framework of a continuum between past, present and future experiences. In particular, social anthropologist, Paul Connerton argues that knowledge of the present is dependent upon knowledge of the past/ traces of human activity in his work entitled, How Societies Remember (1989). Connerton claims that the present is actually experienced in ‘a context causally connected with past events and objects’ (ibid: 2). He also applies the notion of habit to the concept of memory through his concept of ‘habit-memory’ which is categorised by the inherent and the performative as methods for recalling the past into the present, through ‘acting out’ and ‘remembering’ (ibid: 25; 135). Connerton has more recently published a monograph entitled How Modernity Forgets (2009) which offers more insight into social memory and its relationship to spatial encounter and experience, underpinned by the notion that memory has entered into modern discourse as a result of its problem with forgetting (ibid:1).

In order to further develop the discussion of memory within this thesis, I draw upon philosophical concepts of memory. In particular, the philosophy of Henri Bergson provides a critical account of the relationship between the body and memory in his work Matter and Memory (1911 [1896]). Suzanne Guerlac’s translation/ commentary on this work highlights Bergson’s regard for the temporal body, within which he claimed that the ‘past registers itself as motor habit’ (2006: 126).

Aspects of the body as an ageing entity also enter into the discussion regarding the memory of the practitioner and I have drawn upon literature from within the area of dance and performance studies that addresses these issues specifically. Dance practitioner Wendy Houstoun provides a critical account of the ageing performing body (2011) and provides a particularly interesting account of the discrepancies between the ways in which she experiences/perceives her own body and how it actually appears. She also invokes a sense of the relationship between memory and action through her suggestion that ‘the body has imprints of moves running around it that reside in another era’ (ibid: 37). Multiple authors have
contributed to philosophical inquiries into the body’s ability to remember and forget, in particular Paul Ricoeur’s (2004) ideas regarding the interplay of personal, collective and habit-memory (ibid:54) some useful ideas regarding the role of individual memory within collective and social history. However, in order to explore the role of memory in dance revival processes, Maurice Halbwachs’ seminal work on collective memory enables critical insights into how memory is shared between groups of individuals (1992 [1952]). This social theory has not been considered in relation to dance revival processes elsewhere and is therefore applied in order to extend understanding of the function of shared approaches to remembering and how this might benefit new ways of thinking about the knowledge available in the body as an archival body. I also extend these ideas through recognising the layers inherent within the collective memories of a group, particularly through Leo Spitzer’s concept of ‘nostalgic memory’ which provides a commentary upon the active process of forging connections between memories of the past in the present (1998).

**Spatiality**

Philosopher Gaston Bachelard in his text entitled *The Poetics of Space* (1994) offers insight into the way in which it feels to move in space, in terms of relational, directional and embodied markers. Whilst Bachelard’s writings are largely abstract and poetic, other philosophers such as Henri Lefebvre (1991) and Paul Connerton (1989, 2009) offer more critical, rigorous support for the notion that the body and place exist in a dynamic co-present, with an existential/phenomenological base and the suggestion of ritual components to spatial experience. These ideas are more relevant to the exploration of spatiality in the context of dance-making and recollection in this overall discussion. Recent work from Susan Foster explores the existence of the dancing body in space, focusing upon kinaesthesia in performance (2011:86). This builds upon earlier, more philosophical writings regarding the experiential qualities of dance as described by Suanne Langer (1953) and more widely with regards to movement and sensation in the work of Brian Massumi (2002). Spatiality in dance has been theorised by a number of scholars including Valerie Briginshaw (2009 [2001]), Victoria Hunter (2009), Jo Butterworth (2004) and Valerie Preston-Dunlop (1998) in particular. Each of these authors usefully employs the
concept of space to different modes of making dance and theorising about dance performance. However, in terms of understanding notions of embodied space in this thesis, I have adopted Fraleigh’s concept of embodied space with a view to understanding how the body retains knowledge of spatial experience from a phenomenological perspective more specifically (1987).

Kinaesthesia has emerged as a key area of interest and critique in relation to the performance arts in recent years. The anthology *Kinesthetic Empathy in Creative and Cultural Practices* (Reason and Reynolds 2012) merges artistic disciplines with the arts and sciences and therefore provides a broader context for the study of the body as it moves in space and in relation to other bodies/environments. In particular, Matthew Reason explains that the relationship between audience and performer ‘is an intersubjective one of mutual and similar embodiedness’ (2012:139) and in the studio space this connection is emulated between dancers. Furthermore, Sarah Whatley suggests that ‘the presence of a ‘live’ dancer might be said to involve the viewer, sensing in a more immediate, co-present way the dancers effort, breath, [and] weight’ (2012: 266). Additionally, Victoria Gray’s article entitled *Re-Thinking Stillness: empathetic Experiences of Stillness in Performance and Sculpture*, also in this anthology develops ideas of co-presence and kinaesthesia in relation to the space between performer and spectator, adding another layer to this area of the investigation (2012: 201-217). These ideas indicate an increased sense of bodily awareness through ‘being there’, illustrating the richness of bodies being co-present in space.

Stemming from these ideas is the sense of shared process and I explore the different layers of spatial experience through key concepts of collective identity as defined by Melucci (1989) who has claimed that collective identity is a spatial process. This particular concept from within social theory enables an insight into senses of belonging within a group dynamic. In addition, notions of touch are explored through studies of sensory modalities and what Mark Paterson has termed ‘Haptic Geographies’ (2009). Broadly informed by phenomenology, Paterson’s work provides an insight into how domains of touch and sensory feedback facility the recollection of memory and embodied knowledges. In the realm of performance studies, touch is an area of inquiry in relation to performance
art practices as Jennifer Fisher argues, certain performance making practices can function as ‘tactile experiments in […] knowledge’ where ‘each enactment embodies specific socialities […] through gestures of greeting and relationship[...] or the provocation of spatial boundaries’ (2007:166).

Whilst this work relates to a particular performance practice, there are resonances in the sense of knowledge being constructed through spatial proximities.

Over the past few pages, I have discussed the range of themes and literature sources that have been most central to my research. Each of these themes will be discussed in more detail as the book progresses, and they will cross-reference the literature with my primary research data in order to explore the research questions introduced near the beginning of this chapter.
Thesis Structure

The main body of the thesis is divided into two overarching sections. The first is entitled ‘Archival Knowledge’ and contains three chapters that explore the key terminologies and structures that prevail in archival theory with a view to further contextualising and destabilising the meaning of ‘knowledge’ and ‘value’ in relation to dance archival processes (Jenkinson 1925, Derrida, 1996, Cook 1997 Millar 2006,). It provides the context for this research in terms of situating the gaps between practical archival traditions and terminologies and the preservation of dance through an in depth exploration of the concept of ‘ephemerality’ (Phelan 1993, Schneider 2001, Auslander 2006); and more contemporary archival debates that assist in deconstructing some of the more rigid archival principles (Cook & Schwartz 2003, Millar 2006). In chapter 2, I develop this discussion through exploring the idea of the body archive in relation to the primary data from within the archive of Phoenix Dance Theatre and existing ideas regarding the role of the body in revival processes as observed by André Lepecki (2010). In chapter 3 I employ phenomenological perspectives of the dancing body and situate the notion of the lived body within the context of the body archive in this thesis. Overall these three chapters locate the complexity inherent in accessing information that is considered ‘archival’ in relation to dance practices.

In the second section of the thesis entitled ‘Triggering Knowledge in the Archival Body’ I shift the emphasis towards the aspects of the dancing body that are manifest in the memorial, experiential, collective and spatial aspects of dance practice. I draw upon specific examples of revival practices that I have observed and documented throughout the research period with Phoenix Dance Theatre in order to analyse the role that the body plays during such processes. My argument is illustrated with data gathered through interviews in support of my claim that the sensorial and spatial experiences of the body function as triggers to archival knowledge stored within the body. Considering important theoretical concepts regarding memory as being manifest in collective experience (Halbwachs 1992 [1952]) and action (Bergson 1911, 2006 [1896]), I instate the value of re-living as a valid aspect of dance revival process. In chapter 5 I explore spatiality as a context through which archival knowledge is mediated,
exploring how the dancer’s engagement with space informs and influences the role of the body archive as a trigger to knowledge (Casey 1997, Briginshaw 2002, Connerton 2009). The discussion in each of these chapters is summarised through the construction of a model for the role of the body archive as a trigger to archival knowledge. The concluding chapter summarises my key findings, provides an explanation of the body archive model and provides some answers to the research questions that this thesis has responded to.

Each section is introduced with a ‘prelude’ that sets the context for the overall discussion across each of the subsequent chapters. These extracts are drawn from my own observations and personal experiences of archives and dance practice both prior to and during the research project, offering tangible examples that assist in interpreting the new research data gathered throughout the course of this project.
SECTION ONE

ARCHIVAL KNOWLEDGE

Prelude

Exquisite Bees from a Manchester hive
Off for the Hols & so glad they're alive
The great Mr Gladstone reversed of the nation
Points the way to the railway station.

O shall it be train, or shall it be Bus?
It quite turns my brain all this furious fuss
Shall we go to the hills where everythings quiet
Or look out for thrills and glorious riot?

Triping so lightly across Albert Square
Free for a fortnight to do & to dare
Sweet pretty faces & neat tartan cases
Buzz off, & enjoy all the fun of the Fair!

NM/ ©National Resource Centre for Dance (NM/T/1/25/9)

This short poem was written c1920 by Madge Atkinson (1885-1970), a Manchester born dance practitioner who founded the technique of Natural Movement. The movement method was widely taught to children and young adults, and early in her career this mostly took place in the city of Manchester (a city in the north of England with a significant industrial history). It is presumed that this poem was created so as to assist with her teaching as it was originally filed amongst a book of music manuscripts labelled for the teaching of babies and children. Over time and with Atkinson’s retirement, her technique continued to be taught by those whom she had trained and her own materials were filed away almost permanently. Anita Heyworth, Atkinson’s close friend and colleague, annotated and filed many of her professional possessions with a view to ensuring a legacy for the practitioner and the movement technique that she developed. The
materials remained boxed away, some in their original boxes and inevitably
deteriorated whilst they remained dormant until they were deposited at the
archive of the National Resource Centre for Dance, the UK’s Dance Archive
(NRCD).

Whilst employed by the NRCD as an Archive and Research Assistant I
processed Atkinson’s collection as part of my role within a research project.
It was upon opening a manuscript book that I first uncovered the poem and
experienced a sense of nostalgia as the city of Manchester is also my
hometown. This brief link between myself and Atkinson somehow provided
me with a tangible link into Atkinson’s world whereby I had an increased
sense of the setting within which she worked.

I recall the feeling of serendipity stemming from this encounter and my
consciousness of the dust between my fingertips. I was reminded of the
length of time that had passed between when the poem was first created
and the moment in which I came to be touching it, in a deteriorating state. I
was not wearing archival gloves as the National Archives Governing Body
had recently advised that to do so would increase the difficulty in handling
the aged paper as it reduces the sense of touch in the fingertips.

I asked permission from the archivist to take a copy of the document and,
whilst it does not bear the same qualities of the original, it continues to be a
reminder of that encounter and the moment I began to question the
potential of archival materials.
Chapter 1

Archives: Towards a concept of Archival ‘Knowledge Value’

Introduction

In this chapter I explore the procedures that characterise archival practices and outline the principles underpinning those practices in order to explore the meaning and ambiguity of ‘archival value’ as a notion that is recurrent within this thesis. With reference to selected literature and anecdotal evidence, I introduce the idea of the archival method as one that is established and imbued with ideas of linearity, concreteness and authority. I consider both contemporary and historic perspectives relating to the processes and principles of the archival discipline with a view to establishing a working understanding of the purpose and function of the archive to be adopted later in the thesis. This chapter provides a contextual back-drop to the following research questions underpinning the overall thesis:

- How can archival ‘gaps in knowledge’ be identified in relation to the documents of dance?
- What is archival value and how does it function in relation to the documents of dance?

The discussion presented in this chapter addresses concepts of archival knowledge and value which are developed in relation to dance in chapters 2 and 3. The first section of this chapter is centred upon the work of selected authors and governing bodies providing insight into the foundations of archival practices in addition to an exploration of more contemporary and philosophical considerations of the discipline that offer a rationale for debates surrounding the ambivalent relationship between archives and memory. The second section of this chapter summarises notions of knowledge and value that characterise the discipline and the manner in which these attributes are mediated through archival materials. This chapter
traces the development of archival theory, revealing that whilst appearing rigid from the outset, underlying principles of the practice such as provenance and hierarchy can be considered as more lucid and malleable than is often understood, through the application of deconstructionist and philosophical principles.

**Archiving as an Established set of Principles and Practices**

Archives, whilst associated with diverse subject matter, are united through a shared principle to preserve information in order to sustain connections to the past through ‘documentary evidence of events past’ (Millar, 2009: 23). Although archival materials are commonly associated with the past, it is often overlooked that ‘documentary evidence’ provides the ‘facts we use to interpret and understand history’ in a present context (Millar: ibid, my emphasis). The historian R.G. Collingwood explored the idea of historical evidence in his seminal text *The Idea of History* (1946) within which he proposed the categories of ‘potential evidence’ and ‘actual evidence’ (p.280). Collingwood observed that ‘The potential evidence about a subject is all the extant statements about it. The actual evidence is that part of these statements which we decide to accept’ (ibid). The subtext of these definitions and ideas allude to the ambiguity of the archival process as one builds upon notions of factual and evidential information; the process is always subject to interpretation. The interpretation comes from those responsible for managing the records and making them available to a wider public and from those who access the records for research purposes.

In the discipline of records management the process of making information available is dependent upon the idea that ‘stored data in any form, constitutes a document’ which is defined as ‘a record of knowledge, information or data, or a creative expression’ (Hartley & Rowley 2007: 33-34). A binary between knowledge types as either explicit or implicit/tacit is said to exist as a way of organising information sources (Hartley and Rowley 2008, see also Hislop 2009). Explicit knowledge is defined as the information that is codified and recorded in documents which facilitate the sharing of this knowledge. The implicit/tacit knowledge is understood as ‘know-how’ in the human body. It is suggested that such knowledge may be converted into explicit (or objective/public) knowledge through ‘public
expression’ or performance (Hartley and Rowley, 2008:7). The implicit knowledge type is said to be obtained by ‘transmission from another who has it by instruction or by extraction from experience’ (Ackoff: 1989 cited in Hartley and Rowley: 2008, 6). Others within the archival discipline have noted that the act of ‘fixing’ a moment in time in documentary form is what constitutes a record as a source of historical information which is a particularly complex notion in relation to ephemerality (Petersen, cited in Blouin and Rosenberg 1984), as will be discussed later in this thesis. It is commonplace to refer to archival items more generally as ‘materials’, defined as both a ‘resource’ and ‘an object having physical or intellectual substance’ (Pearce-Moses, 2012 available online). This is particularly interesting when considering that valuable properties are interpreted as being manifest in both ‘physical’ and ‘intellectual’ ways. It raises questions in regard to how such qualities might be measured across materials of different media, some of which may suffer the effects of ageing more than others.

In order to gain a place within an archive, artefacts, records and documents must first be classified as archival; the fact that they reach an archival stage does not guarantee acquisition into the archive, rather this is a question of value and the permanence/longevity of the value inherent in the record/item/artefact. Therefore, this discussion aims in part to establish how a document is endorsed as being ‘archival’.

**The Life Cycle Model**

The Life-Cycle concept is based upon the life-span of records and broadly divides the function of records by their creation, preservation and disposal. More specifically in an archive, the three strand model is characterised by the receipt of records, their subsequent use and dormancy. The cycle is applied within the disciplines of records management and archives in separate ways, this is because the former is associated with the active use of records whilst the latter relates to the long term preservation of records within the archive. Philip Bantin’s (1998) research into the management of archives (including electronic archives) explains how the model has been largely influenced by Schellenberg’s seminal work *Modern Archives* (1956) and how this works in practice. Bantin outlines the function of the model
which marks the various stages that the record goes through just as a living organism would do. The first stage relates to the creation of the record and the rationale for its emergence in addition to the characteristics of its production. Secondly, the record enters into an active stage whereby it has ‘maximum primary value and is used or referred to frequently’ by the person(s) who have created it as it has a key role in decisions made. In this stage the record will be located within the area/office that requires its active use. Following this period, the record is evaluated with regards to the future value it might present, it is at this point that the decision to destroy the document is taken, or it will be retained in a semi-active status, meaning that it is still considered to have value, but is not required for everyday decision making (1998:3).

The diagram below further illustrates the key processes within the life-cycle framework:

**Figure 1: The Life-Cycle Model**

The biological term ‘life-cycle’ describes a ‘cyclic narrative’ of the archival record from its active existence through to its reduced activity (‘dormant’) and its final inactive stage. Brothman emphasises that the model does not allow for alternative ‘ambiguous origins and endings’ due to its reliance upon ‘discernible beginnings, successive stages, and an identifiable terminal phase’ (2001:53). This model therefore evades any sense of continuity or records continuum, which as an alternative approach would account for the ‘multiple purposes of records’ (ibid: 56). The idea of this model, as deconstructed by Brothman in particular is key in discerning and
deconstructing notions of knowledge in relation to the archive as what they contribute towards the perception that ‘Archives – as records – wield power over the shape and direction of historical scholarship, collective memory, and national identity, over how we know ourselves as individuals, groups, and societies’ (Cook & Schwartz, 2002:2).

The Life-Cycle model is indicative of the governing practices that assist in authenticating the processes of record-keeping within an archive, as it suggests a level of valuation in regards to archival material as having intellectual gravitas. In this chapter, I explore the theories and methodological principles that govern disciplinary perspectives in order to problematise the processes through which ‘value’ is mediated and managed. The process of classifying a document as ‘archival’ is negotiated through a series of practices that can be divided into two domains, alive and dormant. The first is more practically based and the second is rooted in notional ideologies that underpin the archival discipline and are suggestive of a unique process of value assignation (these are explored in figures 2 and 3 referred to later in this chapter). The Life-cycle concept has undergone substantial critique by archival theorist Brothman mainly due to the implications of the use of a biological term which invokes a sense of beginnings and endings. He enquires at to ‘what marks off the “before” and “after” of an event like the creation, destruction, or use of a record?’ (2006: 240). Brothman acknowledges that the life of a document exists prior to and following its existence and problematises the confines imposed upon documents as a result of this triadic framework. Terry Cook also observes that records ‘reflect the spirit of their times and [are] then interpreted anew by succeeding generations’ (1997: 25-26) which highlights the fact that within these distinct stages, documents/records remain in static and are therefore open to constant re-interpretation. Brothman argues that the keeping of records and recurrent use (2006: 240) ‘somehow impinge[s] upon the contours, contexts, and rhythms of documentary temporality’ which again reinforces the idea that the records preserved exist in and are interpreted according to the conditions within which they are managed and accessed.

Figure 2 lists the six key stages of agreed practice in terms of the archival process that should be followed:
Figure 2: Archival Processes

Accessioning
• Capturing key information

Appraisal
• Determining which elements/items of the collection should be selected for preservation and where they should be placed.

Physical Reorganisation
• Discovering or rediscovering the arrangement of the records prior to process of description

Cataloguing
• Description of the materials including contextual information and finding aids such as reference numbers

Indexing
• Noting specific detail such as subject areas, geographical locations etc.

Access
• Making the information available for use

(Source: Carter, November 2010 original presentation adapted)

The above codes of practice typify the methodological stages that occur within the discipline. The subjective connotations of many of these processes present interesting arguments regarding notions of value and knowledge and how these are constructed as I will continue to discuss in this chapter.

Accessioning

This foundational phase occurs during the acquisition of the materials into an archival repository and refers to the process of documenting this transition. The materials entering the repository such as images, personal papers and scrapbooks are usually registered in a log or database ‘connoting the initial steps of processing by establishing rudimentary physical and intellectual control over the materials’ (Pearce-Moses 2012).
Appraisal

The determination of value is implicit in this process whereby documents are analysed in order to identify their ‘on-going value’ (Millar, 2006) and long term usefulness. Appraisal is a key theme within the archive and records management sector as, according to archivist Laura Millar, the ability of the records to reflect the ‘functions and activities’ of their creator is considered paramount to the management of archives and records. This strategy for determining the value of a record is summarised through the expression ‘keep the best, remove the rest’ (2009: 51). This stage also involves decision making regarding the length of time a document should or can be legally retained by an archive(s) (Pearce-Moses 2012). This process is inherently selective and in epistemological terms, appraisal can be interpreted as a ‘rational instrument’ (Audi 2003: 227) where the archivist relies upon the testimony of a document to authenticate its place within the archive. The implication of an ‘on-going’ value is part of a complex paradigm that is recognised by Pearce-Moses more widely as ‘archival value’. The term is defined as:

The on-going usefulness or significance of records, based on the administrative, legal, fiscal, evidential, or historical information they contain, justifying their continued preservation

2012

This multi-faceted definition is said to also encompass ‘primary and secondary value’, ‘continuing value’ and ‘indefinite value’ (ibid) and is synonymous with the valorising of permanent, enduring and historical qualities.

Physical Reorganisation

Whether in good order, or in bad, or in none, we shall still require to arrange them in such a way that the archive significance [sic] of every document-its own nature and its relation to its neighbours-is brought out as clearly as possible. In this way we give the fairest
opportunity to the archive of saying what it has to say
and to the student of understanding and profiting.

Jenkinson 1922: 80

Within an archive collection, materials are organised in a way which protects their original arrangement before acquisition by an archive. For example, if a box contains items of different formats, such as newspaper cuttings, photographic images, handwritten notes and an object, it should at least be recorded that these items were kept together upon arrival into the archive. This is because these items, whether related to one another or not, were arranged as such by their original owner (in most cases) and this in itself might reveal important information to anyone researching the individual or the materials upon their own terms. The above statement highlights this method, suggesting that this process has a part to play in ensuring that the potential of the document to act as a resource is brought out. This method is inextricably linked to two additional archival ideologies - provenance and original order - and all three combined raise interesting issues in relation to the construction and preservation of archival knowledge as I outline later in this chapter.

Cataloguing

The cataloguing of archival materials is an essential part of making materials accessible to the researcher. The process is standardised through a set of international guidelines, known as General International Standard Archival Description. The guidelines promote consistency across archival description with a view to ensuring that information can be retrieved successfully through a unified information system. The archivist should apply the rules of ISAD(G)\textsuperscript{22} which divide description into seven key areas, including ‘Identity Statement Area’ and ‘Context Area’. The former relates to the more explicit information such as format, extent, date of the item and the latter to the history of the item, requiring details of the creator(s) its administrative history and the circumstances of its acquisition. Following this, the levels of description become more administrative in terms of ensuring that any decisions made by the archivist (i.e. regarding appraisal) are recorded. This includes the physical conditions of the document and its

\textsuperscript{22} General International Standard Archival Description (www.icacds.org.uk/eng/ISAD(G).pdf)
storage environment and that the manner through which the document can be accessed is made explicit through finding aids (catalogue structure and description of records) (Carter, 2010). This method is indicative of the multiple layers of information that surround each archival item.

Indexing

The index allows the archivist to embellish the catalogue records with contextual or referential information that will assist the researcher either as a finding aid or to increase understanding of the material document it relates to. The information regarding the Manchester bee that derives from Atkinson’s poem (as outlined at the start of this chapter) is an example of such information.

Access

The final stage in this process represents the ability of the researcher to access the materials through locational tools such as the catalogue and index, which enable the retrieval of archival materials within the conditions of any legal or confidentiality restrictions.

Historicising and Problematising ‘Archival Value’

Historically, authors such as Sir Hilary Jenkinson in his Manual of Archive Administration (1922) promoted the perspective that the archivist is trained in a manner that will ensure impartiality between the archival materials and the methodological strategy. Jenkinson presents this perspective in relation to the physical arrangement of materials, within which he observes that the role of the archivist is to ensure a certain level of transparency regarding the custodial history of the archival document once integrated into the archive (ibid). Jenkinson also implies that the archival process is designed to optimise the value inherent in the archival material through the reference to ‘archival significance’ as something that is achieved as a result of the archivist’s practice of organising the materials. The interpretation of ‘significance’ within this description echoes the definition of archival materials as having intellectual properties as observed in Pearce-Moses’ more recent definition (2012, available online).
Appraisal is a process which stems from the principle of provenance and original order as methodological concepts in the archival sector. Jenkinson argued that the order in which archival materials had been kept by their creator(s) should be preserved and reflected in the subsequent arrangement once items were brought together in an archive (1922: 124). Within this configuration, the archivist determines the value of the records. Brien Brothman in particular has probed the connotations of value inherent within such processes and in doing so problematises notions of value:

As they strive to maintain these islands of permanent order, then, archives also create value. Archival appraisal [...] is not merely a process of value identification, but of value creation or destruction. It entails more than simply identifying archival or historical value that already exists in a document before archivists encounter it. As they make determinations about archival or historical value, archivists in effect create, initiate or perpetuate an axiological commitment which is manifested in the permanence of the order that emerges [...] whatever criteria are used; it is established during the archival process, not before or after.

1991:81

Brothman highlights the role of the archivist as custodian in the assignation of value, a perspective reinforced through management and access systems to archives (such as an archival catalogue) supporting this notion in their role in ‘the privileging of information, emphasising information and the level of granularity of the information’ (Yakel, cited in Blouin and Rosenberg 2007: 157).

Notions of value are implicit in these ideas of ‘archival significance’ (Jenkinson, 1922) and intellect (Pearce-Moses 2012) in the sense that these features endorse the document’s place within the archive, implicating the archivist (in terms of the methodology undertaken) as the negotiator of value. Brothman problematises the relationship between archival practice
and the identification of value as he explains that it ‘is not merely a process of value identification but of value creation or destruction’ (1991:81). Brothman also maintains that permanent value is determined not prior to or following the deposit of a document into an archive, but during the process of archival arrangement and appraisal, as was depicted in Figure 1. Therefore, these ideas expose the ambiguity of archival knowledge as a concept and threaten Jenkinson’s observation of the impartiality between the archivist and the document. According to archival theorists Cook & Schwartz, the historic notion of archivist as ‘passive guardians of evidence’ is a claim that overlooks the ‘subjective, interpretive, narrative’ (research based) knowledge of the archivist (2002:176). Archival theorist Jennifer Meehan extends this argument by suggesting that ideas of ‘evidence’ are generated through the relationship between record and event within the archive (131). Meehan explains that evidence is constructed through the archival process as I outlined earlier, including analysis of appraisal/arrangement in the sense that:

\[
[...]
\text{the archival treatment of records effectively constitutes records as matters of evidence} [...]
\text{archivists select, shape and situates records such that they can be regarded and used as documentary sources that are capable of serving as evidence of past events}
\]

2003:143

The interpretive nature of the archival process decentralises an understanding of the archive as a place where knowledge is stored. The statement above disrupts the idea that the archive provides the ‘documentary evidence of events past’ (Millar, 2009:23). This is due to the perceived ‘facts we use to interpret and understand history’ in a present context (ibid) are said to be manipulated so as to constitute ‘evidence’ (2006). Cultural theorist Thomas Osborne has declared that the archive is ‘A Centre of Interpretation’ (1999:52). Importantly, he also notes that:

\[
\text{The archive is like a raw material, which is not the same as saying that it is an originary material or}
\]
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an unworked-upon material; rather it is what has been made available, what has been presented to us.

Ibid 1999:57

This quotation recognises that the archive cannot accommodate originary material because of the processes that the archivist undertakes in order for the material to enter into the archive. Osborne suggests it is ‘raw’ because it is made available for the end-user to interpret and this idea relates to ideas of the origins of experience that I discuss in chapter 3 of this thesis. These points reinforce the fact that the archival process as depicted in Figure 2 places the archival document as an unstable entity as collectively they suggest that the knowledge inherent in the document is controlled through the structures governing the archival process. Osborne’s statement has particular significance in relation to this investigation and I explore in this research what might be considered ‘raw’ or primary in dance archival materials in chapter 3. The functionality of identifying value and evidence further problematises notions of the archivist’s and archival researcher’s ability to interpret ‘archival knowledge’. This is especially evident in the more covert archival principles which I outline below.

Archival Principles

The archival profession is governed through standardised guidelines and systems of management that are upheld by the national body ‘The National Archives’23. The organisation leads on policy making in order to ensure that ‘Archive services, alongside their duty to preserve the record of both the past and the present, also aim to make the information in their collections discoverable, accessible and relevant to all’ (The National Archives 2009:7). The notional principles described in the diagram below represent the commonly used parameters that are placed upon archival materials as a means to authenticate the documents/records/artefacts into an archive(s).

This knowledge stems from the aforementioned Dutch Manual which was interpreted Jenkinson in his most renowned Manual of Archive

---

23 The organisation was formed over the period between 2003-2006
http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/about/who-we-are.htm
Administration, first published in 1922 (second edition published in 1937) which were later developed by T. R. Schellenberg, author of Modern Archives (1956). The ideas published by both authors continue to influence the archival profession throughout the twentieth century and frequently underpin contemporary critiques of archives and post-structuralist thinking, especially evident in the work of philosopher Jacques Derrida (1996).

**Figure 3: Archival Principles**

![Diagram of Archival Principles](Source: Carter, November 2010, original presentation adapted)

*Provenance*

- Who/what/why/where/when/how of the creation of the records

*Original Order*

- How the materials were originally arranged

*Hierarchy*

- To sustain relationships between subjects and materials through a classification scheme that can be subdivided

*Catalogue Structure*

- Representing the original reason for activities/reflective of creating activity

*One Catalogue for All*

- One format for all users and uses of the archive

**Provenance**

The concept of provenance is the most influential and upheld tradition across the profession. This fundamental principle recognises that ‘the significance of archival materials is heavily dependent on the context of their creation’ (Hensen 1993: 67). The concept ensures that the origins (inclusive of original purpose and function) of archival materials are reflected in or ‘should be directly related’ to their arrangement and description with the archival repository (ibid).

**Original Order**
This concept is designed to ensure that the ideology of provenance is upheld by preserving existing connections across the materials. Pearce-Moses clarifies that this is not a matter of maintaining the arrangement of the records when they reach an archive but rather that ‘Items that were clearly misfiled may be refilled in their proper location. Materials may have had their original order disturbed […] often during inactive use’ (2012). Therefore the ordering of materials is not a straightforward concept.

**Hierarchy**

A hierarchical system is an important feature of the archive as adhering to a system of ordering for the purpose of arranging and organising materials enables related subjects to be kept together whilst also subdivided so as to reflect the level of information inherent in each and preserve the provenance of the records.

**Catalogue Structure**

Carter observes that the catalogue should echo the activities that originally surrounded the creation of the document. Separate to ‘cataloguing’, the structuring of the catalogue should extend out of the characteristics of the documents and employ the rule of hierarchy in order to do so (2010).

**One Catalogue for All**

This principle ensures that the archival catalogue should be consistent across all archival collections. With the end-user in mind, the standardised catalogue integrates multiple archival collections in a repository’s holdings and complies with the cataloguing guidelines set by ISAD(G). This is usually in the form of an online database.

**Archival Principles and Processes of Assigning Value**

The principles as outlined above are amalgamated through their commitment to ensuring the ‘origins’ of the archival materials are safeguarded, particularly through the concepts of Provenance and Original Order. The demand for respect of the context and circumstances of the original creation and function of the document as illustrated in these ideas
places emphasis upon value as being central to the origins of the document. However, in practice as Osborne has highlighted, the idea of originary material is often disrupted through the archival processes to which the document is subjected (1999:57). The function of Provenance and Original Order as ideological tools is to ensure that essential information and structural relationships within the archival materials is not lost and instead it is cultivated through the catalogue and therefore visible to the user. Meehan has contested the relationship between record and event as a way of destabilising the influence of provenance upon archival practice. In relation to personal\textsuperscript{24} archival collections in particular, Meehan draws upon the notion put forward by Cook & H.Taylor that archival principles are not fixed in time but rather reflect the ‘spirit of their times’ (2003:29). The authors use this phrase in recognition of the continuously shifting context within which they are encountered. Because each user of the archive brings their own perspective and as social and cultural circumstances impact upon the way in which we understand the past, Cook, Dodds & H. Taylor recommend that provenance and original order should be negotiated as a conceptual framework within which the records can be negotiated on their own terms rather than being fixed to the understanding placed upon them at the time of their acquisition into the archive (ibid). For example, with the development of digital technologies and the impact this has had upon the discipline, H. Taylor has noted that such transitions force the archivist to acknowledge ‘what is going on in a totally new environment and emerging culture’ which assists in perceiving ‘the nature of our old environment’ (2003:109). The notion of principles adapting to meet the requirements of the records to which they are being applied is particularly important to this research investigation as it presents the archival methodology as one that can be adapted to suit archival content which may be useful when considering dance in later chapters. Furthermore, H.Taylor’s position recognises the influence of interdisciplinarity and the removal of the sense of concreteness occupying the earlier literature which prioritise permanence and regard acts of fixing items in time and space as constituting good archival practice (Petersen 1984). For H. Taylor, developments in the profession such as the increased use of technical management systems and digitally born archival material have altered the ways in which

\textsuperscript{24} ‘Personal’ refers to the records of an individual in this context
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knowledge is classified. Writing in the late 1980s, H. Taylor argued that there was a break up in what he termed 'knowledge theory' whereby the use of a computer improved the consolidation of patterns of information 'at odds with the [...] age of paper' (109-110). These ideas reveal the shifts created through the aid of new technology, meaning that new and improved processes of management emerged and exposed the weaknesses of previously dominant, textually-based document formats.

The archival catalogue is regimented by standardised guidelines and the application of hierarchy as a tool for assembling the catalogue. In the practice of creating an archive, a retention schedule or Collection Management and Development Policy is usually created/adhered to which provides key parameters that assist in the decision making process in terms of which materials to keep and which to dispose of or destroy. Such a policy was created during the course of this research in relation to the Phoenix Dance Theatre archive and includes details regarding the aims and objectives of the archive in terms of scope and future development, an overview of the genre and media of the records it holds, methods of acquisition and details of the procedure for selecting and deaccessioning material. As a procedure for the management of records, this is reflective of the Life-Cycle continuum template adopted by the profession (active, inactive and dormancy).

**Primary and Secondary Archival Materials**

Archives are associated with primary source materials and the promise of 'new knowledge' because often, for the archival user, there has been no previous critical articulation or engagement with the materials under scrutiny (Pitches, Interview 2011) just as Osborne has suggested they are 'raw' (1999). Materials considered as primary are already imbued with a sense of value, particularly for the academic researcher. The National Archive's policy and guidance for appraising records according to the historical value that they present adopts the 'taxonomy of value' developed by an American archivist, T.R. Schellenberg. Schellenberg claimed that a

---

25 The collection Management and Development Policy created during this research project and is included in appendix...of this thesis.
26 The term 'deaccession' refers to the rejection/removal of an item before it enters into the archive, taking place during the appraisal and selection process.
record has two different layers of value - a primary value or the value to the organisation that created them and a secondary value to historians (Mercer 2004: 2). According to this principle, primary value is specific to the creator of the records whereas value derived from the materials that is not originally intended by the creator was deemed to be ‘secondary value’. This is an interesting perspective in relation to the process of appraisal as a document can have an unprecedented value (Mercer, 2004: 2) especially when considering the idea of constant re-interpretation through new generations of users and the different and multiple readings generated through these encounters. This idea is in conflict with the notion of an ‘on-going’ value as the precedent for determining value, as the ideas above suggest that the value of a record is highly subjective and therefore can never be fully appreciated.

In the recently devised Glossary of Archival terms, Pearce-Moses defines primary value as ‘Material that contains first-hand accounts of events and that was created contemporaneous to those events or later recalled by an eyewitness’ (2012). He explains that such sources ‘emphasize [sic] the lack of intermediaries between the thing or events being studied’ (ibid). It is commonly thought amongst archivists and researchers that first-hand information (e.g. letters, diaries, oral histories, photographs) have more integrity. Pearce-Moses defines a secondary source as ‘a work commenting on another work (primary sources), such as reviews, criticism, and commentaries’ (ibid). Tracing these ideas back to Jenkinsonian principles, these definitions are designed around the manner of ‘profiting from the archive’ (Jenkinson 1922: 97). This premise is based upon the nature of the processes and principles of the archival method which uphold that the archival record should be made accessible in a way that the value of the document can be interpreted by the end-user. This is achieved through methods of appraisal, hierarchy and catalogue structure/organisation. In discussion with Jonathan Pitches, who has an interest in making use of archival material that relates to early twentieth century performance practices and for the purpose of reconstructing historic work, this notion was reinforced. Pitches considers the archive to have the facility to provide an ‘immediate contribution to the field’ in the form of ‘new knowledge’ that

27 In terms of developing discourse within the field of performance studies through publication.
is produced from primary source material as it has not been subject to any ‘extended critical engagement’ (Pitches 2012).

By providing access to the archival materials located within centralised repositories such as libraries and archives, the archivist has a central role in the researcher’s experience. In particular, recalling his encounters with the archive, Pitches describes his experience of particular rules and regulations, for example having to adhere to routine practices such as ‘imposed tea breaks’ during a day in the archive which contributed to the creation of the more familiar feeling of being in someone’s house rather than making use of a public service. This is a very particular experience and cannot be applied to all archival contexts, however in his description of this moment; the structures and idiosyncratic functions of archives and the multiple contexts in which they operate emerge. Whilst other archives such as The National Archives and the National Archives might not impose ‘tea breaks’ as such, access to the materials is only by prior arrangement and within a fixed schedule when an archivist is available to administer your visit. In Pitches’ case, this moment became serendipitous when he was later able to connect this ritualistic process with the work of the practitioners whom he was researching in the archives as he discovered evidence of structured dining times built into training programmes. This is an example of the accidental discoveries or eureka moments that are frequently associated with access to archives, just as in my encounter with the Manchester Bee (see preamble). Helen Freshwater describes this type of archival experience through the idea of the ‘aura’ of the archive (2003:8). She proposes that the academic in particular looks to the archive as a result of a ‘fascination with a seemingly recoverable past’ (2003:9). Similar notions are at play in Derrida’s claim that the Freudian concept of the archive is ‘troubled’ by the demand associated with it:

[the] compulsive, repetitive, and nostalgic desire for the archive, an irrepressible desire to return to the origin…a nostalgia for the return to the most archaic place of absolute commencement.

1996: 91

This statement is indicative of the desire to return to the original context within which a record or event took place/came into existence, that
somehow the archive should be capable of forging such close connections with past contexts. However, according to the multiple planes within which archival value is located, there are several ways in which the past is interpreted/recovered and engaged with in a present context.

Typically, a researcher’s first encounter with the archive is through the catalogue, serving as a reference (or rational) tool from which s/he decides which materials s/he would like to look at prior to entering the archive. Whilst such confines placed upon the materials benefit the user in terms of locating available archival matter, I have experienced frustration in my own use of the catalogue having been misled in the direction of documents that did not meet my requirements as a researcher. This could be a result of my own research bias, a characteristic derived from my unrealistic expectations of the archive to reveal the missing knowledge that I am pursuing. As Osborne suggests ‘It is never a matter of just revealing a given truth that is to be found there’ (199:55). Instead, the politics and organisational structures of the archive intervene and so our encounters with the archive are as much about decoding the principles that govern the practice as they are about gaining information from the source materials that they house. In a sense, we are guided through the archive in a largely prescriptive manner as opposed to a series of intuitive encounters which might be more aligned with ephemeral practices such as performance.

**Decentring Archival Principles and Practices**

The previous section has revealed how the archival method is managed through shared principles and processes with a view to unifying the discipline. Its standards are rooted in established traditions that are not always transparent to the archival researcher and which remain through governance and multiple sets of guidelines. The management of archives through those processes and techniques discussed in the previous section ensures that records are preserved and are navigable through a cataloguing system accessible to the end user. In addition to these principles a number of more philosophical perspectives expand notions of ‘archival knowledge’, marking a shift from traditional understandings and ideas. Critiques of the archival methodology transcend the values placed upon founding ideologies stemming from Jenkinson (1922). Concepts of
memory and the relationship of archives to shifting socio-political contexts and developing technologies assist in widening understandings and application of archival theory and notions of 'value' which are especially relevant in this thesis.

Following Jenkinson’s claim that the archival endeavour is manifest in ‘the keeping of the archives of the past [...] and the making of the archives of the future’ (1922: 2) then archival materials can be understood to bridge past, present and future. This assertion implies that the archive is a transient entity or in a continual state of flux as opposed to fixed in time, destabilising the linearity and sense of permanence commonly associated with the archive. The previous discussion illuminated the archival tradition as maintaining a highly selective and hierarchical approach to records classification and static management of information. I shall consider here the role of interpretation in relation to the archive as inextricably linked to changing social contexts, collective memory and human behaviour.

Brothman notes that ‘the order that archives create out of all the information they process is an order that embodies society’s values’ (1991: 81). The link between social context and the archive is clearly evident in the disciplinary perspective today. For example, the National Archives’ action plan for the 21st Century includes the statement that archives are responsible for:

Shaping the shared sense of national, community and individual identity that creates the framework for our democracy and accountability, gives people a frame of reference for their place in society, and helps them to understand how their location, community and family have developed.

National Archives 2009: 3

This demonstrates a co-dependency between the archive and society, invoking the idea that the archive has a more active role in its relationship to groups of people. The social pressures upon archives in the present are illustrated through the development of archives with new technologies and electronic cataloguing systems which facilitate accessibility. Additionally,
this manifesto for archives in the 21st century highlights the overall priorities of archives which will inevitably impact upon the selection of archival collections made available for public use. This idea is further explored in relation to how the connection of archives with social process influences the archival methodology in terms of ascribing value. For example, Brothman outlines the idea that activities such as records appraisal:

[...] mirror a hierarchy of categories of social values. It is the social process which establishes what has high, enduring value, what is of transient value and what is rubbish.

1991: 81

For Brothman, the archive is therefore associated with the collective memories of a given society (1991: 56), which implies a sense of shared ownership and understanding within the archive but also the ability of the archive to evolve or to exist as a changeable entity as a result of the processual nature of memory. H. Taylor explores the implications that arise for the archive as a result of changing social and cultural contexts. He claims an increased awareness of the body and its environment that has stemmed from technological advances in the archival profession (see Cook & Dodds 2003). H. Taylor has negotiated the value of pre and post literate modes of societal communication as historical sources and, writing in 1988, he stated that pre-literate modes of communication depended upon gesture and action as additional tools for communicating via spoken word and memory in the sense that ‘words are action oriented’ (cited in Cook and Dodds 2003: 132). He also advocates that ‘archives are about actions, and so are documents that move and speak’ by which he means audio-visual material. He acknowledges that archives and the theory that they are imbedded within are ‘the product of literacy and texts’ and assumed to function for records in all formats (or media) (1992 cited in Cook & Dodds, 2003:187). His point is that literacy is losing its dominance within the archive, with the emergence of what he terms ‘new media archives’ (i.e. audio-visual, moving image). He suggests that ‘the development of our oral sensibilities’ and a regaining of ‘the values of oral tradition’ will emphasise the importance of these artefacts (1992 cited in Cook & Dodds, 2003:188).
His perspective highlights that the process of recording with different media ‘loses much of the original act’ (ibid) which has particular implications for discussing what is inherent in the original act that escapes the record. This perspective links archival practice with anthropological study. Such a connection between studies of human behaviour and the management of information is noteworthy within the context of this research as it gives credit to new modes of accessing information. Thus it opens up the potential for exploration of non-literary dance archival material that I undertake in this investigation.

More recently, authors have taken influence from philosophical, post-modern thinking stemming from the work of Derrida in particular who underlined the indeterminate nature of the archive: ‘[…] nothing is less clear today than the word ‘archive’ (1996:90). His writing reveals that the structures and processes that make up the ‘archive’ remain ambivalent, as for Derrida the archive exists ‘at the unstable limit between public and private’ (ibid), a liminal entity. Further to this, significant ideas have emerged in relation to the role and responsibility of archive, marking a paradigm shift which I interpret as being beneficial to the specific and unorthodox requirements of the dance archive as a vehicle for the documentation of ‘un-documentable’ phenomena. For Derrida, the archive is not something bound to the past:

\[
\text{It is a question of the future, the question of the future itself, the question of a response, of a promise and of a responsibility for tomorrow. The archive: if we want to know what that will have meant, we will only know in times to come.}
\]

1996:36

Derrida employs psychoanalytic theory to explore incompleteness within the idea of the archive. He rejects archives as complete entities, observing that they will always be unfinished as ‘The very order of knowledge, at least of classical knowledge is suspended’ (ibid: 52) in the relationship between the ‘known’ and ‘unknown’ archive. Derrida acknowledges that the archive exists within a wider discourse that is also unfixed. His proposition implies that knowledge within an archive is transformative, in the same way that
Cook has suggested that archives are reflective of the context within which they are accessed and should continually be ‘interpreted anew’ (1997). More recently, Freshwater acknowledges that the idea of a ‘fixed historical record’ is fictitious and therefore the promise of the archive is something equally mythical (2003:9).

These ideas reinforce the notion of archive as having its own agendas and with the archive comes a knowledge structure that disguises the originality of the documents that it manages. Derrida’s philosophy recognises this paradox in the sense that the imposed management of archives is what constitutes authority, in the literal sense that the principles construct agency across the archival documents. Therefore, he summarises that ‘the archivist produces more archive… [It] is never closed. It opens out of the future’ (ibid: 68), he observes:

There is no archive without a place of consignation, without a technique of repetition, and without a certain exteriority. No archive without outside.

Ibid: 12

In this quotation, Derrida recognises the archive as a reality, a place within which ‘in… domiciliation, in…house arrest, that archives takes place (1996:2). In describing his archival encounters, Pitches explains the routine of being managed into the archival space as a ritualistic practice but also recalls the sense of the past that he experiences. This he refers to as ghostliness, in terms of the ghosts of previous researchers and from this a sense of specialness which is mediated through the different stages of this encounter, from the appearance of the building to the rationalising of the catalogue on arrival. Pitches reminds us that the place where the archive resides necessitates a particular way of engaging and behaving but also that he is approaching the archive with his own research bias, separate to that of those who have accessed these materials before him.

In his interpretation of archive within the context of a proposed historical continuity, Michel Foucault explains that the ‘archive governs statements as unique events’ (145) and:
[...] reveals the rules of a practice that enables statements both to survive and to undergo regular modification. It is the general system of the formation and transformation of statements.

2002 [1969]:146

Such ideas challenge notions of permanency and originality associated with the archive. Archival theorists Terry Cook and Joan M. Schwartz argue that within the post-modern paradigm, the tension between subjectivity and objectivity emerges as the archival profession ‘cannot escape the subjectivity of performance by claiming the objectivity of systems and standards’ (2002:179). These authors enquire as to how the archivist should ‘perform’ within the postmodern paradigm, examining the role of the archivist as performers in the ‘drama of memory-making’ (ibid: 172). They concede that archivists, with their ability to ‘reshape, reinterpret and reinvent’ the archive, illustrate the power that they possess with regard to memory and identity (2002). Referenceing Judith Butler’s (1999) seminal theory of performativity, the authors parallel her interpretation of gender behaviour with that of the archive, suggesting that archives are ‘manufactured through a sustained set of acts’ (Butler in Cook & Schwartz, 2002:172). This perspective implies that ‘archival practices’, a term that I use frequently within this thesis, refer to a performance or a performed ‘set of actions’ that equate to the ‘established method’. Cook and Schwartz consider the archival process as a performance based upon the idea that it is not a rehearsal or practice for something to come (ibid:185), whereas for H. Taylor, ‘archives are not about an activity, they are an integral part of the activity itself’. These ideas imply that the knowledge inherent in the archival document is artificially constructed within the confines of archival activity and is highly dependent upon present contexts. Deconstructivist attitudes towards the archive such as these challenge the relationship between archival ideologies and the construction of value.

**The Relationship between Archives and Memory**

In her article entitled *Touchstones: Considering the Relationship between Memory and Archives*, archivist Laura Millar provides a detailed exploration of the meaning of memory in relation to the archive and its materials (2006).
She considers the theoretical study of memory closely with the ideologies that govern the archival discipline and reveals a sense of the archive as a tool for recalling and accessing memory. Her article responds to questions raised within the archival discipline regarding the need for a clearer understanding of memory as a concept that has a complex relationship with archives, history, social, collective and individual memory. Millar deals with the much used metaphor of archives as memory resulting from a conception of memories ‘as being “of the past” and we see archives as evidence of that same past’ (ibid: 106). Her inquiry is centred upon the question of whether or not the way in which memories are created, stored and retrieved is comparable to the archival process, in terms of capturing, preserving and making archival materials and records accessible (ibid). Millar explores this question through considering individual memory and the ways in which it intersects with the archive:

Memories [...] are created through a specific cognitive process. We receive sensory information; we store that information in our minds; and we retrieve that information when we wish to recall that particular memory, be it processural [sic], semantic or episodic. An immediate parallel emerges with archives. Just as we capture, store and retrieve memories, we acquire, preserve, and make available archives.

2006: 111

The crux of Millar’s argument is that the materials within an archive do not constitute ‘memory’, rather the archive and its records provide access to memory through serving as ‘triggers’ or Millar’s preferred term ‘touchstones’ (ibid: 112). In particular, she explains that archival materials (such as letters and photographs) function as touchstones as we return to them ‘when we wish to reconstruct and pass on our memories’ (119).

This idea informs much of the discussion within chapters 3 and 4 of this thesis, particularly the idea that memory is a process that evades permanence and hierarchical organisation and that the ways in which we recall and remember experiences are different to the way in which we understand records as ‘evidence’. Millar locates the presence of emotion in
memory, highlighting its absence in the archive. However, H. Taylor has outlined the common issue of the change and loss of the ‘original act’ (1988: 144) when transferred to another format. This presents a conflict between the principles upheld in the field of records management that knowledge can be transferred to a sustainable format in order to constitute an archival record (Hartley & Rowley, 2007) and the idea that the process of transfer generates a gap between the original and the recorded. In terms of the value of memory as a source of knowledge, Collingwood observes:

[...] that memory is not history, because history is a certain kind of organized or inferential knowledge, and memory is not organized [sic], not inferential, at all. If I say “I remember writing a letter to So-and-so last week”, that is a statement of memory, but it is not an historical statement.

1946: 252

However, Millar’s work indicates that memory might be capable of inciting value of a different nature and claims that memory can be strengthened through ‘repeated remembering’, referring to this technique as ‘post-event rehearsal’ whilst also recognising the limitations of memory in terms of accuracy and re-interpretation (2006: 110). Here, she infers a sense of instability in terms of memory over time and therefore the role of memory in a present context. The historian, Hal Foster explores this tension with reference to the work of ‘archival artists’28 and summarises that there is an ‘archival impulse’ at play. He explains that the work of artists within this category is less concerned ‘with absolute origins than with obscure traces’ (2004:5) and as a result the work is ‘non-hierarchical’ (4). What is important to note is that this work, for Foster, stems from what he considers to be the ‘failings’ of cultural memory (21), that this work somehow physically presents historical information that has been ‘lost or displaced’ (4). As a result of the lack of accurate information though cultural memory the original context of creation is disregarded in this instance directly inverts

28 This term refers to the work of visual artists who aim to present historical information that has been lost through their work (Foster, 2004).
archival principles such as provenance, original order and hierarchy. Millar’s work conflicts with this perspective as she implies that the archival material/record is capable of functioning as ‘a memory cue, prompting a series of recollections’ (2006: 114) as if memory were a reliable archival mechanism.

The idea of the archive as a physical space or place and ‘memory as a site’ for recall has been discussed by Barbara Craig who argues that:

[...] an archives [sic] brings together a physical space with documents that, in a mimetic way, gives us the potential to… turn back the clock. Time, space, and process are focused in archives and achieve there a form of relativity that users can experience.

2002:287

Craig reminds us of the archive as an experience made possible through a physical space whereby processes of remembering might occur. The idea that memory might constitute a knowledge that is organised as opposed to processual and active remains ambiguous. However, Millar and Craig’s ideas combined resonate with the inquiry into memory as a source of knowledge/information. They highlight the idea that valuable information can be accessed through interaction with archival materials of an entirely different nature. They also recognise that individual memory constructs a collective identity made up of personal and shared pasts and assists in thinking of the continuum of knowledge created through the interplay of archive and memory. Millar summarises that the relationship between the archive and memory reveals a ‘gap between the record, the event, and the emotion’ (2006: 116) and it is such ‘gaps’ that are considered as potential sources of new knowledge within this investigation.

Chapter Summary

In this chapter I have discussed the fundamental practices and notional ideologies that define the archival discipline. The method of ‘archiving’ materials is a template used across organisations and materials of different media and origins. Some of the theoreticians referenced in this chapter
have challenged a number of these practices in the light of the archive’s relationship to changing socio-cultural contexts, user-interpretation and rigid principles and guidelines. The idea of archival ‘continuums’ has emerged throughout the discussion, specifically in relation to the different stages of a document’s existence and the continuous re-interpretation by generations that sit within a perpetual cycle of change and through interaction with memory (Brothman 2002, Cook 1997, Millar 2006).

The discussion has revealed that value is constructed through the structures that are imposed upon the materials, not just in terms of the information contained within the materials themselves. As a result, this chapter calls into question notions of originality and what might be considered primary and raw materials particularly, and considers the external features that assert a certain level of control over the document. The idea of an ‘archive significance’ (Jenkinson, 1922: 80) highlights the selectivity inherent within the acquisition of material into the archive. In addition to this, more recent perspectives recognise that systems of identifying value such as appraisal can be considered as being in a constant state of flux, as a result of archival practices that strive to reflect the ‘spirit’ of their times (Cook 1997).

In summary, this chapter has positioned key archival theories in relation to notions of value that underpin the discipline. The discussion has explored notions of archival knowledge and value that can be applied to the key research questions underpinning the overall focus of this thesis as I explain below. Primarily, this discussion has addressed the following question:

- How can archival ‘gaps in knowledge’ be identified in relation to the documents of dance?

Overall the discussion has revealed that the archive might be considered to have a valid role in processes of remembering, embracing interpretation and temporality through interaction with memory. Such engagement offers a different way of thinking about archival experience as invoking memorial knowledge that might be rooted in individual sensory encounters with material. I aim to extend this further by considering the role of the body in recalling ‘stored data’ that might exist in sensory forms. Millar’s work also contributes to the notion of gaps in the archive as she emphasises that
information that hangs between record, event and emotion is elusive, escaping the permanence of the archive (2006). In this thesis, I aim to explore the value inherent in accessing these missing attributes by applying these ideas to dance.

The exploration of notions of archival value in this chapter has also addressed the following research question:

- What is archival value and how does it function in relation to the documents of dance?

Through reference to the work of key archival theorists and through a consideration of archival practices outlines here it is also clear that archival value cannot be exclusively placed upon material that survives and is selected for permanent preservation. It is evident that the archive is not all-encompassing and its shifting, interpretive nature, identified by Cook, H.Taylor (1997) and Millar (2006), reveals that archival value cannot be fixed to the document alone. The document is layered with value through the structures and conditions through which it is stored and the nature of our encounters with what has been deemed ‘archival’.

Having established that notions of archival value are multiple and varied, I consider the value of the archival documents of dance in chapter 2 more specifically. In order to deem the dancing body as being archival I continue to consider the role of the body archive in the following chapter, focusing upon the contents of dance-making and performance that fail to enter into the archive through those structures that I have discussed in this section of the thesis.
Chapter 2

Archival Gaps and the Body Archive in Dance

Introduction

The discussion in chapter 1 revealed that the archive, in the traditional sense, is not capable of preserving ephemeral acts, including performance practices. Whilst the tangible, material items that exist in relation to the archive, such as theatre and publicity ephemera, photographic prints and written notes, diaries and minutes, have a place in dance and performance archives, the archival discipline does not yet accommodate aspects of performance experience and dance-making practices and processes that resist permanence as a result of their ephemerality. In this chapter I explore the gaps between dance practice and the archiving of that practice through a consideration of the elements that do not currently reach the archive. Through exploring the knowledge and affect gained through bodily experience of movement and performance, additional ‘material’ that might be considered of value to the archive is revealed.

By re-considering the body as an archive, as scholars including André Lepecki (2010) and Inge Baxmann (2007) have done, new ways of thinking emerge about the body as a site where residual archival material remains and resides. In particular, within the essay ‘The Body as Archive: Will to Re-Enact and the Afterlives of Dances’ Lepecki’s discussion offers a number of useful ways of thinking about the body and I aim to make use of some of these arguments in order to further extend and develop the notion of the body archive in this chapter. For Lepecki, the body offers ‘the most moving support’ for recording performance action and his argument is largely based upon the fact that the body, as a ‘transformative’ entity, is capable of functioning as a site where knowledge can be placed. Whilst this resonates with Hartley and Rowley’s definition that the extraction of knowledge (that is tacit) from the body into a recorded format constitutes evidence or source material (2007), there remains a complexity which is not specifically addressed in Lepecki’s work. The credit given to the body as an archive provides support for my own notion of the body archive. It is my aim to
promote the body as a place where archival knowledge resides and can be recalled and re-invoked as a result of different and multiple access triggers. In this chapter I will explore a number of Lepecki’s provocations in order to contextualise my own position regarding the role of the body archive as a vehicle for accessing information that is ‘lost’ in the process of archiving dance.

To consider these notions further, this chapter will explore the following research question:

What are the archival documents of dance?

The following sub questions will be explored with a view to developing an understanding of the body as archive:

- How can archival ‘gaps in knowledge’ be identified in relation to the documents of dance?
- How does archival value function in relation to the documents of dance?
- How does dance knowledge exist in relation to the archive?

**The Archive and the Dancing Body**

The rationale for exploring the body as an archive stems from the ephemerality of dance as a performed practice in which the body is the main vehicle for expression. In her seminal work on the representation of performance, Peggy Phelan declares that ‘performance…becomes itself through disappearance’ (1993:146). Performance by its very definition is ephemeral, fleeting, transient, and ceases to exist following its execution. The conventional archive consists of material that is non-ephemeral and as a result I argue here that archival ‘gaps’ emerge. These gaps, in a sense, deny the ephemeral phenomena that cannot be captured in traditional ways. They arise due to the complexity of preserving something that has disappeared. Phelan’s observation in particular highlights a tension between what are considered to constitute the material and immaterial traces of performance. This tension is reflected in the perspectives upon archival theory discussed in chapter 1 which address the absence of knowledge in the archive, recognising that the archival process takes place in a context removed from the original event (Derrida 1996). Similarly, Millar’s concept of archival materials functioning as ‘touchstones’ situates
an absence or gap between information, record and event (2006). The capturing of a performed moment, as Phelan claims, will never be complete. Rather ‘the partiality of and incompleteness of any documentation returns us to the transience of the performance itself’ because ‘the act of documentation makes disappearance visible’ (in Reason 2006: 27). In this thesis, I am proposing that the information that escapes the archive is representative of an archival gap. These gaps are potentially available in and through the body archive. The following extract that I referred to in the prelude to this thesis, drawn from my experience of gathering oral narratives to enrich existing archival material in a previous research project (see page 9) illustrates this proposition further:

During one interview, the interviewee insisted on getting onto her feet to demonstrate a movement that could not be suitably expressed with words, another carefully unboxed a costume that she had stored away with a number of mementos from her time at the dancing school so that we could fully appreciate the deep green colour of the stiff velvet fabric from which it was made. I watched with interest whilst the interviewee re-enacted a moment in the choreography she learnt as a child and the manner in which she handled a costume that she had kept tied up in a box for over half a century. She rose to her feet in order to perform the movement she had attempted to explain verbally but did not simply arrive at that movement. Her body passed through a series of processes during which she received sensory feedback indicating, through felt sensation that this was the position that she wished to present. Without the aid of a mirror, she slowly moved through time and space, firstly positioning her feet, stabilising her weight and centring her alignment, following which she took a breath and raised her arms above her head. Her fingers glided into position, and I noticed the slight tremor in her fingers as she searched for the correct position, finally, her head tilted into position and the pose was re-enacted. Throughout this whole sequence, her
focus and facial expressions were continuously altered. (9-10)

During this interview, I set out to record an oral narrative that recalled a dance experience discussed through prompts and conversational dynamic. However, in moments such as these, where verbal communication is an insufficient tool for depicting the movement pose, the value of the body is highlighted and underlines the ineffability of certain choreographic and kinetic elements of dance. During this moment, as a spectator, I experienced the affect and sensation of witnessing movement just as the interviewee underwent a process of moving through the body in order to ‘accurately’ illustrate the movement she was referring to. She did not contain all the knowledge and information associated with this particular dance, however this moment contributed to the material already available, (i.e. the associated costume) and offered a three dimensional encounter that conveyed something of the essence of the movement vocabulary that was not possible through looking at the documents alone. Therefore, this moment is suggestive of an embodied set of traces of the past that are not recorded within the tangible materials contained within the archive and may never be captured. Through identifying gaps, the opportunity to explore the potential of capturing additional archival elements residing in the body can be considered through exploring the body as an archive, where something of the essence of dance practice is stored. Through exploring the role of the body as archive in this chapter, I argue that immaterial traces of performance such as affect, sensation and essence, can be alluded to and that these elements reveal new information that is of value for dance reconstruction, preservation and sustainability.

The moment I have referred to above was loaded with intricate detail and subtle indicators of what it was like to experience the performance first-hand. For example, the physical components of breath, energy, ‘virtual powers’ (Langer 1953), sensations, affect, dynamics, rhythm, ‘flow’ all of which fall into the gap between the conventional archive and the body (archive). These physical traces carried by the body, implicate the body as a vehicle through which they can be read, and experienced (or re-experienced) in the present. The experience of dance performance for the viewer and the dance experience/process for the performer are besieged with the un-saveable, intangible elements that are prevented from
becoming ‘fixed’ in space and time and therefore excluded from the archive. However, the emergence of recent discoveries and terminologies such as ‘dancerly knowledge’ (McFee, 2012) give credit to the dancer’s body as a vehicle for knowledge and support my claim that the intangible, ephemeral attributes that go missing as a result of performance’s disappearance might be captured through considering the body as an archive.

**The Archive and the Repertoire (Taylor, 2003)**

Diana Taylor (2003) attempts to re-shape our understanding of performance history through acknowledging the notion of repertoire as an extension of those documents that characteristically reside in the archive. Her argument recognises that ‘archive’ and its associated meaning, understandings and practical processes/functions do not accommodate the immaterial traces of performance which are manifest in the live encounter, these being the memories and embodied knowledge embedded in performance experience (ibid:15-16). Taylor argues that performance is a “vital act of transfer” capable of transmitting social knowledge, cultural memory, and identities, placing embodiment at the crux of that transmission (2).

Taylor explains that her argument is not to claim a ‘rift’ between the ‘written and spoken word’, but instead to position a binary between the *archive* as the ‘supposedly enduring materials’ and the ‘ephemeral *repertoire*’ (ibid: 19) as illustrated in figure 4 below:

**Figure 4: The Archive and the Repertoire**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archive</th>
<th>Repertoire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texts</td>
<td>Spoken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents</td>
<td>Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings</td>
<td>Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bones</td>
<td>Sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ritual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4, adapted from Taylor 2003:19
Her perspective echoes that of Phelan as she observes that performance can be considered as an object of analysis but also problematises the historically prevalent gap between archive and repertoire. Taylor’s insights stem from the understanding of ‘knowledge’ within the context of cultural tradition in Latin America. She notes how knowledge of the indigenous people’s past and “the lives they lived” disappeared because they did not write it down. This reflects Western epistemologies whereby written materials are dominant and informs the rationale for her assertion that ‘writing has paradoxically come to stand in for and against embodiment’ (16). For Taylor, the repertoire encompasses ephemeral social practice or ‘non-verbal practices such as dance...that long served to preserve a sense of communal identity and memory’ and ‘were not considered valid forms of knowledge’ (18). Therefore, she extends the dichotomy (or ontology) between performance and archive as is dominant in the work of authors such as Phelan (1993) and Reason (2006) in her attempt to validate the repertoire and its relationship and interaction with the archive in the construction of meaning and knowledge. In addition, she suggests that the practice of such forms constitutes preservation in itself and this idea reinforces ideas within the study of dance history that position revival as a valuable method for dance preservation (Thomas, 2003).

Whilst she focuses upon ‘acts of transfer’ within the context of cultural memory within a specific social landscape (Latin America), Taylor’s premise resonates with the inquiry into the role of the body archive in dance explored in this thesis as her notion of ‘repertoire’ recognises the value inherent in embodied, ephemeral acts as vehicles of knowledge, and knowledge transmission. Her proposition of a binary between the traditionally ‘written’ records of cultural practices and the practising of such traditions highlights a distinction between the information perceived to be available in each. If the bodies who have participated in practices such as dance and ritual can provide a source of access and demonstrate knowledge, then the concept of repertoire provides one way of re-imagining dance practice and performance that have been rendered absent or disappearing. Traditional processes of archiving typically begin at the end of an event or practice such as performance, whereby materials that remain are collated and brought into archival structures. Taylor’s notion of ‘repertoire’ observes that elements such as memory, experience, ritual and
behaviour reside differently and offer another layer of knowledge/information which parallels that existing within the archive. This additional layer bridges some of the gap between archive and performance by recognising that a number of elements remain tangible without being seen. Taylor reduces these elements to memory and experiential/practical knowledge of a practice or tradition. This theoretical viewpoint emphasises the importance of the presence of the body (and bodies) in space, owing to the layers of embodied experience that spatially embodied encounters facilitate. Her concept of repertoire situates 'bone' as a material that belongs in the category of archive (2003:19). Taylor presents bone as an enduring material in the sense that it remains, and whilst it is subject to growth and adjustment (i.e. through injury) it carries traces of the body’s past and its material state renders it ‘archival’ as opposed to the ephemeral traces that are inherent in the ‘repertoire’. Therefore, the placement of bone within the context of my argument can be understood as being intertwined with bodily memory, considering that ‘Bone holds our deepest and oldest memories [...] Bone carries the imprint of all that we do and of where we have been’ (Tufnell & Crickmay 2004:199).

The on-going value of the body as a site of memory remains elusive with regard to the traditions of the archival discipline. Susan Leigh-Foster extends this idea with reference to bone as a source of more specific choreographic knowledge. She explains how dances are capable of relying on ‘knowledge bone-deep in the dancer’s physicality - the product of years of dedicated practice to specific aesthetic and social values’ that ‘integrate the knowledge seamlessly into the fabric of the dance, or more precisely, the formation of physicality they have undertaken in learning to dance cannot be separated from other aspects of the performance’ (2011:215-6). Foster’s approach resonates with the practice of dance more specifically and differs from the concept of repertoire by locating the performer’s background as inseparable to elements of performance. By positioning the body and dance as ‘inclusive of the history of the performer’s training and cultivation of expertise at dancing’ she emphasises how the training of the body is something that remains connected to all choreographic experience. The suggestion that the body continues to carry knowledge and layers of past choreographic and movement experience for the duration of the
physical practising of dance resonates with the revival practices undertaken by Phoenix Dance Theatre explored in chapters 4 and 5 of this thesis.

Through exploring the practice of dance and the dancing body as a corporeal archive some of the gaps between archive and performance can be identified, particularly through ideas regarding bodily affects, experience and expertise. For example, muscle memory, breath, sensation, haptic domains, spatiality and spatial relationships are particularly present in dance practice. Furthermore, notions of ‘choreographic expertise’ and ‘signature’ (Melrose 2007), ‘original impact’, affect (Lepecki, 2010) and movement quality/essence can be considered as being inherent within the body archive.

Taylor explains how separating the ‘source of “knowledge” from the knower- in time and/or space’ (2003:19) has resulted in the treatment of the archive as a store of unchanging texts, exempt from the effects of ageing and interpretation. This is perhaps why she favours the use of the term ‘archival memory’ as opposed to ‘archive’, explaining that it functions ‘across distance, over time and space’ and the ‘value, relevance or meaning of the archive’ is subject to change (2003:19). This is an interesting perspective as it exposes a series of complexities in employing the body as a source of knowledge including the subjectivity associated with memory and the impact and effects of ageing upon the body. For Mike Pearson ‘experience of the past is not stable or homogenous’ (2013) and recognising this instability has the potential to diminish our ability to access the meaning invoked and created through ‘acts of transfer’. The example referred to at the beginning of this chapter hints at some of the additional properties or different layers of memory and experiential knowledge within the body of the practitioner that are potentially available but that remain on the borders of the repertoire. Therefore, I intend to explore the attributes that reside in the gap between performance and archive that cannot be captured through the ‘repertoire’ and to probe some of the issues that emerge as a result of thinking about the body as a living entity through the lens of the archive.

‘The Body as Archive’ (Lepecki 2010)

In his essay; ‘The body as Archive: Will to Re-Enact and the Afterlives of Dances’ (2010) André Lepecki explores the notion of the body archive
through a theoretically based critique of practices of ‘re-enactment’ in dance. His focus is towards the future of historic dance works, through a continued creative interest and engagement in the present (in re-enacting movement/responding to work from the past). He proposes that this approach moves away from an ‘obsession with repeatability’ which is associated with dance reconstruction, particularly in the writings of Mark Franko (1989, referred to later in chapter 3). Lepecki’s perspective marks a departure from traditional modes of ‘reconstruction’ and instead begins to address the role of the body as an archival site. Referring to three specific examples of choreographic practice Lepecki discusses ‘re-enactments’ as a bodily archiving of dance where the body functions as a vehicle for the continued re-enactment of historic repertoire through a corporeal archiving of the choreographic work of others. Lepecki bypasses the concept of ‘archive and repertoire’ and instead positions his argument from a more temporally dynamic understanding of the intricacy that occurs between the continuous overlapping of body, dance, and archive. However, his approach to understanding the ‘body as archive’ has the potential to unpack the concept of repertoire further owing to his reinstatement of the body as ‘a system or zone where works do not rest but are formed and transformed, endlessly-like ghostly matters. Or simply, like bodies’ (44). This is because Lepecki’s concept embraces embodied praxis and re-focuses archival attention towards the body as a place where non-verbal practices can be actualised through enactment. Lepecki’s work favours what can arguably be considered as a performance based approach to history, and is explored through the work of three practitioners whose work challenges our understanding of archive in different ways, two of which I will explore here.

The ‘will to archive’ (Lepecki: 2010)

One of the key ideas discussed in Lepecki’s essay is the notion of a ‘will to archive’. This expression refers to what dance scholar Ramsay Burt has deemed an ‘active’ and ‘generative’ approach to dance historical material, which is opposed to more traditional approaches to dance re-enactments

that are largely imitative and representational in their attempt to be authentic (Burt 2003:34-35 in Lepecki 2010:29). In part, Lepecki presents a critique of Hal Foster’s ‘archival impulse’ (as outlined in the previous chapter, 2004) which refers to the artists desire "to connect what cannot be connected" with a view to ascertaining its value in the present (21). This concept is rooted in what Foster considers to be the failings of cultural memory (i.e. to reinstate absent memory (2004)) and Lepecki observes that the archive itself is a construct of ‘endless memory “failures”’ as a result of its ‘acts of exclusions and misplacements’ (Lepecki 2010:30). Therefore, he adapts the idea of ‘archival impulse’ by suggesting a move away from a preoccupation with ‘failure’ in favour of a move towards an embracing of the temporality between past and present by using re-enactment in relation to dance history as opposed to repeating or ‘multiplying’ a historical idea (31). For Lepecki, dance re-enactments constitute methods for finding, foregrounding and producing difference as opposed to attempting to be ‘faithful to original works’ (46). In this context, re-enactment represents a process that does not attempt to ‘fix a work in its singular (original) possibilization [sic], but to unlock, release and actualize [sic] the possibilities of a past work through contemporary iterations. He recognises that re-enactments embrace new possibilities through activating a creative field of “impalpable possibilities” inherent in past works. Here, Lepecki is referring to the work of Brian Massumi (2002) within which the value of movement, affect and sensation that he claims has been overlooked in cultural theory is reinstated. For Massumi, ‘each perception is surrounded by a fringe of unlikelihood, of impalpable possibility’ (2002:91). Lepecki explains that the active body can be understood as a vehicle for exploring and producing movement affect. More specifically, when referring to Gilles Deleuze’s work on memory and duration (1966 after Bergson), he positions these possibilities as “recollections that try to become embodied” (1991:71).

The overall rejection of an imitative approach to re-enactment or the desire to remain true to the document in order to open up new opportunities for the place of dance history in the present are the key themes for Lepecki in his term ‘will to archive’. As an overall concept, this idea provides support for the exploration of ephemeral attributes as having an ongoing value and as attributes that reside in the gap between the body and the archive.

---

30 The context for Foster’s discussion is rooted in the genre of contemporary art-archival art.
In his essay, Lepecki refers to the work of choreographer Richard Move to illustrate his application of the term ‘will to archive’ to processes of re-enactment in dance. In 1996 Move transformed himself and performed in drag as Martha Graham and Lepecki claims that his body was ‘picked to serve as archive’ (43). Male dancer Move impersonates Graham and, when performing her choreography has been described as ‘an exhibit...a dancer as a living archive of dance’ (The New York Times, 2011) ascribing the sense of Move himself as an artefact. Lepecki explains that Move’s work is not strictly developed through archival investigation/mining but derives from a response to archival material, the ‘force’ of Graham’s historic performances and ‘donations’ from former Graham dancers who shared details that could not be derived from the black and white archival photographs and the artificially coloured film records of Graham’s work, e.g. the precise colour of her lipstick. This highlights the dispersal of information outside of the archive and beyond Move’s own knowledge of Graham and therefore problematises the accuracy of Move’s body as a ‘living archive of Graham’. More recently, Move has extended his work into digital realms, claiming that, ‘the iconic still photography of two deceased female artists provoked within me the haunting agency to create new works of kinetic cinema’, one of whom is Martha Graham. Move explains that ‘I portray Graham and re-enact her heretic among many of her dances’ (see Ghostlight 2004) claiming that his work renders artists ‘undead through filmic re-enactment’ (2010). Lepecki interrogates this position through the notion of Move’s unleashing of an afterlife for Graham; he refers to Graham’s “Ghostly Matter” as:

An excorporating [sic] cloud traveling across time, across space, across genders, across historical periods, across legal copy-right barriers, and bursting through the supposed fixity of the past into a transgressive revelation of its powerful actualizations, [sic] via a transformative incorporation in Richard Move’s performances.

Ibid: 42

31 This concept is derived from the work of Sociologist Avery Gordon (1997)
Here, Lepecki explains how Move’s body functions as a place where the qualities of Graham’s performances that are ‘unfixed’ are capable of becoming embodied through Move’s re-enactments. The statement above is antithetical to the traditions of the archive as I have previously discussed, as the act of ‘fixing’ a moment in time in documentary form is what constitutes a record as a source of historical information (Petersen, cited in Blouin and Rosenberg 1984) and ‘stored data in any form, constitutes a document’ (Hartley & Rowley 2007:33-34). However, Lepecki alludes to an idea of material that does not remain in any tangible form or within the boundaries of a place, in space or within a specific context, but can nevertheless be invoked through enactment. Such a perspective reinforces post-structuralist notions of archive as proposed by Derrida in his rejection of the archive as a complete entity, (1996) in favour of an archive that is incomplete and unfinished because it is never possible to retain all knowledge of the past in material that meets the requirements of the archive (52). This openness is reflected in the ‘will to archive’ as Lepecki encourages us to ‘understand dance not only as that which passes away (in time and across space) but also as that which passes around (between and across bodies of dancers, viewers, choreographers) and as that which also...comes back around.’ (2010: 39). This idea reminds us that performance is an act of transfer (Taylor, 2003) and acknowledges that the experience of participating in dance performance, either as spectator, performer or choreographer, means that the dance does not disappear since it remains in the bodies of those experiencing it. However, the example of Move’s work is not representative of material being passed between bodies and therefore raises questions about the validity of his body as an archive. Furthermore, Lepecki does not specify in what manner or format this knowledge exists in and between bodies and overlooks the complexities inherent in these multiple experiences of performances and their variability as meaning making experiences. This perspective highlights the absence of the knowledge or material capable of being transmitted via the original body of performance. This underlines the gap that emerges as a result of the fact that all knowledge cannot be transferred from one body to another.

The ‘will to archive’ and Provenance
As outlined in the previous chapter, the concept of provenance ensures that the original purpose and function of archival materials is reflected in or ‘should be directly related’ to their arrangement and description within the archival repository (ibid). Lepecki’s ideas surrounding the body as archive concept contravene this founding principle of archival practices. In Move’s case, the adoption of movement material is largely removed from the original context within which it was created. In his attempt to embody Graham’s identity in persona and body, the movement is learned or repatriated from the archive into his body as opposed to being recalled from its original source (i.e. the knowledge is not already ‘in’ his body). This is because Lepecki’s perspective positions the body as a new, refreshed storehouse of knowledge, as he argues that, in order for the body to make the ‘archive visible’ (2010:38), “re-writings” of the archive take place through the re-writing of movement onto the body of the new performer (Move) (ibid). Considering that, by definition, provenance privileges the original order or origins of material because ‘the significance of archival materials is heavily dependent on the context of their creation’ (Hensen, 1993: 67), the role of Move’s body as an archive of Graham’s work distorts this concept as it could be considered an inauthentic site for Graham’s movement. Provenance requires that the original order in which a document has come into being and its relationship to other documents is preserved and reflected in the arrangement of archival materials. Move’s re-enactment of Graham’s work stems from an embodied response to archival material that demonstrates traces of the context and visual representations of movement rather than as a result of a direct, experiential encounter with the original performer herself, or the original performance. Lepecki’s ‘body as archive’ challenges this perspective because the context of Graham’s creation of work is not completely available. The example given in relation to the precise colour of Graham’s lipstick emphasises the dilution of the original in Move’s re-enactment as a result of the different context within which his work has come into existence, further highlighting the limitations of the archival material in contrast with the memory of a person’s experience and or encounter with the original performer. The contents of an archive, if preserved in accordance with the principle of provenance will maintain the original-order of the material and the actual lipstick belonging to Graham could feasibly remain in the archive. However, Move’s approach to becoming a ‘living archive of Graham’ is highly selective and one that
creates difference as opposed to attempting to remain ‘authentic’. It is not Move’s aim to accurately portray Graham as such, but rather to capture something of the essence of her work through his own body within a performed dance event. This is representative of a distinct gap between the archive and the body’s ability to both enrich and destabilise the tangible material that remains because it adds a lived, active aspect to the archive and illustrates how re-enactment can function as an insight or lens into historic dance repertoire, through the dancing body. Overall, Lepecki’s ‘will to archive’ requires an activation of or an alternative telling of the past in a body other than that by which it was originally performed. By contrast, in this thesis, I aim to understand the value of activating knowledge that is already stored in the body of the dance practitioner and might be considered as more synonymous with the principle of provenance because […] In recognition of this gap I will explore ways in which material that cannot be transferred or extracted from the body might be recalled and accessed with reference to specific examples in chapters 3 and 4 in particular.

**Corporeal Archiving**

The notion of the body as archive is further problematised in Lepecki’s discussion in relation to Tolentino’s work entitled *The Sky Remains the Same* (2008-ongoing). In this work, Tolentino attempts to archive Ron Athey’s *Self-Obliteration # I* onto/into her body within a performance. Lepecki explains how, upon entering the performance space, the audience are faced with both the original performer and Tolentino, facing each other in the start position for the piece to be performed. Athey, the original performer executes the work whilst Tolentino witnesses before both Athey and Tolentino repeat the work together in order for Tolentino to ‘corporeally archive’ it ‘for her life’s duration’ (ibid: 34). Considering Taylor’s premise that non-verbal practices such as performance constitute the act of preservation, the performative process of transfer between bodies illustrated in this example supports this idea (2003). However, I argue here that what is overlooked in this example is the difficulty in repatriating material from one body to another through the act of transfer. Tolentino and Athey create a new context for this historic work though their shared performance, marking its difference to that of the original. Tolentino’s arrival
at the end product of a working process is interesting in her role as a ‘corporeal archive’ as she embodies the product of an idea originating in and through another body, echoing the selectivity of archival processes. This evokes the very nature of the archive as a site for material that has survived, however it also highlights a gap in knowledge that I consider to be potentially available in the body of the original performer, as Athey will have undertaken a process or made a series of choices prior to performing the work whereas Tolentino arrives at the end. She embodies the end product of an idea previously conceived and undertaken in a different body, in a different context as undertaken by Athey, her experience of the work takes place implicitly in the live and lived moment, where ‘multiple forms of embodied acts are always present [...] in a constant state of againness’ (Taylor 2003:21). Lepecki recognises the multifarious nature of her place in this performance through his description of Tolentino as being ‘simultaneously audience member, student of the piece, an archivist, a potential archive, a performer, a partner, an enabler, a mirror image, a differentiator, an assimilator.’ (33). Each of these roles invokes a different relationship with the notion of ‘archive’ and moreover reinforces the concept of repertoire as performed acts that ‘generate, record and transmit knowledge’ through the transmission of ‘communal memories, histories and values from one group/generation to the next’ (19). Tolentino’s presence in this performance means that her body is compromised as an archive because the originality of the work is changed through her presence, and in performing this work she becomes a part of the repertoire.

Lepecki’s use of this example suggests a literal manifestation of the body as archive, in light of the fact that performed material is being passed from one body to another to be stored. Whilst Lepecki credits the body as a place where performance knowledge is capable of residing and Tolentino succeeds in re-performing the work, and learning the movement, the essence, original intent and Athey’s experiential knowledge of executing the work is exclusive to his body. Therefore, a gap still remains at stake in terms of valuable information about this work that is lost in this type of transference between bodies which privileges the final movement/performed act over the contextual and experiential qualities of the original act.
Furthermore, the tension between the body as a lived entity, passing through time and space, ageing, forgetting and replacing memory is not explored in Lepecki’s work. The emphasis is placed upon the body’s ability to perform work as an alternative to writing it down, therefore bringing us closer to a way of preserving performance knowledge. However, this method of corporeal archiving does not equate to a solution because the ‘ongoing value’ (Millar, 2006) of this work when mediated through a different body is highly unstable. The limitations of the body’s ability to transmit and recall movement knowledge as the memory of this experience ages and the impact this has upon the notion of the body as an archival store is largely overlooked. With Taylor’s emphasis on performance as a mode of storage, one that operates differently from the traditional archive, Tolentino becomes a part of the repertoire. Overall, Lepecki’s discussion of the body as archive provides useful territory for exploring where archival gaps might reside and the implications of these within my own study.

Towards an understanding of the Body as Archive

Lepecki highlights the value of the dancing body as a living entity with the ability to contain information required for re-enactments. He observes how the work of Tolentino and Move in particular creates new opportunities for experimentation with historic dance repertoire and as a result reinforces the fact that the ‘repertoire, like the archive, is mediated’ (Taylor 2003: 21). Lepecki gives agency to the body as an ‘archival site’ through the suggestion that ‘dance can only find its proper archival site onto/into a body-the body understood as an affective system of formation, transformation, incorporation, and dispersion’ (43). The idea that a body can constitute an archive, regardless of its instability and constant state of transformation or flux, is pertinent to this investigation.

However, Lepecki’s perspective overlooks the value of knowledge already available and existing in the body of the dance practitioner because of the notion that ‘actors archive past roles within themselves-they maintain them, consult and compare them, replay them, relate them to past and present experience’ (Pavis 2003: 45). This ‘living archive’ concept, as defined by Pavis highlights the complexity of the body as a ‘text’ since the material contained within it is always subject to change with the passing of time and
the intermingling of past experience with that in the present. As a result, not all information is capable of passing from one body to another and the specific nature of knowledge inherent in the dance practitioner’s body and his/her ability to enact is not thoroughly explored. Considering the idea that there are additional, intangible attributes that disappear with the ephemeral, lived moment of dance practice (and performance), I am proposing that the ‘body archive’ is a point of access for the ephemeral traces of dance performance that evade permanence. Pavis alludes to the body as an archival repository; this notion is useful within the context of my own investigation regarding the body and its function as an archive. However, rather than exploring the possibility of the body as a host for the representation of past dances, I am extending the notion of the ‘body as archive’ by exploring further the role of the body as a centre of knowledge, capable of transmitting knowledge of dance, through the recalling, re-invoking and reawakening of ephemeral traces already residing in the body, enabling access to the past through an alternative archival document, which in this case is manifest in the dancing body as an entity beyond that which currently exists in standard archival practices.

I aim to build upon the work of Lepecki in relation to the body as an archival site by recognising that the body contains further knowledge and dance expertise such as movement affect, sensation and emotion that is invisible and cannot be directly replicated or transferred but nevertheless that can be accessed and considered as valuable archival material. Whilst Lepecki’s work departs from traditional archival principles, I intend to employ key concepts such as provenance, hierarchy and original order which enable exploration of the value inherent in being connected to and preserving the original context within which dance material emerged/was created, as a potential route for accessing knowledge of past dances. In terms of the archive, the concept of provenance requires that the original order of materials is respected so as to maintain the context of their creation. I understand the body as the place where the ‘original act’ (H.Taylor, 2003 [1988]) that escapes permanence takes place and therefore can be connected to the original context of a work (1992 cited in Cook & Dodds, 2003:188). By shifting the focus of the discussion onto the body that originally performed the work, my own hypothesis is directed towards determining the value of the knowledge sourced within the original body of
the practitioner rather than through the transfer of material from one place (body) to another.

*The Expert Practitioner*

The discussion so far has pointed to the difficulties that surround the notion of positioning the body as an archive and highlighted the potential of the body as a place where knowledge can be placed and also as a site incapable of fixing knowledge. Whilst Lepecki’s work offers a theoretical exploration of the body as archive, others have offered insight into the value of the body as a source of historical information through scrutiny of the characteristics of dance practice and performance. In particular, from a practitioner perspective, Susan Melrose has argued that the dancer can be considered an ‘expert-practitioner’ owing to the knowledge generated and retained by the dancer/choreographer through processes of dance-making. According to Melrose, the archive has the potential to be more ‘practitioner friendly’ if it could accommodate what she terms a ‘practitioner theory of knowledge’ (2007). Her perspective is that the aspects of the dance-making process are multiple and the spectator/archivist is unable to identify where ‘expert decisions’ have emerged (2006: 76) and yet aspects of the process can be indicative of the ‘performance mastery and expertise’ inherent in the work of the dancer or choreographer. For Melrose, the ‘expert-practitioner can be understood within the context of “knowledge-producing” epistemic objects’ (2007:8) which she explains that the practitioner is ‘knowledge centred’ and ‘knowledge producing’ which suggests that information might be preserved and stored and accessible through the epistemology of the body. The problem, for Melrose is that the expertise involved in the dance-making process which she summarises below is unattainable for the end-user (archivist, spectator, archive researcher):

> Performance-making practices [...] are individually owned [...] tend to be collaborative, negotiated between heterogeneous practitioner undertakings, and different types of expertise [...] negotiated live, on the ground; they tend to take on board the impact of contingent factors.

2007:77
This statement indicates the multiplicity of elements inherent in the choreographic process, and Melrose continues to explain that some of these factors include ‘creative-problem solving’ and happy and ‘unhappy accident’ whereby movement content might be generated as a result of spontaneous occurrences as opposed to more informed ways of working. She notes that the work made is ‘conditioned and developed’ and is subject to the ‘production values’ that are demanded of it, all of which are integral to the work’s journey towards performance but which, she claims, have not yet been sufficiently theorised (in writing) and therefore escape the permanence offered through the archive in the traditional sense (ibid).

In this thesis I maintain that knowledge of a ‘dancerly nature’ (McFee, 2012) is dispersed across multiple materials, including the body and the notion of expertise as identified by Melrose adds a further dimension to understanding the gap between archive and performance. Her provocation that the archive has yet to accommodate the ‘logics of production’, which are clear from her description of the intricacies of the making process in dance, highlights a significant gap in the archive where creative, choreographic choices are unidentifiable (2007:8). Her overall argument is that the dance practitioner carries a particular expertise and know-how of choreographic creation and dance performance, but as dance ‘operates [...] outside of language’ this expertise goes unrecorded and has sat outside of academic debates because of its non-verbal, ineffable nature. Melrose’s positioning of the intricacies of performance making as an ‘epistemic object’ credit the choreographer’s craft as a source of information and reinstate the value of the work that precedes performance.

During the process of creating work, the way in which a choreographer/dancer proceeds is largely variable. In order to create a movement sequence each person will have a preferred method or stimulus, the body will be warmed-up and ready to move and different stimuli will be referred to in order to trigger movement. Established routines are employed along the journey of making work and for Melrose these routines culminate in expertise that is often pooled together by a number of ‘expert practitioners’ such as ‘dancer’, ‘choreographer’ and lighting/sound

---

32 Jo Butterworth’s ‘process continuum model’ within which she addresses five choreographic methods is an example of this variability. (2004: 55).
designers (2009: 24). Melrose explains that the end result of such a (collaborative) process carries the signature of the choreographer, that it represents a specific ‘model of intelligibility’ (ibid). The ‘signature’ or ‘expert-intuitive’ nature of performance-making that is brought by the practitioner cannot be ‘extracted from the work’ (2009:31). She recognises that the body is the vehicle in which this knowledge is ‘fixed’, rooted and therefore connected to the decisions and processes undertaken during the creation of a dance work.

*Expertise and the Archive*

Melrose’s notion of the ‘expert practitioner’ is key in exposing an archival gap when considered in conjunction with ideas of the archive. The tension between the body as a storehouse for knowledge and the archive as a place of permanence has led Melrose to argue against the archive’s tendency to ‘highlight product rather than process’ because the archive, typically ‘intervene[s] not only after the production of the work, but after its evaluation (and selection) by others’ (2007: 75). This same limitation was discussed earlier in relation to Lepecki’s examination of the works of Move and Tolentino.

Melrose’s argument is specifically arranged with the archive in mind. She argues for:

> a realignment of documentation, away from product and into decision-making processes, where [...] the complex processes I have described tends to prioritise the operations of expert intuition, along with a whole series of constantly renewed evaluative mechanisms, and that these operations tend, as far as documentation is concerned, to be invisible.

2007:6

This perspective locates one of the key issues in presenting a rationale for the role of the body as archive by noting that the archive does not allow space for information gathered through the multiple aspects of the making process or ‘where expert decisions come from’ (ibid: 77). This gap was highlighted in the work of Tolentino in her approach to corporeal archiving.
taking place in and during performance, as opposed to throughout the making process. The complexity in this approach resides in the fact that for Melrose, the expertise inherent in the making of dance performance cannot be removed from the work, as for her ‘expertise seems to be ‘held’, and to be internalised, in such a way that others can only see it in the quality of its enactments’ (2007: 6). Valerie Preston-Dunlop also claims that the ‘core of the dance’ should be present in each performance and this is manifest in ‘trace’ which should be ‘hidden [...] unrecognisable [...] irretrievable by someone else’ (1998: 21-22). These perspectives recognise that knowledge of dance is inherently embodied and visible in the performed work but cannot be recorded in any other tangible format.

The notion of the ‘expert practitioner’ directly challenges Lepecki’s concept of the ‘body as archive’ as a corporeal archive where knowledge can be repatriated from one body to another because Melrose’s argument observes that it is not possible to extract certain elements of the work from the originating practitioner. Melrose’s notion is therefore more synonymous with the principle of provenance as she is valuing the practitioner as the source of embodied knowledge in terms of the origination of a dance work. Her valuing of the body as a living record of dance-making process and a marker of dance expertise assists in the exploration of the meaning of ‘archival value’ in this thesis. Moreover, she acknowledges the dispersion of expertise across multiple stakeholders of the performance. However, in later work she highlights the instability of shared knowledge as it destabilises the ability to locate the ‘exact source’ because the invention of a moment (when collaboratively conceived) ‘is rarely quarrelled over at the time, and they may not recall, when interviewed who said or did what’ (2009: 30). Whilst this viewpoint somehow contradicts the idea of expertise being internalised as Melrose is questioning the reliability of remembering artistic decisions, she reminds us that the body, as a lived entity, cannot be relied upon as a record of all of its past, just as ephemeral acts leave no complete trace. However, her observations recognise that ‘engagement with the making processes’ create ‘sensory positions and intelligible meanings” specific to the practitioner’s understanding and undertaking’ (2007:17) which cannot be obtained by those who were not present during the process. For example, a moment in the choreography may depend upon physical contact with the floor, or another body in space. This sensory
interaction may form part of a choreographic pattern that enables the performer to progress into the next movement, or it may form a trigger to another part of the choreography, or signal a change in dynamic, that has been devised and learned during the making process.

**Expertise and Value**

Melrose’s notion of the ‘expert-practitioner’ problematises Lepecki’s theoretical approach to the body as archive because she identifies that knowledge is inherent in the work of the practitioner and cannot be repatriated elsewhere, meaning that the work of Move and Tolentino can never represent a complete archive and the ‘intelligible meanings’ of the work are invisible and inaccessible. It is clear that Tolentino is able to repeat and embody the movement action executed primarily by Athey, but Melrose hints that more knowledge is to be had considering that Athey’s body is the site of expertise; it carries the signature of his work. The question of how this expertise resides within the notion of archive and the body is of particular interest to my investigation as it offers another layer to notions of inherent value. This layer is constructed of knowledge gained through process, choreographic expertise, lineage and sensory experience and is not always visible and therefore evades the tangible archive. Additionally, for Melrose, ‘process threads and thematic threads are partly revealed [...] and based on a sense of rightness these are likely to be taken up, tested, retained or cast aside (2009:32). This idea is suggestive of the role of the making process in constructing epistemological knowledge that is of value because it is a source of information about decisions made but that remains invisible. The example referenced at the start of this chapter, of an elderly lady recalling movement that she danced as a child and into early adulthood, illustrates how there are multiple layers to the archive that we do not see. In particular, that the body carries with it expertise in terms of a set or pattern of processes that lead to a performance, in dance this might range from the acquisition of a particular movement technique, a collaborative method of movement generation or the use of a stimulus for the creation of movement as examples. In the interview that I cited earlier in this chapter (see page 88), the manner in which the interviewee entered into a movement gesture was imbued with layers of knowledge of how to arrive at that desired position and bodily elements such as breath, balance,
muscle memory, posture and the ‘sense of rightness (2009:32)’ intertwined in order for the desired position to be realised (Melrose, 2007).

**Chapter Summary**

In this chapter I set out to address the following research question in order to identify gaps in the archival documents of dance:

What are the archival documents of dance?

I have drawn upon key ideas regarding the value of the body as an archival material in order to expose the complexities inherent in capturing material generated through performance experience. Taylor’s concept of the ‘archive and the repertoire’ offers a starting point for reconsidering where knowledge exists in relation to the practice of dance (2003). This paradigm also unveils a portion of information that belongs in the repertoire as being absent from the archive. Through application of notions of the body as archive as proposed by Lepecki (2010) combined with ideas of expertise in dance-making practice and performance (Fraleigh 1987, Melrose 2007) a noticeable shift in what constitutes value in relation to dance emerges. These ideas have contributed to an identification of archival gaps in relation to the archive of dance,

Through the discussion I have attempted to identify archival gaps in knowledge through a consideration of the archival theories outlined in chapter one and more specific examples from within the discipline of dance and performance studies. Laura Millar’s proposition that archival material is not limited to ‘information, record and event’ (2006) highlights the idea of gaps and I suggest that elements that are ephemeral exist within a portion of this gap. I have also explored the body as a mode of storage for some of the knowledge that typically goes missing within conventional archival practices. Taylor’s concept of repertoire recognises that the body might be capable of preserving immaterial traces of performance and Lepecki’s work on the ‘body as archive’ assists in developing understanding of the body as a suitable archival site. This is due to the ability of the body as a living entity to contain and exert physical components such as breath, affect, dynamics and emotion that can be considered as ephemeral aspects of the body as a ‘holistic’ phenomenon (Fraleigh, 1995).
This discussion has revealed that aspects of dance-making and learning processes are multiple and they construct layers of knowledge and experience within the body. These traces might take the form of memory, original intent, muscle memory, movement expertise and decision making, all of which can be considered to fall within the ‘gap’ between archive and performance. I suggest that these aspects reside within the original practising body, unlike in the case of Richard Move’s work as referred to by Lepecki (2010). I will continue to consider the value of knowledge inherent in the original body where a ‘sense of accuracy’ (Melrose, 2007) in relation to the movement vocabulary might be more valuable than that represented in the more traditional archival materials. Additionally, this discussion has exposed a gap between knowledge that resides within the original body of performance and the limitations of transferring this knowledge to another body. Therefore a gap is present because all knowledge generated through dance-making practice and performance cannot be transferred from one body to another.

This chapter has enabled the positioning of the body archive as potentially containing knowledge value equivalent to that contained within traditional archival contexts. The dancing body can therefore be considered as a supplementary source material. Exploring these ideas assists in moving towards an understanding of what the dancing body might have to offer as an archive in its own right.

I aim to build upon the notion of the body as archive in the following three chapters. I will consider the role of the original practising body in transmitting knowledge that is constructed through lived experience in chapter 3. I will then develop these ideas in specific relation the role of memory and spatial experience in processes of recall and remembering through the body (chapters 3 and 4). I aim to contribute new ideas regarding the role of the body in transmitting valuable knowledge that characteristically escapes the permanence of the archive and brings us closer to accessing material that resides in the gaps between performance and archive. I argue that the material discovered in the gaps may present significant value for posterity against which future dance-making in which reconstructive practices can be investigated.
Chapter 3

The Lived Body as an Archival Material

Introduction

In this chapter, I will continue to develop the notion of the body archive through exploring concepts of phenomenology in relation to dance. In particular I will draw upon concepts of the lived body (Merleau-Ponty 2002 [1962]) in order to illuminate the value of the original practising body to which I have alluded in the previous chapter. In Chapter 2 I discussed pre-existing notions of the body as archive, specifically in the work of André Lepecki who has claimed that the body offers the 'most moving support' for dance archival material to reside (2010). He recognises that the dancing body provides a site for archiving movement action of the body, originally executed by another body, but he does not problematise the ability to transfer all knowledge of movement experience from one body to another. I identified a gap between archive and performance as a result of this tension, suggesting that elements such as memory, original intent, muscle memory, movement expertise, decision making and ephemeral markers of performance reside within the original practising body. The gap between knowledge that resides within the original body of performance and the limitations of transferring this knowledge to another body contributes to the overall problem underpinning this thesis. I aim to employ phenomenological perspectives of the dancing body within this chapter as a lens through which the knowledge generated through dance-making, performance and practice can be explored further. I will outline the importance of the original body in dance and contextualise its place as the body archive in this thesis. This chapter responds to the following research questions:

- How does the original practising body function as an archival body?
- What knowledge is inherent in the body archive as a result of lived experience?

For the purpose of this research investigation, I have observed the revival work of Phoenix Dance Theatre and explored the methods employed in this
aspect of their artistic work through discussion and interview with company members both past and present. The methods of revival undertaken by the company within this research period have raised a number of questions regarding the idea of the body archive because of the value that is placed upon the input of the original performer(s) and choreographers of the work being revived. There are two strands to the processes of revival that I have observed in the main activities of the company. The process of reviving past dance repertoire on new generations of dancing bodies’ forms the majority of the work undertaken by Phoenix Dance Theatre. However, I have also observed the process of recapturing past repertoire from the original bodies upon which it was created and the re-performance of this work by those original bodies. The main focus of this investigation is on the latter example whereby the original bodies are engaged in a revival process, but I also address the complexities inherent in reviving historic dance works upon new generations of dancing bodies due to the different context within which the acquisition of dance movement vocabulary occurs. I draw upon the data gathered through both of these processes in order to explore the research questions.

Looking at Dance through Phenomenology

Phenomenology is a branch of philosophy that facilitates an exploration of ‘knowing’ as a process of embodiment. As outlined in the literature review, it has been applied to dance in the work of Maxine Sheets-Johnstone (1966) and Sondra Fraleigh (1987) in particular. As a practice of the body, dance-making processes are inherently embodied and these authors have encouraged new ways of looking at dance through first-person accounts. Phenomenology is concerned with immediate experience and its aim in the case of dance is to ‘arrive at meaning, perspectives of the phenomena of experience [...] which can be communicated’ (Fraleigh 1998:135). The writings of both Sheets-Johnstone and Fraleigh adopt the body-centric approach to philosophy that stems from existential phenomenology. They propose that the body in dance is not understood as a product of the world that it inhabits but a homogenous part of the world. For Sheets-Johnstone;

---

33 Both have been largely influenced by the work of Husserl, Heidegger (1927), Ricoeur (1950) and Merleau-Ponty (1962).
The meaning of any dance comes alive for us only as we ourselves have a lived experience of the dance, and is not the result of either prior knowledge of dance or of any later reflective efforts.

1979: 4

This statement outlines one of the key considerations when looking at dance through phenomenology, which is that it enables the separation of any preconceptions or biases towards the lived moment of consciousness. This is because a phenomenological perspective aims to strip away analytical or theoretical approaches as the primary mode for understanding consciousness and alternatively prioritises bodily knowing, leading to the capture of pre-reflective experience through the immediacy of being-in-the-world. This underpinning principle plays an important role in understanding the role of the body archive in this thesis. This is because phenomenological reduction is invested in the search for 'moments of insight into an experience when the details of 'being there' are vivid in feeling'. (Fraleigh 1998: 138). This claim offers an important distinction between phenomenology as that which describes the lived world from the perspective of a detached observer and the idea employed in this thesis that the observer cannot be separated from the world (Mickunas and Stewart 1974: 64).

This claim is central to the investigation of the body archive within my research inquiry. This is because I aim to explore the details or subtleties of 'being-there' with reference to the idea that elements can be re-traced through the dancing body through processes of re-living and revival. Phenomenology can assist in constructing an understanding of how the body, through the lived process of dance practice, can retain key corporeal properties that can be called upon as archival sources when reconstructing/reviving historic dance repertoire. These might include (but not be limited to) breath, dynamics, rhythm, emotion, eye contact, physical contact, weight, gravity, effort and kinaesthesia. Susan Leigh Foster suggests that the training of the dancer’s body ‘derives primarily from sensory information that is visual, aural, haptic, olfactory and [...] kinaesthetic (2007:237). These elements are imbued within dance-making processes which often rely upon and employ strategies that are centred on
the body’s ability to generate and engage in action with other bodies.\textsuperscript{34} In such processes, multiple layers of knowledge and sensory experience take up residence within the body and Fraleigh examines this idea through her description of the dancer’s experiential perspective:

\begin{quote}
 [...] when I dance, I am acutely aware of my movement.
I study it, try out new moves, study and perfect them,
until I eventually turn my attention to their subtleties of feeling and meaning. Finally […] I embody the motion.
\end{quote}

[1989]:140

This statement describes the process of acquiring movement knowledge through lived action, in a spatio-temporal context and articulates the different layers within this experience. Fraleigh continues to explain that ‘the dancer deals not just with movement but also with the motivational source, idea, or metaphor behind the movement, that which the movement will bring to mind’ (ibid: 141). Through these ideas, Fraleigh observes that dance is less ephemeral than she has previously assumed because it is considered to have a permanence in the repeatability of the movement she has acquired, which is able to occur through the body (ibid: 141-2). It is this perspective that I intend to carry forward onto the discussion, recognising that it is through the lived experience of dance movement that the body can be understood to preserve dance movement knowledge. Ultimately, the behaviour of the body in motion is at the core of Sheets-Johnstone and Fraleigh’s thinking and the phenomenology of dance ‘involves a dynamic engagement between bodily actions and reflective processes’ which reconnects with the body and ‘reawakens us to […] the simple act of being embodied in a place and a time’ (2006: 91, original emboldened font). This suggestion of a bodily awareness and its interconnectedness with duration provides a useful way of thinking about how movement knowledge stored in the lived body as Anna Pakes summarises:

\begin{quote}
 [...] we can perceive, think about, imagine, and remember the same thing on different occasions. This would be impossible if the objects were immanent in our
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{34} i.e. Dance Improvisation (see Blom & Chaplin 1988)
psychic processes, but is possible insofar as they transcend particular acts of perceiving, thinking, and remembering.

Pakes 2011: 37

These ideas resonate with notions of expertise within practitioner processes, as I have discussed in the previous chapter through Melrose’s provocation that the body is a ‘container’ for knowledge and carries a certain expertise (2007). I return to these insights later in this chapter within the discussion of inseparability.

The Lived Body in Dance

The notion of the body as archive in the context of this investigation is rooted in the idea of the body as a lived entity, as proposed by phenomenological theory. Sheets-Johnstone has employed this philosophical approach to dance because of the living context that the dancing body has with the world. Drawing upon the earlier philosophies of Merleau-Ponty (1962) and Jean Paul Sartre (1948), Sheets-Johnstone explores the lived experience of dance encompassing the ‘structures, such as temporality and spatiality, inherent in the total experience’ (1966:12). The interrelationship of the body’s experience in space and time is at the core of her explorations of the nature of the human body in dance, as she claims:

[...] if we wanted to capture the essence of the lived body in the experience of dance, then we would go back to the lived experience of the dance itself, for it is there and only there that we might discover the way or ways in which the lived body appears in dance.

1984:133

This statement is particularly resonant with the idea of the original practising body because it privileges the actual experience of ‘doing’ in dance practice. This notion is suggestive of the importance of the lived experience of dance as being central to the very movement of its execution. The lived body in dance can be understood as a non-dualistic concept, as Sondra
Fraleigh claims through the notion of the dancing body as a ‘minded body’ (1987: 9) in the holistic sense, body and mind are united in the lived practice of dance. Further to this, Fraleigh recognises that the lived body is ‘a body of action’ and that movement is the ‘realization [sic] […] of embodiment’ (ibid: 13).

This overall investigation focuses upon the work of one company and the genre of contemporary dance in particular and it is important to note, as Sheets-Johnstone has acknowledged that ‘there are many ways to be a lived body in dance’ (1984:133) because of the different uses of the body in movement and different ways in which the body is trained to dance (across genres for example). This perspective emphasises the exclusivity of the experience undertaken by each performer and in the case of revival work the tension between the original experience and that of the dancer in the present is highlighted. During an interview, Sharon Watson (Artistic Director of Phoenix Dance Theatre) explained that the work created by the company in the early years of its existence was so individual to those male dancers that if performed by different dancers:

[...] it wouldn’t look the same because those dancers weren’t trained in the same way, so what you’re going to get is something that is physically raw and you try and recreate it on dancers that are very refined so you are asking them to almost imitate something that isn’t naturally in them.

Interview 11.02.2011

In this statement, Watson notes the difference in the abilities of the original performers of dance repertoire to those attempting to recreate it. She claims that it would not be possible for them to accomplish the same type of movement because that particular way of moving is not natural to them. This perspective is particular to the conditions within which the company emerged, as Adair notes, in the early years of their existence, there were assumptions that the founder members of the company were not trained (vocationally in dance) because they had not undertaken the standard three year training programme at a dance school (with the exception of David Hamilton). Instead:
Their physicality was developed through a range of other experiences, including sports, martial arts and boxing. They played on the streets doing dares and taking risks and as they got older they went dancing in clubs and brought all of those influences to the stage.

Adair 2007:38

Watson’s point refers to this aspect of the company’s background as she claims that the dancers employed by the company in the present have usually undertaken a three-year vocational dance course which largely constitutes their dance training. As a result, the raw physicality that Watson associates with the founder members is expressed as being unobtainable as it would function as ‘imitational as opposed to natural’. These comments help to build the notion of the lived body and the way in which I position this as the body archive, because of the idea that the characteristics of movement executed by one generation of dancers cannot be replicated by the same generations. This illustrates Sheets-Johnstone’s point with regards to the lived body because the difference translates to multiple ‘ways of being in the world’ (Sheets-Johnstone 1984.133) which in turn reinforce the individuality of the body archive.

The concept of ‘being in the world’ as applied to dance by Sheets-Johnstone is adapted from Merleau-Ponty’s Phenomenology of Perception (2002 [1962]). His definition of this concept can be read through the statement below:

The body is the vehicle of being in the world, and having a body is, for a living creature, to be intervolved in a definite environment, to identify oneself with certain projects and to be continually committed to them.

2002 [1962]:94

This statement places the body at the core of experience; the body and its environment are mutually emergent and co-constitutive. Merleau-Ponty explains ‘I am conscious of the world through the medium of my body’ (94-
5) which in the case of the body archive implies that the body is both the medium through which we access the archive and the source of all worldly experiences, therefore the archive in itself. It is in the work of Sheets-Johnstone and Fraleigh in particular that the body in dance is observed as a ‘body of action’ (Fraleigh 1987:13) in the sense that ‘I live my body as a body-of-motion’ (ibid). For Fraleigh, this perspective, underpinned through phenomenological thinking marks a shift away from dualistic concepts of dance which claim that the body is an instrument with movement as its medium. Instead, Fraleigh upholds that ‘the whole self is shaped in the experience of dance’ (1987:11) which requires a ‘concentration of the whole person as a minded body’ not a mind in control of a body (ibid: 9). This perspective emphasises a holistic view of the dancing body and rejects dualistic ideas of instrument and agent.

For the dance practitioner, the lived body in action compounds multiple layers of experience which I claim cannot always be extracted for the purpose of the archive therefore must be considered as being exclusive to the body archive. In terms of how the lived experience can contribute to the notion of the body archive, ideas of how valuable information is constructed through dance practice can be explored further. For example:

The lived body, with its embodied intellect, feelings and experiences, has come to occupy the heart of contemporary performance practice […] recognising the body as belonging to a subject, thereby acknowledging its historicity and all its contextual relations as embodied within it.

Mitra, 2009: 41

This perspective upon the lived body in dance, as observed by dance practitioner Royona Mitra, is indicative of the main ideas relating to the body as an archive within this project. For Mitra, the body belongs to a subject implying that the body is a vessel of its own history and context. The rationale for this is apparent in her recognition of the lived body as a collective construct, in the sense of its history, experience and social/cultural circumstance. From Watson’s perspective, the revival work of Phoenix Dance Theatre embraces the idea of prior experience and contextual knowledge of the work, particularly where the spectator is
concerned. This is evident in her rejection of the term ‘reconstruction’ and preference for ‘revival’ because for Watson, ‘it automatically identifies with something that you’ve had an experience of’ (Interview 11.02.2011). Here, Watson offers the sense that revival might be a means of retrieving past experience as she employs the term in direct reference to a previous (or historic) experience of the work. Moreover, during discussion with Watson, she referred to a moment in conversation with an audience member who had explained that they did not wish to see a certain work revived and performed by a different generation of dancers which meant that that work ‘will never be done again because those dancers will not step back in that studio to produce that work’ (ibid). This raises an interesting tension in terms of the value of performance work in a body other than that within which it was originally conceived and performed.

Transferring Knowledge between Bodies

Lived body concepts assist in recognising the tension between the knowledge inherent in the original practicing body and that which is transferred from one body to another, a process that is frequently the case in dance revival processes and re-enactments, as described by Lepecki in his work on the ‘body as archive’ (2010). This difference is noticeable in the work that Phoenix Dance Theatre has recently carried out. In 2010 the company revived a piece of historic repertoire entitled Haunted Passages which was originally choreographed by Philip Taylor for the company in 1989. This particular revival is particularly interesting to draw upon because Watson had been an original cast member in 1989 in one of her first roles as a company dancer. Therefore, Watson’s role in relation to this choreography was from a different perspective and the transference of this work onto the bodies of a new generation of Phoenix dancers offers some insights into the place of her original experience during the revival process.

The dancers who performed the revival of Haunted Passages in 2010/2011 were introduced to the work through video footage in the first instance and learnt the vocabulary in the studio under Watson and Tracy Tinker’s (rehearsal director) direction. Following this, Taylor himself came to work with the dancers in the studio, teaching and refining the choreography in preparation for the performances within the forthcoming tour.

---

35 This work was originally created and performed by Nederlands Dans Theatre II in 1981
When asked about how much of her own knowledge of this work Watson shared with the company dancers, her response suggested that this would be counter-productive because her own experience of the work was very different. Watson relays a conversation with Azzurra Ardovini who was dancing the role that Watson had danced 22 years previously:

[...] your experiences are very different so what you hang on that information is not something I can give you I can share it with you but you’re going to have to find your own language [...] we can compare notes later.

Interview 11.02.2011

Here, Watson refers to Ardovini’s own process of making sense of the choreography and claims that it is not possible for her to ‘give’ her own knowledge of the work to Ardovini, rather this is something she has to endure and configure through her own individual experience of the work. This is suggestive of the inextricability of Watson’s own learning processes and choices to the original experience because she did not feel it was appropriate (or possible) to share this with Ardovini before she herself had experienced the repertoire upon her own terms. Interestingly, Ardovini described the process of learning and performing *Haunted Passages* within her MA thesis and the challenges she felt in relation to the fact that this was what she refers to as an ‘archive piece’ (2012). Ardovini recognises that the main challenge she faced was in executing the neo-classical style of the dance and notes her surprise at discovering that Watson also recalls experiencing this same difficulty during her first encounters of the work. At first, this connection seems fairly serendipitous but in light of the fact that both had experienced this challenge within separate contexts contributes towards the notion of the body archive. This is because Watson’s inability to pass on this knowledge to Ardovini was a result of her recognition that Ardovini had not arrived at this point in the same manner as Watson, their training backgrounds and embodied dance knowledge and experience prior

---

36 A short edited video featuring extracts of footage and interview extracts with Philip Taylor is available at [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=83r2EV_comA](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=83r2EV_comA)

37 The company often use the phrase ‘archive piece’ to refer to historic works selected for revival.

38 Neo Classical Ballet emerged in the early 1900s-1920s
to their separate involvements in *Haunted Passages* largely differed. Considering that dance ‘is created anew in each action of the dancer and in the perpetual enactment of another’ it was important for Ardovini to experience the work through her own lived body because dance ‘leaves nothing concrete-as object-behind’ (Fraleigh 1987: 48). Watson’s body archive could not have suitably passed the knowledge of overcoming such challenges onto Ardovini because it is so inherently embodied, the physical action needs to take place in order for the body to store and access this knowledge for future reference. This idea is reinforced through the comment; ‘When certain steps proved particularly difficult for me to execute, repetition was the most effective method to master them’ (Ardovini 2012: 16). Through practicing the movement, Ardovini felt that she was more able to embed the movement knowledge for future practice and recall. She also explains that when working with the original choreographer she gained an ‘enhanced empathy towards a choreographer’s style’ which assisted in taking ‘ownership of movements that were not created specifically for their body’ (2012: 16). This is an important observation as it suggests that the value of working practically alongside the choreographer, as a source of expertise in relation to the choreography enhances the learning experience for new generations of dancers. Watson also claimed that where it is possible to bring back the original choreographer of the work, she is able to bring the work back ‘in its full glory’ because of the embodied knowledge of the work that they have retained (Interview 11.02.2011). Sondra Fraleigh’s work helps to underpin this idea through the claim that the dance and the dancer are inseparable (1987) which echoes the idea that ‘expertise’ and ‘signature’ are inextricably bound to the body of the practitioner. These ideas provide further support for re-considering the notion of the body as archive through closer scrutiny of the elements that can be recalled and re-awakened in the original practitioner’s, or in this case, the choreographer’s body.

**The Past, Present and Future Body**

One of the key principles in Merleau-Ponty’s *Phenomenology of Perception* is the notion of ‘being in the world’ which connects the body with time and space, reinforcing its temporality through the notion that the ‘present does not cancel its past, nor will the future cancel its present’ (ibid: 81). This idea has been adopted in the work of Fraleigh in her phenomenological
approach to dance. For Fraleigh, the body is not ‘devoid of past and future, since both are lived as part of the present’ (1998:135) inferring that the body as it experiences the present moment, bridges both past and future. In the case of dance especially, the temporal, spatial-presence of the body is what facilitates movement but simultaneously renders the lived experience as ephemeral, in flux, fleeting. Elsewhere, Sheets-Johnstone reinforces the inextricable link of the dance and the dancer as she underlines the fact that a dancer ‘takes his body with him’ and ‘if the dancer is not present in any lived, dynamic sense, then the dance can hardly be’ (2009: 307). She makes this point in response to Merleau-Ponty’s claim that in painting, ‘the painter takes his body with him’ and ‘show[s] how the things become things’ (Merleau-Ponty 1962 in Sheets-Johnstone: ibid). Sheets-Johnstone expands upon this notion in the statement below:

If painting truly enlightens us about how things become things and world becomes world, then dance should enlighten us in correlative ways about movement and the animate world [...] it should be of particular concern to philosophers of art to question the meaning of that enduring practice and its genealogy [...] to know something of its origins.

2009:308

In this statement, Sheets-Johnstone is referring to the wider problem of understanding the historical lineage of dance as a form of art and more broadly its evolution from movement of the human body to its development into more performative, cultural platforms. Nevertheless, this notion enables synergies to arise between the idea of how dance practices endure and the affect that this has upon the ability to gain insights into its ‘origins’. The idea of the endurance of a practice translates to the sense of a historical lineage of movement stored within the body, and I argue that this perspective is relevant to the overall inquiry into the functioning of the body archive in this thesis as it illuminates how experience of movement might be rooted in the body over time.

39 For example in the work of Suzanne Langer (1957)
In terms of the idea of the body as bringing past, present and future as Merleau-Ponty has done enables a reading of these subtleties inherent in simple movement actions such as running and walking as being unfixed to either past, present and future, rather they are of the present, experiencing moment, lived and perceived as opposed to existing in external time. This perspective sits in tension with the idea that the body might function as a container for knowledge (Melrose, 2007) whereby traces of dance movement experience reside for future recall as it privileges the precise moment of experience. In terms of the revival work of Phoenix Dance Theatre, the preservation of dance experience in the body of the original dancer and that of the dancer learning the choreography as new movement offers an interesting insight into the idea that the dancing body is a ‘container for knowledge’ as proposed by Melrose (2007). Watson described watching Ardovini execute the movement of the choreography that she had originally learnt over twenty years earlier as an ‘outer-body experience’ and explained that:

I think what’s registered in my body in terms of even the absence of the timings [it] is still in my body [...] the slight differences in where a dancer would put an emphasis on a particular movement, or how they will soften something [...] its how close to the body it comes as opposed to just very subtle differences.

Interview 11.02.2011

Through further analysis of these comments, I consider Watson’s statements to be indicative of some of the knowledge that she has retained and is reminded of when observing another dancer executing the same movement as she has done with Ardovini. When she refers to the absence of timings, she is noting that she has watched Ardovini perform the movement without any verbal instruction with regards to the timings of the movement but still she is able to understand through her own embodied experience the correct counts for the movement/steps. In addition she notes the subtleties of how another dancer adjusts the choreography and where accents are placed differently to where she herself had placed them as a dancer. This illustrates the ability of some aspects of the original to remain and to be echoed in another’s
body yet, inevitably they take on a new rhythm and interpretive perspective. However, the actual archival source of the original knowledge is still preserved within the original body.

Questions of expert spectatorship also arise here, in terms of Melrose’s notion that for knowledge of dance-making practices and the subtleties of movement execution to be encompassed by the archive, a greater sympathy towards the hidden attributes of dance-making processes is required (2007:77). In Watson’s case, it is clear that there is knowledge of the original experience of the work that is reinforced through the notable difference in another dancer’s execution of it, who has endured a learning process different to that undertaken by Watson. Melrose’s concepts illustrate that knowledge is retained in the body as a result of choreographic expertise and processes of making dance that leave an attainable trace in the body and in the actual work itself. The notion that these cannot be extracted from the body or the work is an idea that resonates with lived body concepts as theorised in specific relation to dance. Most notable is her notion of the ‘expert practitioner’ whereby the performing body signals ‘expert or professional intuition’ through ‘invisible qualities - e.g. ‘soul’, ‘mind’, psyche, ‘purpose’, even ‘dance expertise” (2006, available online).

This perspective can be developed through the explanation below which recognises that the workings of performance making are closely bound to the personal experience of the body:

> From the watched comes the folklore of practice…preserved in memory as anecdote and analects and revealed in discussion and interview and in personal archive as diary and notebook.

Pearson & Shanks 2001: 57

The idea of a folklore of practice that is stored in memory and anecdotal traces that can be made available through modes of communication such as discussion and interview is an important observation as it resonates with the idea that memory is constructed and articulated through triggers and active processes of recall as is upheld in Millar’s archival theories (2006) . This is applicable here as interview and discussion are processes that also occur within a lived context, discussions and interviews carry the spontaneous qualities and dynamics of conversation that emerge from the
moment of encounter and real-time responses to prompts or questions that trigger memories and knowledge of past experience. The overall point here is that the folklores of practice as Pearson and Shanks suggest are recorded in formats other than those in the traditional archive. In the case of dance this relates to the idea proposed by Melrose that practitioner undertakings are multiple and varied and moreover are individually owned (2007:77). They may be conjured in a collaborative making process, in dance through choreographic exercises, improvisation techniques all of which involve a process of trial and error, the dancer is familiar with different ways of working to an end result and maintaining/training their bodies to do so. These processes, according to Pearson and Shanks’ proposition are diarised and documented by the individual undertaking them and accessible through less fixed and circumstantial contexts such as conversation.

Phoenix Dance Theatre’s Rehearsal Director, Tracy Tinker has reinforced the exclusivity of knowledge in the original body undertaking or experiencing dance-making processes as she explains that in reviving historic repertoire, the dancer’s responsibility is to ‘recreate’ because they carry no trace of the original making process:

[…] I think that is what the dancers job is and if the first stage and I think there are stages in that recreation so I think the first stage is to recreate it as much verbatim as possible […] So you get the steps back, you get the musicality of it back, you get the subtleties, what it should be back as much as possible. Then you can go on to stage two which is making it your own. Hopefully the choreographer comes back and works with you and then they have the right, that their job at that stage to say ‘you know what this would look better if you try this, if that doesn’t work for you or take it onto another stage’.

Interview 7.11.2011

This statement outlines three main phases in the revival process from Tinker’s perspective and experience of working within the company. She claims that initially the dancer will learn as much as possible from the video
recording in order to ‘get back’ or reclaim the steps and movement detail as accurately as possible. However, there is a complexity here in the fact that the dancers are not always in a process of recalling and remembering as is the case of the Phoenix founder and early company members that I discuss in chapters 4 and 5 of this thesis, rather, the dancers are learning the material as new, through a different process to that which they undertake with a choreographer creating a new work, as was the case with Kwesi Johnson in 2011. Tinker’s statement recognises the impossibility of the work being replicated authentically\textsuperscript{40} but upholds that the choreographer is ultimately responsible, as the creator of the work, for working with the dancers to ensure the final product is as they intended. This is a complexity more broadly inherent in dance revival processes as it also raises questions about the authenticity of the revival work and brings the absence of the time of making into question, the main concern here is how the origins of experience are available and of benefit to the process of revival through the body archive.

\textit{Origins of Experience}

In this chapter, I am claiming that the original dance-making experiences undertaken by the practitioner reside in the body and can be considered of value to the archive in the context of the body archive. From a phenomenological perspective, Maxine Sheets-Johnstone suggests that ‘it is the immediate encounter which constitutes the foundation of our knowledge’ (Sheets-Johnstone 1979: 5) which recognises that the immediacy of experience has a part to play in the epistemology of the body. In addition, Sheets-Johnstone offers a useful insight into the notion of original experience as she explains that it is:

\[\ldots\] through the suspension of judgement or belief, one approaches the phenomenon fresh or anew, so that what is usually familiar becomes strange, not in

\textsuperscript{40} As has been explored in the work of dance scholars such as Ann Hutchinson-Guest (1995).
the sense of being foreign and unintelligible but in the sense of being original and untainted.

1979:133

This meaning that phenomenological ways of understanding dance enable the dancer to discard any preconceived ideas or rulings about the movement action, rather their attention is solely based upon the moments of movement, experiencing the action qualitatively without external narratives or imposed beliefs. The suggestion that this somehow creates a fresh ‘untainted’ experience is what is of most importance to the idea of the body archive I am claiming in this thesis. This is because it offers the sense of primacy, of the beginnings of processes of constructing movement. However, this idea also gives rise to a tension because it is suggestive that each time a movement is executed it is experienced anew, differently to previous encounters of the same action. This aside, in later work, Sheets-Johnstone claims that the kinaesthetic experiences of the body can be examined by the human body by paying ‘rigorous attention to what is actually there, sensuously present in our experience” (2011:121) as she explains:

[…] we begin by attending to ‘the things themselves,’ meticulously examining what is there, going back again and again in order that we may describe and verify for ourselves what is actually present in our experience and thereby discover and validate aspects of our sense-making that lie sedimented within us.

Ibid

This idea builds upon the idea of original experience as something that is deposited within the body and that remains therefore for the body to reference and continually re-experience what is ‘kinetically there’ (ibid: 122) from a first-person perspective. The idea of kinaesthetic experience as being sedimented within the body is particularly rich and resonates with the idea of the dance practitioner as a ‘container for knowledge’ (Melrose 2007). In terms of applying this idea to the notion of the body archive, as the original practising body, the archival Life Cycle model as I outlined in Chapter 1 of this thesis (see page 59) contributes to understanding how the
original experience of choreography might function within an archival framework.

The Life Cycle model divides the process of a record within an archive or records management repository into three separate phrases. The initial phase is regarded as the moment of creation which echoes the idea proposed by Sheets-Johnstone of new, untainted experience but that also in the case of dance carries traces of the circumstances within which it was produced (i.e. collaborative decision-making, Melrose 2007) or what is known as the ‘characteristics of its production’ in the life cycle model. Secondly, the record enters into an active stage whereby it has ‘maximum primary value and is used or referred to frequently’ by the person(s) who have created it as it has a key role in decisions made. In dance, this can be connected to the performance of the work; once the movement material has been registered in the body through rehearsal it is performed and enters into the repertoire of a company, such as Phoenix Dance Theatre. The archival model upholds that it is during this stage that the physical record will be located within the appropriate office requiring its active use. Therefore, as Sheets-Johnstone (2011) suggests, within this knowledge sedimented in the body, the dancer can revisit this information as and when it is required, in this stage the movement material is regularly accessed and executed, before it sinks deeper into the body’s repositories in the finite stage of its life cycle. The final stage of the cycle involves an appraisal or evaluation of the record, or material in terms of the value it holds for future use. It is at this point that the decision to destroy the document is taken, or if it should be retained in a semi-active status. This means that the material is still considered to contain value but that it is not required for future decision-making processes. This notion mirrors the idea of the dancer’s acquisition and long-term preservation of movement knowledge which is of particular importance to the revival process. Once that dancer has acquired knowledge of a piece of dance repertoire, they may be asked to recall it at a later stage, in order to demonstrate for others or if they are required to re-perform the work. This suggestion is particularly significant in relation to the notion of the body archive because it offers another layer to the notion of archive in the traditional sense. Watson notes that when the original choreographer works with the company, they are unlikely to be thinking ‘twenty years ahead of themselves, or thinking that the dancers are going to
look very different’ (Interview 11.02.2011). Therefore, they are creating work with the bodies present at that moment and often leave no additional trace of decisions made and the rationale for those decisions apart from through the lived experiences of the dancers themselves. Similarly, Watson’s ability to remember the subtleties of movement that she had learnt twenty-five years ago when watching another dancer execute the same movement phrase suggests that it has remained in Watson’s body, in a semi-active status and could be recalled should she wish to attend to the movement knowledge obtained (Bantin 1998:3). A parallel can be drawn here between the ideas of the life-cycle of a record or trace of original choreographic/movement acquisition as is the case in this thesis. Furthermore, the value of the original experience is reinforced because the choreographic process where movement knowledge is required can be considered to be as equally ephemeral as the final performance product.

**Inseparability**

Within the disciplines of dance and somatic studies, Sondra Fraleigh has also approached the inseparability of the body, mind and movement (Fraleigh 2004: 56) from a phenomenological perspective, seeking to reach the core of the phenomena (Fraleigh 1998: 142). In doing so she also acknowledges the body to be in process which she reasons through Heidegger’s notion of temporality, that the ‘past and future unfold in the present’ (Heidegger 1962 cited in Fraleigh 2004: 55). This idea has rich implications if we are to link it to earlier considerations of the archive as a link between past and present contexts (Craig 2002). She also suggests that there is a ‘hidden relation’ between the natural and social ‘extending the innate potentials and learned behaviours of human movement’ (ibid: 56). This idea can be traced back to those offered by Mauss (1973) in that it addresses opposition of natural and constructed bodily action. Similarly, dance phenomenologist Janna Parviainen has suggested that the ‘past is embodied in actions’ through the notion of ‘**Habitual** body memory’, functioning on a ‘prepersonal’ level (1998: 54), almost as involuntary action. The idea of innate potential is an interesting provocation as it implies that there is intrinsic tacit knowledge within the body, unaffected by the social:
Through the lived experience we arrive not only at the sense of any particular dance, but also at the essence of dance.

2004:4

Fraleigh’s concept of the lived body suggests that ‘dancing requires a concentration of the whole person as a minded body’ (ibid: 9), that both the body and the mind are brought to dance the value of which is depicted in the above quotation. Fraleigh’s provocations contribute to the discussion of memory and bodily knowledge as archival sources within this thesis in the sense that lived experience might bring us closer to the specific nature of dance practice.

For Fraleigh, the suggestion of transference between one body and another, as in Lepecki’s description of Tolentino’s work and as in the dance revival processes of Phoenix Dance Theatre that I have described above, is problematic when applied specifically within a dance context. Fraleigh (1987) claims that ‘the body is besouled, bespirited, and beminded’ [sic] and elements such as ‘soul, spirit and mind’ are not separate from what is regarded as the ‘physical’, instead ‘they are intrinsically tied up with it’ (ibid:11). Here, Fraleigh is reinforcing the perspective that the body and mind exist holistically. This insight is useful in identifying information or knowledge previously rendered invisible and unattainable in archival terms. The idea of soul and spirit in relation to dance could be related to the experiential qualities of a work and could also be considered to echo Melrose’s ‘sense of rightness’ because it is suggestive of the body’s sensorial, experiential responses to dance movement/bodily action. As I explained at the start of this chapter through reference to the interview conducted with an ex-practitioner, glimpses of the spirit or essence of a dance work can be viewed or re-invoked. Fraleigh’s perspective is useful in this context as it assists in identifying intangible qualities developed through the lived experience and practice of dance that can be explored further in relation to the notion of the body as archive later in this thesis. Fraleigh’s (1987) reference to what are considered to be ephemeral aspects (i.e. soul, spirit) arguably occupies a portion of the gap between the material and immaterial traces of performance that might be accessible through the practitioner’s body.
Lepecki has observed that ‘the body is archive and the archive a body’ (2010:43) which seems to chime with Fraleigh’s position that ‘the body is the dance, as the dancer is the dance’ (1995: 32). The main parallel here is between the idea that the dance exists co-dependently with the body just as Lepecki’s take on the archive is reliant upon a human body that is living and physically capable of executing movement, both concede that one cannot be extracted from the other; that dance and the body and the body and archive are synonymous. Lepecki’s notion implies that the body is what gives concretion to the archive as it facilitates the possibility for re-enactment through offering itself as a place where movement/performance can be supported. Additionally, the idea that the ‘body is archive’ recognises that the body is a place where valuable material (knowledge) resides. However it is this notion that presents a number of slippages through the examples used in his discussion, because the lived qualities of the body (i.e. the fact that it is not fixed in a singular time or context) mean that the material it contains is always subject to change, adaptation, forgetfulness and re-appropriation for example. Therefore, Fraleigh’s viewpoint is beneficial in terms of providing a rationale for the dancing body as archive because of her claim that ‘[...] the body is concretely there in the dance’. Her position emphasises the body as a living structure where dance movement takes place, further defined in the statement below:

The body is not the instrument of the dance [...] The body cannot be an instrument, because it is not an object as other instruments are. Instead the body is a ‘lived concreteness’.

1987: 32

This idea is framed through the body as a ‘mutable, changeable, living substance’ (Fraleigh ibid: 17) and Lepecki favours a process of activating the body, as a ceaselessly transformational archive. Both perspectives embrace the body as a site that is processual. Whilst this similarity is useful in offering justification for the body as a living entity to be considered as an archive, it also contributes to understandings of the gap between archive and performance. This is because the potential ‘failings’ of the body are not clear from Lepecki’s discussion, particularly the case that the body ages as it passes through time, and memory and physical ability become
compromised. For the dancer, injury or changes in the body’s abilities as a result of age or reductions in dance activity have a large effect on their ability to perform and accurately remember movement over time. Whilst it is necessary for the body archive to exist as a living being (as both Lepecki and Fraleigh observe), a number of issues remain that require further exploration. In particular, how feasible the role of the body archive when it is subject to the effects of ageing and decay, which in turn reduce the ability of memorial and experiential knowledge to contribute towards the gap between archive and performance. The lived qualities of the body form the crux of Fraleigh’s argument and her claim is that there is an inextricable link between the body and movement because the body’s concreteness, i.e. the body as a structure, is not separate to the experience of dance movement, rather, the experiential qualities of movement are ‘intrinsically tied up with it’ (2004:11). This claim supports the perspective that in dance, the body is not simply an ‘instrument’ for movement but a unification of ‘body, movement, self and agency’ (ibid: 13) in a holistic sense. This perspective is important in relation to the exploration of ‘archival gaps’ as a result of the limitations of traditional archival practices because it offers support for the idea that the body and the movement it executes are mutually inclusive. This holistic view of the body is central to phenomenological viewpoints of dance as a temporal phenomenon as Merleau-Ponty suggests:

The body is the vehicle of being in the world, and having a body is, for a living creature, to be interinvolved in a definite environment, to identify oneself with certain projects and be continually committed to them.

1962: 97

The point here is that the lived body and its environment exist in a totality and it is by mutual recognition and active experiences that they are ‘intervolved’. Moreover, ‘being in the world’ is a temporal structure and constitutes the ‘temporal structure of our experience’ (ibid: 97). Maxine Sheets-Johnstone applies this idea to dance practice as she upholds that analytical approaches to dance should not ‘shatter the totality of dance into externally related units, but focus again and again upon the wholeness of
the work’. The holistic nature of dance, for Sheets-Johnstone is identifiable in the structures inherent in the immediate experience of dance (1979:8). Here, the binary between the material remnants of dance, such as video recordings, photographic images, theatrical ephemera and the experiential qualities of the practice is reinforced because of the suggestion that the dance movement action cannot be extracted from the body through which it is lived and experienced is highlighted. This idea also contributes towards the importance of the origins of experience as preserved in the body as a key feature of the body archive.

Chapter summary: In this chapter I have explored the following research questions with a view to understanding the role of the body archive through phenomenological perspectives of the lived qualities of the body in dance:

- How does the original practising body function as an archival body?

- What knowledge is inherent in the body archive as a result of lived experience?

I have explored the potential value of the original practising body, defined as the body that has endured and encountered the dance at the time of making and played a part in the construction of the final product. In archival terms, this type of body might be considered as being more closely associated with the origins of experience and therefore offers a primacy or a source of provenance in relation to the final piece of repertoire produced. Through application of phenomenological perspectives proposed by Fraleigh (1987) and Sheets-Johnstone (1966, 1979, 2011) in particular I have observed the holistic nature of dance and adopted ideas that the once movement vocabulary has been taken up in the body it remains in order to be referred to when appropriate and moreover it is inextricable form the original site of its acquisition; the body archive. This notion was reinforced through analysis of interviews with Watson (2011) and in the written work of a company dance (Ardovini 2012). The combined ideas of both of these sources assisted in highlighting the value of the body archive as the original practising body rather than another body that did was not present in the original context of movement creation. The overall implication here is that the body offers potential for movement action to occur once it is sedimented.
or preserved in the lived body (Sheets-Johnstone 2011). The diagram below illustrates what I have determined to constitute the original practising body and the knowledge that is potentially available within it:

**Figure 5: The Original Body**

The above summarises the knowledge that I am suggesting is inherent in the lived body as archive, broadly categorised into kinaesthetic knowledge, sensorial experience, anecdote and a sense of accuracy. I have established that the lived body enables knowledge of the dance to remain, constructed through kinaesthetic, sensorial experiences that can be remembered on multiple occasions and remain in a semi-active state for future use. These aspects are dependent upon the body’s continuous unfolding between past, present and future and that neither one cancels out the other, the body is in a continued state of emergence, carrying with it the traces of past experience. In terms of how the body can remember and also forgets knowledge acquired, I will explore what I consider to be triggers or cues to movement knowledge in Section 2 of this thesis.
SECTION TWO
TRIGGERING KNOWLEDGE IN THE ARCHIVAL BODY

Prelude

On 11th November 2011, Phoenix Dance Theatre marked its thirtieth anniversary. In the spirit of celebration an evening of performance was curated, involving dancers from various stages of the company’s existence. A significant contribution to this event was from the founding members of the company. David Hamilton (b.1963), Villmore James (b.1964) and Donald Edwards (b.1963) were the company’s first members, with Hamilton as initiator and artistic director. They were later joined by Edward Lynch (b.1965) and Merville Jones (b.1964) and later Gary Simpson who also participated in the 2011 revival. In January 2013, I conducted an interview discussion with Edward Lynch within which he offered insight into the process and experience of reviving work alongside original company members. The quotation included below is an extract of the transcript from this interview, and it reveals the interplay of memory and dance practice that to be explored in further detail in this chapter:

[...] we did a reunion of the founder members in November 2011 after probably about 20 years of us not being together, coming back together to create something for that event was quite moving in fact, it was quite touching as well, we were in the studio for about 2 months working once or twice a week on an evening [...] members had to come all the way from Swindon, from Birmingham [laugh] but the five of us actually got together [...] it just...reminded us of when we first started back in 1981, you know just putting something together and everybody contributing to the idea and coming out with something special, but also capturing that uniqueness that we had when we first

---

Edward Lynch also joined the company board in 2009.
started so that was an amazing experience after years of not actually working together…

It was like being able to remember, remembering how we used to work how we put pieces together and its quite amazing 'cause quite a lot of the, the ideas or even some of the movement of the pieces that we did all those years ago again came back and I think that’s quite interesting to see that. I think its because we retained the movement because [...] with we did it so many times [laughs] you know when you do something over and over and over again it just becomes second nature really and I think because we performed those pieces and that kind of movement for a very long time it was like it just kind of like all came back [...] the most exciting time when we were rehearsing or something that happened which was quite amazing was one time when we'd learnt the choreography we had learnt the piece and then we all just, it just kind of came out of nowhere we all did the movement at exactly the same time, it was what you call you know that perfection when a group of people come together and they’re in unison, and we had only been working together for probably about 5-6 weeks one day a week and all of a sudden it just happened in that when we did this movement phrase and we all jumped at the same time our arms and our legs and everything, as if we hadn't been working together, it felt that we’d never stopped working together, that was the unity that we captured in the studio when we were rehearsing. I think we were all amazed we said as we were doing it you know obviously there were mirrors in front of us and as we just all said ‘did you see that’ it was just an amazing thing that happened, and it just showed the unity that we had when we worked together and I suppose that's what makes a company, when a company can
actually unify and come together and they are really tight not just in body and not just in movement but for me also in spirit as well because that was a connection that happened for me at that moment in the studio...

Interview 21.01.2013\textsuperscript{42}

\textsuperscript{42} The full transcript of this interview is included in Appendix 6 of this thesis.
Chapter 4

Memory and the Body Archive

In the previous chapter I discussed the notion of the lived body in relation to the concept of the body archive within this thesis, revealing that the origins of experience that reside within the original practicing body contribute to layers of embodied knowledge that cannot be extracted from the body. In this chapter I develop these ideas through exploring in more detail the role of the memory of the practitioner as having archival value. In chapter 2, I explored the notion of the body archive in relation to concepts proposed by André Lepecki (2010) and considered repertoire as a concept that identifies an additional archival strand but nevertheless does not encompass all material existing outside of the traditional ‘archive’, especially that residing in the original practising body as referred to in chapter 3. In the previous chapter, the experiences encountered through the lived experience of the dancing body were identified as key elements that tend to fall into the gaps between traditional archival techniques as a result of their non-verbal nature and ineffability. Through this discussion a number of issues were raised in relation to the role of memory and notions of value regarding the body as a lived entity and a site where knowledge is made available. In particular, the exploration of ideas proposed through Lepecki’s (2010) theoretical explorations of the body archive and Melrose’s acknowledgement of the body as ‘a container for knowledge’ (2007) highlights the potential of the body archive to capture the transient moment and store ephemeral markers in the body’s archival repository. However, the process of accessing material that resides in the body or exists externally to the tangible, traditional archive, i.e. in the repertoire, remains problematic, ambiguous and difficult to articulate. In this chapter I explore concepts and ideas of memory as a vehicle for unlocking and remobilising movement essences, qualities and experiences, and explore potential methods through which we can access the elements of dance/movement that are captured and stored within the body.
In the previous chapter, I focussed upon phenomenological perspectives of the body in dance as a lived, un-fixed entity that bridges space and time (Sheets-Johnstone, 1966, 1979, 2011 Fraleigh, 1987). This emphasised the changeability of the body’s ability to remember and transmit knowledge accurately and identified the potential value of the original practicing body when employed as a body archive in dance revival processes. In the concept of repertoire, Taylor notes that just as ‘individual instances of performances disappear from the repertoire’ (2003: 20) the archive can represent that which is forgotten, as materials are discarded through processes of appraisal in the same way that the body favours different types of knowledge. By taking on new memory, older memories sink deeper into the body’s repositories, therefore this implication for on-going value and the recollection of knowledge gained through original experience is a tension within the notion of the body archive. In terms of the shape of the dancer’s memory, studies in embodied cognition suggest that it is structured through three inextricably linked but individual segments of ‘auditory, visual and motor memory’ (Bläsing 2010:82). However, as McKechnie and Stevens (2009) acknowledge, much of the research to date relates to ballet - a highly codified technique which is more suited to systems of documentation/preservation in the form of description and notation^43 - whereas this investigation is concerned with the genre of contemporary dance that:

[...] frequently consists of idiosyncratic movement derived from the theme being explored and is less easily reduced to verbal description.

McKechnie and Stevens 2009: 44

This insight highlights the ephemerality of the practice and the difficulty it presents when attempts are made to verbalise aspects of dance-making process and performance and its transference to other media (i.e. written formats) in general. However, as Bläsing has suggested above, the preservation of knowledge that cannot be reduced to other modes of communication might be re-traceable within multiple aspects of the dancer’s memory. The discussion of ideas regarding the body archive in chapter 2 alluded to the value of memory as a source of archival information.

However, this claim was related to the ability of the body to acquire knowledge of historic dance practice and preserve it in their memory and as explained in chapter 3, I am concerning the notion of the body archive through first person perspective of the experiences of the dancing body. This is because of the knowledge or ‘expertise’ (Melrose, 2007) that is understood to be lodged or sedimented on the body and subsequently remaining as memories within the body archive. Taylor’s provocation hints at the potential issues with considering memory as an archive source. Yet for Lepecki, the body represents the ‘most moving support’ for dance/performance archiving (2010:34), by which he means the body is a suitable site for material that ‘moves’ and offers the level of motility required for movement to take place. Others have hypothesised about the value of the knowledge in bodies that qualifies the desire to retrieve it, in particular, concepts of bodily memory have been widely explored and Baxmann’s provocation that the body is a ‘seat of memory’ reveals that there is valuable knowledge in bodies that we want to be able to retrieve:

The body has been rediscovered as a seat of memory, because sensory, emotional and cognitive experiences are stored in movements, gestures and rhythm. This knowledge is based on oral and gestural traditions and is manifested in non-verbal expressive forms or artefacts.

2007:207

This perspective emphasises memory as a phenomenon that rests in dance as a ‘non-verbal’ practice of the body. Baxmann’s claim that memory is ‘stored’ in the multi-faceted experiences of the body raises a number of questions regarding the longevity of such memory and calls into question how we might access such memory. Bläsing provides further explanation of how memory functions specifically for the dance, whilst her example is based upon the practice of ballet; it provides some insight into the particular function of memory for the dancing body:

[...]the situation in the ballet studio in which the dancers learn the movement, the face and voice of the choreographer, the images he gives to illustrate the movement, the comments given by the other
dancers, the jokes they make and the questions they ask, are all stored in the dancer’s episodic memory[...]. This is the information the dancer would pass on if she had to teach the choreography to a new colleague [...] when the dancer practises the movement, all the sensori-motor information she gains is stored in her non-declarative memory’ and with each practise [sic] of that same movement it becomes more ‘automatized’ [sic] and ‘deeply anchored’ and as this is the knowledge she will rely on completely when performing the piece, it is crucial that it contains as much relevant and flawless information as possible.

Bläsing 2012: 83

Her connection of this idea to ‘oral and gestural’ tradition evokes the idea that such memory has the potential to ‘re-appear’ through the practising of such traditions and as such may depend upon this as a mode of access. It also builds upon the idea discussed in chapter 3 that it is through the process of learning and generating movement content that valuable knowledge required for future dance practice is deposited within the body. However, the feasibility of this notion is not made explicit in her premise that the ‘body is a seat of memory’.

In this investigation, I aim to explore the body as an archival material and in this chapter I propose that memorial knowledge as an embodied epistemological source can and should be considered as valid ‘archival’ material that is capable of complementing the multiple sources of information found in the traditional archive. Concepts of ‘living archives’ proposed by Pavis (2003: 45) for example recognise that the body might be understood as a living record of knowledge and its traces of experience can be made use of as information sources in the present. This chapter explores the value inherent in the memory of the practitioner and considers the conditions within which such knowledge can be made visible. In the literature review section of the introduction to this thesis, I introduced key concepts in the philosophical study of memory, stemming from Bergson (1896) and Halbwachs (1992) in particular. Bergson’s philosophy forges
connections between memory and bodily action and it is the co-existence of these two elements within dance-making (revival) processes that is of primary concern within this thesis (1911 [1896]). Bergson argues that ‘recollection is capable of blending so well with the present perception that we cannot say where perception ends or where memory begins’ (in Guerlac 1991: 106). His theories surround the division of memory into two distinct categories, these being ‘automatic’ and ‘image’ memory. The former is what is most relevant to this investigation as it is considered to be the ‘memory of the body’ which is ‘produced through repetition and occurs as repetition’ (ibid) in a habitual sense as opposed to image memory which retains the past in images ‘that carry the mark of the unique moment in which they were lived’ (ibid: 127). Furthermore, for Bergson automatic memory is said to perform the past in the present when a habitual action is repeated (ibid). The idea of ‘automatic’ memory is relevant to this investigation as it implies that the movement of the body might serve as a trigger to memory.

In order to extend the discussion regarding the relationship between bodily action and memory, I have also referred to the work of sociologist Maurice Halbwachs (1992) who developed the concept of collective memory within which he claimed that the process of recalling memory is always mediated through social experience. Following this, Ricoeur defined this notion as ‘a collection of traces left by the events that have affected the course of history of the groups concerned’ (ibid: 119). Both authors claim that recalling memory is a shared process and Halbwachs in particular offers some important definitions of the ways in which groups of individuals remember, suggesting that it is dependent upon the collective recollection of a shared experience. Therefore, this key premise provides a means through which the understanding of the role of the body’s memory can be extended and developed within this chapter.

The definitions of memory provided by these scholars underpins the discussion in this chapter which draws upon examples of dance-making process and practices undertaken by Phoenix Dance Theatre during several periods of observing dance revival processes and through discussion and interview surrounding such practices (such as that included in the prelude to this section of the thesis). I also employ more recent debate surrounding the relationship between archives and memory and in
particular, ideas of archival materials serving as triggers or ‘touchstones’ to memory (Millar, 2006).

This chapter explores the following research questions:

- What knowledge is inherent in the memory of the dance practitioner?
- Where does this memory reside and through what methods can it be recalled and accessed?
- Can the memory of the dance practitioner be considered as ‘archival’, and how does it exist in relation to the archive?

I consider these questions with reference to three key themes; these include the exploration of the relationship between collective experience and memory in the body, the role of collective experience, between performers and audience as a trigger to memorial knowledge stored within the body. Finally, I explore how memory is preserved through ritual, behaviour, habits, relationships and roles, including group dynamics and hierarchies and consider the influence these can have in triggering memory of dance movement and experience.

**Memory, Duration and the Mnemonic**

Through his consideration of the relationship between memory and duration, Henri Bergson embraces the temporality of the body through his suggestion that memory is not absent from the body as it experiences the present. Rather it becomes apparent in the moment of action, as is conveyed in his observation that the body is a ‘center [sic]) of action’ (1911:4). Bergson proposes that the body is an aggregation of the ‘material world’, that it exists within as ‘it receives and returns movements’ and has the ability to automate necessary actions in response to its environment (ibid: 5-6). Bergson’s ideas are useful within the context of this chapter as I aim to explore how memory exists within the body and how it employs multiple modes of recall. Investigating the accessibility of past memories in the present and how this might be connected to the actions of the body can be applied to the ideas of preserving memory in the dancing body over time, as I will continue to explore in this section.

In regards to the memory of the dancing body, it is becoming commonplace for archival materials that exist post-performance to be understood as
‘mnemonic devices’ (Melrose, 2006) a notion which is supported by archival theorist Laura Millar who claims that archival materials can be understood as ‘touchstones’ to memory (2006, also see page 39 of this thesis). Drawing upon historian Jacques Le Goff’s identification of speech, images and gestures as mnemonic materials, Joseph Roach has argued that each has the ability to ‘supplement or contest’ the authority of “documents” (in Roach 1996: 11). This argument reinforces the overall inquiry into the functionality of the body archive and assists in rethinking the long term value of such ephemeral phenomena. Roach claims that an important strategy of performance research today is to juxtapose living memory as restored behaviour against a historical archive of scripted records (1996:11). In his explanation of restored behaviour, Roach also references Ngugi wa Thiong’o’s concept of ‘Orature’ which is said to comprise a range of forms that may be invested variously in gesture, song, dance, processions, storytelling, proverbs, gossip, customs, rites and rituals, but are nevertheless:

[...] produced alongside or within mediated literacies of various kinds and degrees [...] orature goes beyond a schematized opposition of literacy and orality as transcendent categories; rather it acknowledges that these modes of communication have produced one another interactively over time…

ibid: 11-12

This statement suggests that aspects of the archive (as written, textually based materials) and the repertoire as lived; ephemeral phenomena are required to function co-dependently in order to generate knowledge. Not only do these ideas create a link between archives, performance and memory but they seem to endorse the interpretive nature of the archive, presenting the subjectivity of archival practice and encounter in a more positive light than those outlined in chapter 1 (Jenkinson 1922, Forde 2007). This distinction represents an important shift in our understanding of the documents of dance as sources that are less ‘fixed’ and perhaps more malleable and therefore valuable in the case of dance. I propose that this recent interpretation of archives as mnemonic tools has emerged in light of
the difficulty experienced in gaining valuable knowledge from the material typically available in the archive of dance. This notion forms the point of departure for my argument regarding the body as a valuable source material. Through this proposition I am challenging the very notion of ‘source materials’ or, as Pearce-Moses would argue, materials with ‘intellectual substance’ or ‘resources’ (2012, available online). The emergence of what Melrose (2006) and Roach (1996) in particular are claiming to be cues to memory represents a dispersion in the type of historical sources that we might look to in order to gain knowledge of the past and therefore present a clear rationale for exploring the body as an archival material.

The (dancing) Body as a Seat of Memory (Baxmann, 2007)

The question of how knowledge remains in the dancing body has already led to the unpacking of ‘memory’ as a concept and how it functions in specific relation to the practice of dance. The body understood as a ‘container for knowledge’ (Melrose 2007), as a source of expertise, and as a product of the repertoire (Taylor 2003) highlights its role as a potential source of ‘tacit’ knowledge. Inge Baxmann has enquired as to how ‘tacit knowledge’ can be of use in the writing of dance history through attempting to situate its value as parallel to that of the ‘traditional’ archive (2007). Her work derives from Polanyi’s definition of ‘tacit’ where it is referred to as a dynamic form of knowledge that is continuously in flux and therefore unfixed (2004). Baxmann’s (2007) inquiry refers to a particular approach to the writing of dance history adopted by the French Archives Internationales de la Danse (AID44). Acknowledging the notion of ‘Body Techniques’ coined by sociologist Marcel Mauss in 1937, the organisation embraced the recognition that being a body is learned within the specific context of the socially/culturally constructed ways of moving and behaving to create a repository for dance that would be productive in practice. They related this idea to Mauss’s work regarding ‘Techniques of the Body’ (1973). His premise is that the idiosyncratic movements or everyday action of the body can be read as markers of the social and cultural conditions within which the body is placed. This considered, the process undertaken by the AID aimed to broaden the knowledge available in the documents traditionally

44 http://www.cnd.fr/accueil
associated with the archive by creating opportunities for exchange between practitioners and theoreticians across disciplines. The approach sought to recognise the context within which historical dance practice took place, as a physical process as opposed to attempting to understand it through the lens of static, fixed materials (ibid: 207-208). The integration of the ‘tacit’ into this archival approach led Baxmann to posit that:

The body as a seat of memory, a storehouse for knowledge about movement, sensory experiences and alternative sensory arrangements essentially called into question old-fashioned ideas of the archive.

Ibid:
211

From this, it is clear that Baxmann is placing value upon the body as a site where memory and tacit knowledge types are embedded in sensorial experience. She explains that our understanding of the archive is challenged through the recognition that movement knowledge is stored in the body. Because it is bodily based, this knowledge has fallen into the gap between the archive and the body but there is potential for accessing this information via the body’s memory/the body archive. The framework of the body as a seat of memory and a site where tacit funds of knowledge are located has the potential to be explored in relation to the ways in which material is managed within the ‘old-fashioned’ archive. Whilst Baxmann (2007) offers a sense of the modes through which knowledge might be stored within the body (i.e. sensory experience), the manner though which such information can be accessed through the body archive requires further exploration.

Baxmann’s premise is suggestive of new approaches to archival practices in dance through her incorporation of the experiential qualities of dance action encounter by the practitioner. More specifically, she positions memory as central to her understanding of the body as an archive which is becoming more commonplace across dance archival techniques and in guidelines for the preservation of dance related-material (ibid). For example, in 2006, the American ‘Dance Heritage Coalition’ (DHC) published
a guide to the documentation and preservation of dance. The guide describes memory as a product of ‘unrecorded evidence’, in contrast to ‘recorded evidence’ which constitutes the ‘dance documentation products that have a visual or written form’. This approach is well informed in terms of ‘proper’ archival practice whereby the notion of ‘fixing’ a moment in time in documentary form constitutes an archival record as a source of historical information (Petersen 1984). In opposition, ‘unrecorded evidence’ is ‘unwritten […] unfixed’ information that is said to be generated from ‘body experience’ in either performing or watching dance:

A performer who participated in a dance might be asked, years later, to use his or her memory and kinaesthetic knowledge to teach the dance to another group, with few other visual or written aids, or a person who witnessed an improvisatory dance might tell someone what he or she saw.

DHC 2006: 60

This definition of unrecorded evidence highlights the body as an alternative yet valid source of ‘evidence’ in the form of memory and embodied knowledge. The potential of the body and its memory as archival sources as outlined above is key to this overall debate as it marks a shift towards an acknowledgement of embodied, memorial and sensory knowledge as valid dance archival components. These elements of dance characteristically escape the archive as they do not comply with the principles that are built around the tangibility of a source and the role of transferring knowledge between bodies is raised as a method of preservation through the statement above. This point emphasises the role of embodied memory and knowledge in reconstructing or preserving historic dance practices.

Reconstruction and the Interplay of Memory

A specific example of ways in which we might re-view choreographic experience and witness memory recollection in action is through dance reconstruction or revival processes. Dance scholar Ann Hutchinson-Guest has claimed that dance preservation is not limited to the recording of a work (through video/notation) but also the production of the work through ‘the
Hutchinson Guest debates the archetypal terminologies commonly associated with the process of production from a previous recording. She explains that ‘Revival’ constitutes a process which mirrors that undertaken by a musician working from a notated score to bring a composition to life. In dance, a movement notation score is sometimes used as the recording of the dance work in the process of production, although video documentation is more common. Whilst the work that I explore within this thesis is defined by the company concerned as ‘revival’, much of the literature and wider practice of presenting historical dance works is referred to as ‘reconstruction’ (e.g. Franko 1989, Hutchinson Guest 2000). For Hutchinson Guest, this term is representative of a process whereby a work is constructed anew ‘from all available sources of information aiming for the result to be as close as possible to the original’ (1995: 65-78). Mark Franko explains that in the case of reconstruction, ‘its master conceit is to evoke what no longer is, with the means of what is present’ (1989: 58) highlighting the lack of the authentic as a result of the separation from the original creative context. These ideas reinforce the hierarchies within the archival tradition, whereby the materials that remain preserved, form the point of departure for revival processes; they are textually or audio-Visually based, as opposed to bodily based, including bodily memory.

Memory as a feature of the body as archival material has begun to feature within and inform new archival practices more generally. Just as Connerton’s work raises the inextricability between spaces as a mnemonic structure (2009), so too does Laura Millar’s concept of archival materials as ‘touchstones to memory’ (2006) because it positions new and alternate modes of access to archives as a challenge to the meaning and relationship of memory and archive. For Millar, the increased use of digital archiving marks a shift across the ‘association of memory, archives, and computers’ (2006:108). This is because the traditional metaphor of the archive ‘as memories of the past, kept in clear order in a particular place’ is altered through the different mode of access that the digital archive requires whereby information is ‘stored randomly but retrievable instantly through the magic of electronic alliance’ (ibid). There is an emphasis here upon the irretreivability of information via electronic storage systems. However, the dancing body also functions as a site for recovering knowledge and
ephemeral markers implicit in spatial encounters which facilitate the remembrance and access to information stored in the body. There are considerable parallels between the use of technology for archiving and the body archive in terms of ‘The computer’s ability to save, or lose, information at the touch of a button’ (ibid). Millar argues that this has caused a ‘redefinition’ of archival practices ‘away from the past toward a continuing present’ which disrupts the traditional ‘life-cycle- model’ as discussed in chapter 1 of this thesis (ibid). This model recognises three key stages in the life of an archival document which might be said to mirror the process of which a dancer acquires stores and remembers movement, as I discussed in chapter 3 (see page 126). Millar maintains that the underpinning factor within the shifting paradigms of archival management and uses ‘is an ongoing belief in a relationship between what we keep and what we remember’ (2006: 109). At the crux of Millar's point is the notion of a continuum between past and present running parallel with the complexity of memory over time and across distance and the processes of revival referred to in this thesis can be understood as disruptive towards the sense of flow and continuousness in the body.

Phoenix Dance Theatre: Dance Revival Processes

Dance theoretician Helen Thomas emphasises the incompleteness of the documents that remain post-performance in dance through the provocation that ‘revival’ as a process of bringing to life past works, reveals itself as an approach for ‘filling in the blanks which equates to a ‘more truthful picture of dance history’ (2004:34). In this thesis the term ‘revival’ is employed as it is the term favoured by Phoenix Dance Theatre in their practice of re-staging historic dance repertoire. The revival work of the company foregrounds the role of memory in such practices whilst also presenting a number of issues regarding the availability of information in the archive and the body archive. It also problematises the methodologies undertaken in order to bring past works back to life, including the access of memories of previous company members. The company does not have access to dance movement notation systems but continues to revive historical repertoire, originally performed in the later 1980s and onwards. Its current artistic director works to her own system of notating for the purpose of future revivals. This is an interesting point in relation to the notion of touchstones to memory in the
archive as modes and systems of notating are different for each choreographer/dancer/rehearsal director. It is likely that the creator of the notation (Watson in this case) is the only person who can make sense of the notes, as ‘personal archive’ perhaps (Pearson & Shanks 2001). This reinforces the importance of the original body that still remains in interpreting the choreographic notes. Under the direction of Sharon Watson, who was appointed Artistic Director in 2009, the company embarked upon a revival of a work entitled *Haunted Passages* originally choreographed by Philip Taylor\(^{45}\) in 1989 and re-performed in 2010-2011. In terms of the process of reviving this work Watson explains the method as follows:

[...] we gave the dancers the recordings of the shows that were done by the original cast and some of those steps were literally learnt [...] from the video [...] I think in terms of doing it from a video, they [the dancers] learn it verbatim in that sense and then the essence of actually the thing that is missing from a video is that you don’t get any of the dialogue you don’t get any of the language behind it kind of keeping the story to allow you to get into any of the characters, so great we have still got the choreographer around to get him in to fill those gaps.

Watson 11.02.2011

In this statement Watson observes that the video is the initial material used by the dancers to learn the movement vocabulary. However, she also reveals that the choreographer offers further insight regarding the dialogue and original languages and narratives that informed the work, highlighting their absence from the video and reminding us that ‘[...] the knowledge inherent in dance is notoriously difficult to capture and to document’ (Groves 2007: 91). Watson also refers to the fact that no ‘text’ exists on the video, that it contains no written detail or instructions and that it was important to bring the original choreographer into the studio to work with the dancers as a way of locating some of the original material relevant to that particular revival. This approach is highly dependent upon the perceived

\(^{45}\) It is useful to note that Philip Taylor is also from Leeds and explain dance training with early company members
accuracy of his knowledge and reinstates the hierarchical place of the choreographer as the creator of the original work.

Similarly to this, under the direction of Thea Barnes (when Watson was employed as a company dancer), as the company approached its twenty year milestone, an archival project was developed. The primary aim of this was to collate materials reflecting the company's development during 1981-1987 in a multi-media resource capable of blending information from ‘performance videos, newspaper cuttings, programmes, costume design drawings, photographs, and any memorabilia that will assist in the reconstruction of choreographic works during this time’ (undated memo, company documents). A number of textually based and video materials contained within the archive trace the development of this project and additional documentation offers further detail regarding the archive project and approach to reconstructing historic dance repertoire:

As part of the company’s preparation for the millennium, Phoenix Dance intend to make a comprehensive archive of resource material from particular pieces that strongly reflect the diversity of Phoenix choreographic history, The intention is to use the resource material to reconstruct sections of the works for performance and research.

Barnes, 6 August 1999

Barnes’s approach was to create a retrospective programme of dance works for which the archive became essential in assisting the ‘research process’. Within project correspondence, her vision is recorded as; ‘Phoenix Dance intend to make a comprehensive archive of material from particular pieces considered to be oeuvres that strongly reflect the Phoenix style’ (26 July 1999). This approach embraced the selectivity inherent in the archival tradition and diffused the sense of raw, originary material, as Osborne has commented, ‘it is what has been made available, what has been presented to us […]’ (1999:57) in the sense that the material has been managed and undergone a level of interpretation by the archivist before the user can access it. Adair explains that the programme which motivated this ‘archival process’, was ‘both a pragmatic and visionary’ decision as Barnes’ intention
was to present a diverse repertoire that would reflect the ‘wide range of aesthetics Phoenix had engaged with during its history’ (2009: 204-5). Barnes claimed that the programme (entitled *19: Rewind and Come Again*) enabled ‘the dancers to physically embody the history of the company, so they would come to have this tradition in their bodies […]’ (Barnes 2000 in Adair 2007:204). However it could be argued that, having not lived through some of the earlier traditions in their original manifestation, it would be impossible to fully embody these traditions through an attempt to repatriate material into a new generation of dancers’ bodies.

In order to accomplish her archival aims, Barnes claimed that the reconstruction process would ‘refer to both primary and secondary source material’ to include ‘performance footage […] press reviews, interviews with choreographers, musicians, designers, programme copy, photographs, original lighting designs/plots, original stage/costume designs, posters, television/radio interviews and other memorabilia’. Additionally, Barnes recognised the limitations of this approach as she noted that the lack of material available pre-1987 would mean that ‘research into the artefact’ (the work itself) would be undertaken by ‘speaking to the relevant people internally […] or by contacting relevant people externally such as ex-Phoenix members and business associates’ (ibid). This is an important distinction, particularly in the context of this discussion and wider investigation in terms of the exploration of the value inherent in the body archive. Though adopting this approach, Barnes reinforces a position asserted by Pearson and Shanks who observe that:

> Performance survives as a cluster of narratives, those of the watchers and of the watched, and of all those who facilitate their interaction technicians, ushers, stage-managers, administrators…From the watched comes the folklore of practice…preserved in memory as anecdote and analects and revealed in discussion and interview and in personal archive as diary and notebook.

*Pearson & Shanks 2001: 57*

The method upheld by Barnes is a reminder that the layers of knowledge stored through experience of dance-making and learning processes as I
have observed in the previous chapters in relation to lived body concepts and notions of expertise (Melrose 2007). The personal archives alluded to in the statement above can be considered to fall into the archival gap, their implicit, ineffable nature escaping permanence in a format other than the lived body as the most suitable place for such elements to exist.

Whilst Barnes recognised the lack of material relating to the early years of the company's existence, owing to the fact that it had mainly gone undocumented and what little remains is largely fragmented, she claimed that a combination of primary and secondary material would aid the reconstruction process. Her approach also privileged the audio-visual representations of performance that allow access to the moving image. Some of these types of materials have been critiqued in scholarly investigations regarding the performance archive. In particular, Matthew Reason critiques the role of the video as an archival material through the statement below:

[...] whatever the original purpose of any particular video recording of a live performance, its eventual and overriding function is more broadly and simply that of documentation - of preserving and making present to see and know something that without being recorded would be inaccessible and unavailable.

2006: 80

Reason also problematises the value of material such as photographic images as he recognises that dance images do not always represent 'a documentation of a live performance' as they are 'not a record of something that happened on stage in front of an audience' but that the 'form, subject and meaning of this photograph resides only within its own being and existence' (2006: xi). Reason refers to the work of a renowned dance photographer, explaining that the image often stems from a number of separate images that have been manipulated using a computer to produce the final image. This, he suggests, positions the image as being 'evocatively real' as it raises questions about the feasibility of the image as a portrayal of the actual performance (ibid). Therefore, rather than the image serving as indexical, it might actually be considered as performative in its own right; an
argument that has subsequently been developed by Philip Auslander, through his notion of *The Performativity of Performance Documentation* (2006). Whilst Reason positions his discussion in relation to the unavailability of performance post ‘live’ event, the tension between image and performance (and more broadly document and performance) translates to the wider problem of the fixed archive, live performance and memory.

Reason suggests that video is frequently used for multiple purposes, from marketing, archival use or primarily ‘to aid rehearsal processes’ as a research tool (ibid). He emphasises that one recording can serve a number of purposes; the recording is not always designed for its intended use. This is an important observation that is equally relevant regarding both the uses of video and the absence of video in dance revival processes because it highlights the difference in the intention of recorded material. A recording is not always made solely for the intention of reviving a work, it does not always follow that every work will be revived but where they are, recordings that may have only been made to serve as an archival record that a performance has taken place, suddenly become a learning material for dancers trying to embody the dance repertoire. Other scholars reinforce the different uses and interpretations of archival materials that stem from studies in dance history and the lack of ‘moving image primary source material’ (Nicholas 2013:241). Dance Historian, Larraine Nicholas reflects upon a process of archival mining whereby she is engaging with a series of letters written by a group of dance practitioners during the mid-twentieth century. She describes her experience as one that causes an intertwining of memory, previous knowledge and imagination and which is provocative in the context of memory and recollection in relation to archival materials:

> When I read Burrowes’ letters I see in my minds eye her face, her hair and her slim, toned body so it appears that mental imagery is arising from my memory of photographic source material...some of these images are based upon memory, integrating previously known source material into the current ones. Others have no basis in a reality I know of,

46 It is notable in the case of Phoenix Dance Theatre that subsequently to Barnes’ management, the amount of rehearsal footage available in the archive increased, peaking particularly during 2002-2007 (and increasingly in a more convenient DVD format).
remaining pure possibilities and often floating freely without any effort on my part.

ibid: 242

Nicholas explains a process of ‘trying to make images of their moving bodies’ and describes her attempt to ‘question aesthetic differences’ through imagining the feeling of doing the movements depicted as a form of ‘quasi-kinaesthetic imagery’ or ‘quasitactile mental images of the sensation, touching the fabric of a costume’ (243). It is significant that for Nicholas, the importance of constructing a memory through imagining the way in which a movement might feel highlights the centrality of the experience of movement to understanding the practice and its place in history. The attempt to feel how the movement is experienced through the body seems integral to her ability to understand the work on a thorough enough level, and in doing so she imprints sensations of the vocabulary into her body. She also identifies the ‘thing being danced’ (dance work, class) as ‘an event with its own motives and aesthetic features’ (ibid) that is inherent in the actual doing and engaging in the context within which the practice is placed. Nicholas refers to the multiple layers of engagement with archival materials and their role in producing an unreliable imagined memory of the work whereas those who had originally performed the work might offer a more authentic insight into the historic dance practice.

Present Experience and Processes of Remembering

In preparation for Phoenix Dance Theatre’s 30th anniversary celebrations (as described in the prelude to this section), founder and early members of Phoenix Dance Theatre returned to Leeds in the autumn of 2011 to revive historic repertoire originally created and performed in the early-mid 1980s. The material available to support the process was particularly limited. The quality of video recordings was poor, the remnants of material gathered at the time had dispersed and little remained in the actual archive. However, unlike the current approach to revival whereby the video is the first source of reference, Phoenix’s founder members approached the task through their bodily remembrances. Their approach provides rich evidence for the notion of the body archive. The group rehearsed over a period of approximately two months to revive extracts from a selection of historic repertoire

*Figure 6: Phoenix Founder and Early Members, Publicity image of Forming of the Phoenix © Terry Cryer, c1982*
Working together in the studio, the group undertook a warm-up and loosely agreed a schedule to which they would work, in terms of the phrasing of the overall piece. This was often based upon who was present and who was absent. Where there were sections of the work that required fewer dancers (duet/solo), others would rehearse either independently, re-learning the vocabulary, or would observe from within the studio space. The group repeatedly attempted full runs of the entire work, taking pauses where there were gaps in their progress or absent group members. The manner through which this process enabled the group to remember can be explored through Henri Bergson’s understanding of the body and its relationship to memory.

Bergson’s claim that ‘What I call ‘my present’ impinges both on my past and on my future’ (1896: 142) implicates the body as a bridge between past, present and future. This is sympathetic with phenomenological perspectives that situate the body as being in a continuous state of becoming. Merleau-Ponty summarises this in his claim that the body’s ‘present does not cancel its past, nor will its future cancel its present’ (1969:70). The sense of continuity and the idea of the body in flux offered through such viewpoints illustrates potential where memory is concerned in archival terms, as archives give credit to materials that are of ‘ongoing
value’ considered capable of sustaining links with the past, in a present context, therefore determining their eligibility for preservation (see Millar 2006). Bergson’s theories convey important observations regarding the body’s experience or ‘perception’ of the present moment, as he suggests that ‘memory is not accessed spontaneously, rather it is connected to the past through encounters of the present’ (1896: 197). This would suggest that the perceiving body actually activates memory, in a similar way to the collective process as the group functions as a cue to past knowledge and experience or, for Bergson, that perception creates an ‘occasion for remembering’ (in Guerlac 2006:119). This idea is represented in the diagram below.

*Figure 8: Bergson’s Memory Cone (1896)*

For Bergson, memory is embedded in perception as he states ‘Our perceptions are undoubtedly interlaced with memories’ (in Paul and Palmer 1911: 75) and the model above represents the implication of duration upon processes of remembering. In the diagram, the ‘P’ stands for the present and the ‘S’ is representative of the ‘spacious-present’ of the experiential encounter with the/an object (the body). The cone itself symbolises memory and the cords marked A-B refer to different planes of past experience which
reach further and further back towards the oldest memories that might be considered ‘unconscious’ and reveal themselves spontaneously. The model offers a way of understanding how a plane of past memories is re-invoked in the present (ibid: 152-162). It is particularly relevant here not least because of the dependency placed upon remembering historic dance repertoire in the revival work of the founder member group but also because of sense of spontaneous recollection conveyed through Lynch’s discussion regarding the process and alludes to the multiple layers of memorial recollection.

The plane (p) is representative of the action occurring in space and time, which for Lynch can be applied in the sense that physical movement was being recalled in the dance studio collectively amongst the group. Such a moment is evident in the extended quotation from Lynch in the prelude to this section of the thesis. Lynch refers to a situation during which the group were rehearsing a piece of choreography that they had been learning and he notes a moment of spontaneous recollection between the group, explaining that ‘all of a sudden it just happened in that when we did this movement phrase and we all jumped at the same time our arms and our legs and everything’ (24.01.2013). This statement is indicative of Lynch’s perception in the present of a moment in rehearsal, which is symbolised through the metaphor of the cone in the intersection of the point of the cone (s) with the plane (p) in the above diagram. Lynch adds that in this event, there ‘was a connection that happened for me at that moment’ whereby he was conscious of the unity between the group members through what Bergson refers to as the ‘sensori-motor mechanisms’ (where memory of the past has survived) that occur within the ‘shifting plane of experience’. The connection between the group became apparent to Lynch in the spontaneous recall of a movement phrase that was executed with precision, in terms of the group’s timing and the simultaneity of their positioning of limbs in space. This can be linked to Bergson’s concept in the sense that the memory of this past action is recollected as a result of its relevancy to the task in hand, gleaned through the ‘lessons of experience’. Edward Casey has claimed that ‘all experiences—“leave their mark” and ‘are made to be remembered’ (1997: 285) and the work undertaken by Lynch and other company members is illustrative of how the body might function as an archival repository whereby the past experience of the dance could be said
to have left its mark in a number of ways, through multiple layers of bodily experience stored within the body that can be drawn upon in order to remember past choreographic action - just as an archival record can be retrieved by the virtue of an archival catalogue and specialised storage.

Lynch claimed that there were ‘things’ that he had ‘retained physically’ (interview 24.01.2012), which describes the availability of muscle memory that is commonly regarded as a vital resource for the moving performing body. Practitioners rely upon this memory as choreographer Twyla Tharp has explored within her writings about creative practice:

Muscle memory is one of the more valuable forms of memory, especially to a performer. It’s the notion that after diligent practice and repetition of certain physical movements, your body will remember those moves years, even decades after you cease doing them. In the dance world, muscle memory comes into play every day; we couldn’t survive without it.

2003:64

Tharp claims that a dancer is dependent upon this type of memory because ‘dancers have nothing written down. It’s all in their heads and bodies’ (ibid). Thus she underscores the gap between the body and the archive in valuing the dancer’s body as a place where memory is stored in a form that is difficult to replicate textually or diagrammatically, highlighting the inseparability of the two. She recognises that if ‘muscles didn’t remember’ rehearsals would have to begin at the same point every day, i.e. it is by virtue of muscle memory that creative/dance-making processes are able to progress and if dancers were not able to access this type of memory then they would be repeating the beginnings of a choreographic process over and over again. This perspective resonates with Melrose’s (2007) concept of expertise and the body’s containment of the knowledge of a making process, and implies that this resides in the muscular memory of the dance practitioner.

In her writing, Tharp also refers to the length of time that dancers’ bodies retain information, though she does not specify what type of information and
how it is accessed. She hypothesises that if she asked a dancer with whom she had worked thirty years ago to demonstrate a dance they had performed in the past:

If she demonstrates the dance without thinking about it, she will re-create each step and gesture perfectly on the spot the first time, as though she were a medium in a trance. That’s muscle memory. The second time [...] she will hesitate, second guess [...] question her muscles and forget. That’s because she’s thinking about it, using language to interpret something she knows non-verbally. Her memory of movement doesn’t need to be accessed through conscious effort.

Ibid: 65

In this statement, Tharp is explaining how the dancer would be able to execute the movement independently without conscious effort because the movement is embedded within her bodily memory. She then refers to the different form this type of memory takes on when trying to teach this movement to another dancer/a new generation of dancers. According to Tharp, this is when forgetfulness occurs because the dancer is forced to think more carefully about what her muscles are doing in the movement vocabulary because she is passing it on, transferring it between her body and another. In comparison with the work undertaken by the Phoenix founder members, this presents a different scenario as the dancers were from the same generation and had all created and learned the movement together approximately 25-30 years previous. This was not a situation where knowledge was being transferred across bodies but a case of remembering between bodies. As Lynch pointed out in the interview, if the dance work being revived was a piece that he choreographed, he would have ‘retained that choreography, or [...] movement phrase, or however that movement quality was’ (4). In this statement, Lynch’s observations can be aligned to my argument that there are many layers of knowledge and his description enables me to identify three separate strands to remembering the original dance. Firstly, he implies that as the choreographer of a work, knowledge of the steps would remain and secondly he also notes that if a
dancer contributes a movement phrase then this is easier for them to retain, as it is where the material originated. Finally, his recollection implies that muscular memory facilitates the unlocking of movement knowledge. This is significant in terms of the idea of provenance and the original order of material as I outlined in chapter 3 (see page 98). Lynch’s ideas support the notion that ‘provenance’ as an archival concept applied to dance can be understood in relation to the dancing body, as the site where movement is conceived, constructed and executed for the first time. Lynch implies that whoever originally ‘owned’, i.e. created, the material is more likely to remember that material than the dancer who experienced it in a different way i.e. through being taught a movement phrase.

**Hierarchy and the Body Archive**

Hierarchy is a key ideology within archival practice that can be applied to the role of memory in the process of revival to illustrate the body archive in this thesis. As discussed in chapter 1, this principle is designed to enable related subject matter across archival materials to be kept together and subdivided to reflect the value of information inherent in each item (see page 70). In Bläsing’s work, she refers to psychological theory to explain the duration for which content is stored in the memory. Citing Baddeley & Hitch (1974), Bläsing notes that ‘Anything an individual sees or hears is available for several milliseconds in a sensory storage, like an after-image or echo’ before it is then transferred and integrated into short-term memory (2010: 82). She continues to explain how single units of this information register within the working memory and are known as ‘chunks’ and it is through the use of such chunking techniques that information can be organised into meaningful units, increasing its ‘efficacy’. In summary, Bläsing observes that:

Information whose access might be required for a longer time is transferred to long term memory, where it can be saved for many years, up to a whole lifetime.

Ibid
This technique of integrating knowledge into memory through a process of transfer into ‘meaningful units’ can be related to archival processes such as appraisal and hierarchy. This is because it is suggestive of a method of selection following evaluation of what should be stored for future use; however, it is not clear from Bläsing’s work the manner within which this information is stored and the difficulty in accessing knowledge of dance-making process that is deeply rooted in the dancer’s body is not problematised. The process is integral to the body archive of the final work because of the layers of knowledge that are gathered throughout the making period. The process is integral to the body archive of the final work as I am defining it in this thesis. The dance material that is selected for the final work is repeated many times in order for the knowledge to be secured in their bodily memory, but also, before reaching the decision of what to include and what to reject, the dancer will repeat previous versions of the material as they slowly change and get refined, and she might also dance and perhaps repeat material that is created and then not included in the final work, but still informs the work. In the body, there is a layering of muscle memory of both material that ends up in the final work and material that doesn’t, all of which sits behind the ‘expert-practitioner’s’ (Melrose, 2007) final performance but is lost in the records of the final performance. With this considered, Melrose has identified the archive’s tendency to highlight ‘product rather than process; and raises the notion of ‘archiving expert process’:

[…] the times of composition, of making new work over time…first is the time before making the work (when it is thought on, in some manner or another); second are the times of making itself; third is the time of finishing, and fourth is the time of the ‘finished work’, when it has emerged […] then comes the time of the archive.

Melrose 2006 (available online)

Melrose's point is that the archive contains work that is ‘already made’ (ibid) and therefore overlooks the groundwork involved in the creative process. Whilst Bläsing has suggested that the dancer retains knowledge such as dialogue with the choreographer, the knowledge retained in the body is
much deeper than this. The times of composition, as Melrose identifies above contain more than explanations of the impetus behind the choreography, the knowledge is deeper body-rooted knowledge that cannot exist in any other place than the original dancer’s body. As I discussed in chapter 3 of this thesis, it is through the lived experience that the original body is able to construct and reserve knowledge of the experiential qualities of movement repertoire. Parviainen in particular recognises that the body can recollect memorial knowledge through ‘felt quality’ because ‘body memories do not lend themselves easily to verbalisation’ (1998: 55). Hierarchically then, the origins of dance creation might be said to begin in the body and remain as embodied knowledge whereas the hierarchical organisation of the final performance as it is represented in the traditional archive will sit within a different structure with accompanying records, few of which will offer insight into the making process.

Interestingly, within such processes, the choreographer will often direct the dancers in the creation of movement vocabulary and therefore the hierarchy in terms of where the knowledge resides challenges previous ideas constructed through Lynch’s discussion of the revival process. The choreographer Kwesi Johnson worked with the company In December 2011 and explained how the dancers had had an integral part in the creation of movement for his work Soundclash:

[…] the dancers have been instrumental in giving themselves to the creative task and have come up with some fantastic material […] there’s loads of material that we’ve not used, but even though it’s out it doesn’t mean it’s rubbish it’s just not right for this piece – it’s gone on the ‘save for another day’ pile.

Interview 16.12.2011

This statement is indicative of shared choreographic process whereby the dancers are responsible for generating movement through their own bodies. It also reinforces the idea that selection of material means that much of what is generated through the process is omitted from the end product. This raises the question of where this material is archived. Particularly if the choreographer has not actually embodied the movement as it was generated through the body of the dancer(s). Johnson explained that he made use of his own recording device to document ideas and visual
references throughout the process, and the company also recorded much of the activity taking place within the studio. However, having not experienced the movement in the sense of the lived body, Johnson’s position as the original body is compromised and this level of hierarchy places tensions surrounding the original body and whether it resides with the choreographer or the dancer, or is fragmented between body archives.

Through my observations and analysis of revival practices throughout this investigation, I would argue that the hierarchical nature of knowledge storage is not aimed towards the preservation of knowledge within the body; rather it is a mode of recall and re-awakening. Moreover, as an additional layer to processes of remembering, concepts regarding the sensorial experiences of the body are rich with implications for the concept of the body archive considering that ‘sensation is the first glimmer of a determinate experience’ (Massumi 2002: 16).

In the case of the Phoenix founder member revivals, the role of the original choreographer in sharing and facilitating the recollection of movement knowledge can be considered through the lens of hierarchy and its application to the notion of the body archive. Hamilton founded the group and choreographed most of the company’s earliest works and during the rehearsals the other dancers took their lead from him in remembering movement phrases, Regardless of the time that had passed since the group had worked together in a studio context, Hamilton’s senior role was reflected in the behaviour of the dancers. During one rehearsal as the group came to the end of a run through of one movement section, the music accompanying the work included the lyrics ‘we want to execute political systems’. This sparked some discussion with regard to whether or not the group were trying to make a political statement in their work, referring back to their early years within the company where their identity had sparked much debate within critical dance circles and funding bodies and noting the number of changes the company had undergone throughout its then thirty year existence (see Adair, 2007). Villmore James had raised this point and Lynch and Edwards were quick to note that the group had ‘naturally progressed’ since then and moreover that aspects of the

47 The artistic team begin to record activities much later in the making process, when ideas are becoming more concrete, therefore not all of the process is captured for future reference.
48 8th October 2011
choreography had emerged from the culture in the 1990s, such as martial arts and the ‘boisterousness’ of their teenage years (Edwards). Following the discussion the group ultimately agreed that Hamilton should decide how the group would handle this shift in choreographic intent as a result of the altered context within which they would be performing this historic work. This moment highlighted the hierarchical nature of their relationship, whereby Hamilton played a central role in managing the group and leading the creative ideas of the company whilst maintaining a co-operative approach that was typical of the group in the early years of their existence.49

In standard archival practices, the primary role of the archivist is to interpret ‘documentary relationships (H. Taylor 1997 in Cook & Dodds 2003: 230) and in the founder member rehearsal processes, the relationships between the memorial knowledge available to each of the group members appeared to be central to their working processes. Lynch described the process as being easier because ‘different bodies remembered different things’ which emphasises the idea that knowledge is shared between the group and also relates to Lynch’s proposition that the person who originally choreographed the piece would recall it most easily. However, the group always sought clarification/affirmation from Hamilton, again as the senior figure within the group dynamic. Their reliance upon Hamilton in this way was illustrated in the manner through which phrases were recalled, with Hamilton leading. The group would follow him in a movement sequence and begin to remember it of their own accord, each of them contributing their own knowledge of the different actions as the sequence unfolded. I suggest that this type of process offers a new insight into the role of the body archive as it indicates how the most reliable of valuable information perhaps is filtered out from the original choreographer where the impetus or stimulus for the work originated. It appeared that choreographic knowledge of each of the works was fragmented between the bodies and the material that each had originally created could be recalled in the collective context and re-pieced together. I would suggest that this process of recollection of shared choreographic knowledge can be said to exist hierarchically, where subcategories of knowledge exist within the original performing bodies, as

49 This aspect of the group’s early choreographic process is explored in Adair 2007: 40-50.
subsidiaries of the original knowledge that stems from the ideas and choreographic direction of the original choreographer.

This notion is further extended through Millar's concept of touchstones as it demonstrates the production of archival knowledge as a process of re-invoking and reawakening knowledge as a result of the shared experience in the studio. For Millar, archival records:

[...] are not memories. Rather, they are triggers or touchstones that lead to the recollection of past events. And there is not a one-to-one relationship between the record kept and the memory it stimulates.

2006:114

This quotation indicates the plural nature of memory when accessed through interaction with archival materials, and in the case of the body archive within a dance revival context can be considered as a 'memory cue, prompting a series of recollections' (ibid). This series is varied across each individual and can be considered as contributing to a more complete source of knowledge, through the presence of all those originally involved in the process.

**Movement Retention and Recollection**

Throughout the conversation with Lynch, the idea that he had retained movement in different ways was continually reinforced and described. Barbara Craig's work on archives proposes that memory can be considered as a store of knowledge, for Craig, memory is a robust ‘mechanism that fixes items for later recall’ (2002). This premise resonates with ideas of movement retention and recollection within the context of this discussion which is concerned with the remembering of movement vocabulary through the dancing body. Lynch asserts that movement is stored in different places for different bodies. He claims that some knowledge is retained physically and some mentally. However, he continues to claim that both physical and mental capacities work in tandem in order to remember movement, reinforcing a more holistic view of the body; a view that correlates with the
notion of the body as archive and the layer of knowledge that it contains within in this thesis. Lynch explains:

I can just remember something and it just comes back in the body and then there are also things that I've retained because it was a feeling when you did that piece.

Interview 24.01.2012

Lynch’s observations regarding the feeling of movement echoes the idea of lived experience and the lived body concept and again places emphasis and value upon the felt sensations of dance practice. This perspective illuminates the dancerly qualities experienced by the body such as sensation, mechanics, movement action, and physical accuracy that are valued in this process and consequently influence the understanding of the body archive in this thesis. When observing the group in the studio, the tone of the working environment would frequently shift into a display of camaraderie and playful competitiveness, in a sense reverting back to past ‘selves’, roles and relationships. Often, the group would demonstrate their technical skill, attempting to ‘out-do’ one another’s physical capabilities in recognition of the change in their bodies due to age and experience but also in a way that seemed familiar, as if old behavioural habits were re-emerging. This can be interpreted as an echo to their past studio etiquette because of the collaborative nature of their choreographic methods and following my observations of the revival processes, I have explained elsewhere that the activity taking place in the studio rehearsals captured something of the convivial atmosphere of the original studio environment:

Individuals within the group frequently deviated from the choreography in order to exhibit their abilities in exaggerated displays of strength and technical aptitude.

Griffiths 2013:189-90
These observations illustrate the additional qualities that the body archive brings to revival processes such as that carried out by the founder member group. These displays of group dynamics and relationships can be contextualised through Bergson’s ideas regarding memory as being available in the form of past experience, as is depicted in the uninterrupted, circular shapes (AB) of the cone model (see page 157), which represents the continuity and multiplicity of the past as it extends backwards from the present moment emphasising a coexistence with past knowledge. Bergson explains: ‘there is no perception that is not full of memories’ (in Paul & Palmer 1959:19). This is made more complex as a result of the fact that the ‘sensori-motor apparatus furnish to ineffective, that is unconscious, memories, the means of taking on a body, of materializing themselves, in short of becoming present’ (ibid). This suggests that in order for the recollection to be apparent in the consciousness of the individual, it must be transferred from ‘pure memory’ to the ‘precise point where action is taking place’. Bergson explains that ‘it is from the present that comes the appeal to which memory responds, and it is from the sensori-motor elements of present action that a memory borrows the warmth which gives it life’ (ibid). The key here is that the lived body offers itself as a material site for memory to re-manifest itself in the lived moment. This perspective is suggestive of the idea that for the dancer, memory can be materialised through the lived moment, and more importantly the action connected to the lived moment. Lynch’s remembering of the movement vocabulary appears to be synonymous with his lived present; it is through the physical action of his body and the re-enactment of past movement and associated social modes of being along with that of his fellow company members that enables access to knowledge. His ‘being there’ promotes the materialisation of memories through the body.

Accessing Memory

A parallel between memory and the archive can be drawn here through Millar’s idea that archival materials can be considered as ‘touchstones’ that enable the recollection of memory (2006). She explains that ‘we preserve only fragments of the whole experience in our long-term memory, retaining it in our minds for as little as a few minutes or as long as our lifetimes’ (2006:109). This is juxtaposed with ‘procedural memory’ which is also
known as tacit knowledge or implicit knowledge as it refers to memory covering skill and procedures (ibid: 110). This type of memory facilitates ‘know how’ and in Lynch’s case, his being present, in the company of fellow founder members can be seen to reflect the unlocking of knowledge and recollection of these two types of memory working in tandem. As Millar observes ‘Memory is a process’ as it does not exist as a totality, rather ‘we retrieve bits and pieces of data from our minds and reconstruct these into an imagined whole’ (2006: 112).

Suzanne Guerlac’s analysis of Bergson’s philosophy summarises the notion that memory is a knowledge source available to us in the present:

[…], memory images are more useful to us than perceived images because they carry knowledge of the consequences that are attached to past actions.

2006: 119

This is a particularly interesting observation when considering that, for Lynch the approach to the execution of the choreography shifted, owing to the fact that his body had aged and he could remember the after effects of the original work and the alterations required:

It didn’t need to be a physical challenge because […] even though all those years ago people would say that Phoenix was very athletic and you know could jump and all that, we could still jump, 20 30 years on we could still jump, we could still turn, we could still barrel turn, we could still split jump, we could still do things but it’s the way […] we thought about doing those movements, whereas before it had a raw edge so we would just do it whereas we would actually, our thinking would be different so then it would feel different. So for me, that’s why we were able to retain some of the movement, not doing it how we did it back then because obviously we were teenagers, and when you’re a teenager you’ve got energy and you just go and you don’t think about it where we were able to retain it but able to also think about how we could do it differently.
The crux of the argument here is that memory is not necessarily visible to the present moment but it is attached through perception, therefore the role of the original body emerges as an important element in this revival example because it carries with it memory of the original experience.

In terms of how this works in the context of dance, there are multiple interpretations of the function of the dancer’s memory. In view of Bergson’s premise that memory carries with it some knowledge of the impact of past experiences, this statement has particular resonances in terms of the role of memory in the present. Suzanne Langer has suggested that in remembering an event one re-experiences it, however the experience is not the same as the first time (1953:263). This exemplifies the notion of the ageing body, in particular the fact that experiences are encountered through the body a second time but this body, as observed by practitioner Wendy Houstoun, is a body with ‘imprints of moves running around it that reside in another era’ (2011: 37). I would suggest that Lynch’s statement above recognises that the execution of the movement did not resemble the same qualities as the original because of the difference in the ability of the body. This relates to Houston’s description of the imprints of moves residing in a different era and encountering ‘a piece of machinery’ (the body) that is slowing (2011). Not only this, Lynch alludes to the fact that he is referencing experience of the past, in terms of tacit knowledge or memory of the way in which movement was previously executed, with ‘a raw edge’ which was adapted for this second experience of the vocabulary, echoing Langer’s sentiments but also reinforcing Bergson’s premise that the body draws upon its funds of personal experience in the present moment. In this quotation, Lynch presents an acute awareness of his body as having aged and the adaptations caused through the recognition of its limited capabilities which raises questions regarding the accuracy in terms of the recollection of the body’s memory and therefore the authenticity of revival processes.

Bergson maintains that memory is solicited through perception, but that it does not function in the same way that the body responds and makes sense of its environment through perception. Instead, ‘memory’ is detached from this reality or present action because it remains in the past. It is this framing of the mind and body which forms the crux of Bergson’s argument
that memory occupies ‘the point of contact between consciousness and matter’ (in Guerlac 2006: 123). This premise is rooted within the construct of time as Bergson recognises perception as taking place within the context of action and the body forms the centre of the action in its encountering of ‘matter’ or ‘images’ in the present. The present moment is again of importance here, as Bergson explains that the ‘past is nothing but idea’ because action of the past is absent whereas the encounters of the body in the present are ‘thick with duration’ (in Guerlac 2006: 120-1). This means that knowledge of past body encounter/action is enmeshed in the body’s experience of time and space in the present moment, whilst it continues its connectedness or lineage of past, present, and opening into the future. The reference to ‘duration’ is significant, as for Bergson it is not merely a marker of time but is rooted in consciousness. Bergson advocates that duration is a phenomenon that cannot be qualitatively measured because it cannot be materialised in space. By this he means that duration ‘as a faculty of consciousness is immeasurable, immaterial and continuous which reinforces the notion that our experiences of the present are inescapably connected to our past (ibid). Here, we are reminded of the immaterial traces inherent in the dancing body, those that Taylor has explained fall into the concept of repertoire because they cannot be fixed in time or space (2003). Duration therefore refers in a similar way to the body’s state of being or bodily ‘being-in-the-world’ which in the case of memory points to the fact that the body’s memory is always present, in the moment of perception.

**The Ageing, Original Body**

Lynch and the founder member group had not danced together in over twenty years and their level of dance activity had reduced significantly since they were touring dance performers in their late ‘teens and early ‘twenties. They were able to construct the revival performance over a three-month period and execute it for an audience, but the group’s bodies and their performances were subject to the physical signs of ageing.

Twyla Tharp explores the age of the body in relation to muscle memory, claiming that the length of time a body can retain knowledge of choreography through this mechanism is considerable. However, others
have argued that the way in which one feels movement is different to how it may be executed. Anna Fenemore’s commentary upon the body in performance suggests that the body’s ‘livedness’, its ‘internal perception’ does not always tally with ‘external commentaries on the body’ (2011: 39), however she makes an interesting claim for her memory as a joining of the ‘multiple actions, roles and observations’ that she has undergone as a performer. She states that these ‘are part of a continuity’ inside her body which reminds us of the sense of the body in flux, unfixed in time and space, in the phenomenological sense (see page 111). In addition, Houstoun asserts that there is an increasing gap between ‘[...] how a move feels to do and what it looks like’ and that there is a:

[...] tendency of older dancers to look as if they are lost in their own nostalgic dancing past [...] unwilling to surrender their prime-and unable to enter the present [...] I find myself asking people if I look embarrassing when I move. Commentaries [...] seem to revolve around the notion of surviving, continuing, persisting. A kind of pat on the back for still being alive...

Ibid

This idea is echoed in sociological perspectives upon the dancing body and concepts of ageing. Helen Thomas notes that a gap exists between what she refers to as ‘the ‘outward‘ physical appearance of the ageing body and the subjective sense of age felt on the inside’ (2013:111). Lynch’s reflection on the feeling of the movement in the body chimes with a number of those ideas offered above, and, in the statement below particularly, it is clear that any uncertainty on the accuracy of the movement being executed was overridden by the feeling or sense that the work was accurate:

[...] as we did it, it just came back to its original, you know, I think sometimes people can retain things [...] I know there were certain things that we did but it actually felt like that’s what we did, but I actually felt like that’s what we did, so we didn’t know, so for me it was like was it right, was it wrong, or was it different? I can’t really say it just, we just know that those
connection were there [...] it was just quite organic, it just all kind of a sudden came back together [...] that unity of molecules actually linking together [...] 

Interview 24.01.2013

Here, Lynch reinforces the idea that the feeling he experienced was one of accuracy and one that functioned on a number of planes, including a sense of unity and empathy within the group. During the vox pop interviews following the actual performance, Donald Edwards, who also participated in the revival, explained that it ‘hurt’ physically but that performing the work felt ‘as if it was yesterday’. Furthermore, he claimed that when he was in the moment, he was on ‘automatic pilot’ but acknowledged that his rate of recovery was much longer. Another performer, Pam Johnson\(^{51}\), who originally joined the company in 1989 as one of the first female members said: ‘It’s amazing what you forget [...] you forget more than you remember’, which is different to Lynch’s experiences of remembering. However, Johnson continued to state that the process had enabled her to re-connect with the company and ‘what it is about [...] the common element has always been the spirit [...] there is a Phoenix spirit’ (Interviews 11.11.2011).

The shared histories of these performers and the amount of time that had passed between their original involvement with the company and the revival performance raised a number of interesting ideas in relation to their age, ability and authenticity. For example, during the interview with Lynch, he explained that it was of the upmost importance in the revival performance that it was the original dancers performing, i.e. the founder and early group members and other performers from throughout the company’s history.

[...] we could have just gone on stage and just walked around, because [...] it was who we were that actually made Phoenix.

Interview 24.01.2013

This is an important observation as it recognises that for Lynch, the bodies undertaking the performance were authentic, they were the same individuals who founded the company and performed in its earliest years of

\(^{51}\) At the time of recording, in November 2011 Johnson was Lead Officer for Dance, Arts Council England.
existence. However in terms of the dance and movement that actually occurred, the same does not strictly apply, due to the shift in context and age of the dancing body. Therefore, it is important to address what remained the same in this example of revival process, acknowledging Bergson’s hypothesis that memory is located within the frame of temporality (1911 [1896]). The fallibility of the body archive as a source is implicated through these ideas. As the memory of the body breaks-down, the body might suffer memory-loss and the inability to retain those memories for the long term. Even if the memories are there, the body may no longer be able to execute them. This is therefore a reminder of the problem that is central to this investigation; how to extract valuable knowledge that is embodied.

**Nostalgic Memory**

The reversion back to former social roles and collective experience as observed in the founder member rehearsal group appeared to be of value to their entire process. The ability of their bodies to accurately execute the movement was less easily achieved and following the final performance a number of the performers acknowledged the difficulties encountered. However, those performing in the revival performance and those who witnessed it were less concerned with what they had forgotten that with the presence of the ‘history of the original people’ (Hughes, Interview 11.11.2011). The oral narratives gathered through the vox-pops that I conducted revealed that the experience of those present was loaded with emotion and nostalgia.

In the work of historian Leo Spitzer, nostalgia is explored in relation to concepts of memory and he has suggested that nostalgia can be considered as:

> [...] A signifier of “absence” and “loss” that could in effect never be made “presence” and “gain” except through memory and the creativity of reconstruction.

1999: 90

This perspective positions loss as being central to nostalgic feeling. Spitzer recognises the yearning for an ‘irretrievable youth’ from which the individual
has become distanced and detached. However, it is through the concept of memory that Spitzer suggests familiarity with the past can be restored. He argues that ‘sounds, tastes, smells and sights’ can function as reminders of past environments and as a mode of triggering memory. Nostalgia can therefore be considered within the frame of the body archive. The collective experience of those performing the revival resonates with this perspective. The group reverted back to former roles and adhered to the social ordering of their past choreographic experiences. Their ability to execute movement thirty years after the company’s establishment was less celebrated that than the fact that these were the original members performing original works, to emotional, nostalgic effect.

Spitzer recognises that recollections can be ‘layered and complex’ (94). In the processes of remembering the choreography, it was apparent that different modes of knowledge were stored in the dancers’ bodies, such as emotion and a perceived spiritual connection and empathy between them. This aspect of the work relates to Spitzer’s concept of nostalgic memory through the idea that ‘recall and reaction’ functions as an ‘overall “connector”...stimulating a variety of responses to the past’ (96-97), which also appeared to extend towards the audience members during the evening as many claimed that there was an indescribable ‘spirit’ shared between those present. The collective experience was central to the capturing of this shared feeling and emotion.

In relation to nostalgia, Spitzer claims that:

[...] by establishing a link between a “self-in-present” and an image of a “self-in-past”, nostalgic memory also plays a significant role in the reconstruction and continuity of individual and collective identity’

Spitzer 1990: 92

It is feasible that nostalgic memory contributes a layer of remembering within the body archive which facilitates the construction of a shared identity from past to present. In the context of the dance revival performance of the founder members, the statement above also connects to the sense of a shared ‘spirit’ perceived by those present for the performance, both
performers and audience members who were all able to remember their own experiences and social resemblances with those performing and present for the occasion. Spitzer’s suggestion that nostalgic memory contributes to the continuity and reconstruction of collective identity can be observed in the sense of belonging and the ability of the group to adopt their past social roles during the revival processes. This could be said to assist in the unlocking of movement memory across the group, within a collective context and is therefore a valuable element of the original practising body (or bodies) as archive. Nostalgic memory depends upon the ‘self’ and facilitates the reconstruction of memory, as is observed by Spitzer and it can be considered here as central to the ability to execute historic processes of dance-making within a group, therefore occupying a portion of the archival gap.

**Collective Remembering**

Following the performance of the revival work, original company member, Villmore James, described the entire experience of ‘being with the guys’ he had grown up with as like ‘reliving some of the memories in the studio’ (11.11.2011). Just as Hutchinson-Guest has argued that preservation is about the ‘bringing to life’ of a record, in this statement and others offered by those undertaking this significant revival, memory is also being brought back to life through the re-living of movement vocabulary and choreographic experience. Revival can be considered as a process through which choreographic experience is relived and re-experienced through embodied knowledge. Additionally, shared experience of remembering choreography facilitates the ‘production and reproduction of knowledge by “being there”, being a part of the transmission’ (Taylor 2003: 20) enabling memories to emerge.

The value of the five dancers participating in the revival can be explored through notions of collective processes of remembering movement/choreography. The concept of collective memory as proposed by Maurice Halbwachs (1992) assists in extending the idea of the body archive and the role of collectivity in triggering memorial knowledge. The concept of collective memory as proposed by Halbwachs places memory as a strand within ‘a totality of thoughts common to a group’ (52). The group is
made up of individuals who have a relationship in the present moment or indeed have been engaged in relations in the past, as was the case with the Phoenix founder members. Halbwachs claims that in order for older memory to be 'localized' [sic] it must be placed within a totality of memories common to other groups, such as a family. This is because, in order to reconstruct or retrieve memory, the family memories follow a logic of their own; they exist within a context familiar to all participants:

In the case of the family group the similarity of memories is merely a sign of a community of interests and thoughts. It is not because memories resemble each other that several can be called to mind at the same time. It is rather because the same group is interested in them and is able to call them to mind at the same time that they resemble each other.

Ibid

The crux of his argument is that whilst we may remember something on individual terms, it can only be understood when located within the shared, common thoughts of the corresponding group (53). This notion can be seen at play in the work of Lynch and the founder member group. Lynch explains that ‘we all went on a journey together, we were working together’ where ‘we all experienced the same thing at the same time’ but that the ‘actual movement vocabulary’ enabled the group to ‘unify again’ (24.01.2012). He also explains that the feeling of the piece was shared between the group and that this was manifest in the connection between the group and their historic relationship. This directly reflects Halbwachs’ preposition that ‘the framework of collective memory confines and binds our most intimate remembrances to each other’ (1992: 53). A number of those interviewed referred to the company as a ‘family’ or reflected upon their time there as being part of a family.

In contrast, sociologist Paul Connerton has critiqued this idea of localization [sic] as he claims that Halbwachs overlooks the system of communication between individuals, and the transfer of memories across generations of ‘family’. For Connerton, ‘to study the formation of social memory is to study those acts of transfer that are to be found in both traditional and modern societies’ (1989: 38-9) as a mode of transmitting cultural tradition. In the
case of dance, and more specifically Lynch’s revival, new meaning is given to the manner through which memory is materialised (or localised) that is not dependent upon a written or scripted act of transfer. Drawing upon the founder member revival, it is feasible to suggest that the collective ‘being-there’ of the members was essential to the recollection of memorial knowledge and subsequent reconstruction of original movement material. This is evidenced further through the fact that the group would often skip sections of the movement during rehearsals because one member was absent and he would be the person who would remember that section. This echoes the suggestion that each group member remembered their own original contributions to the choreography, and therefore they were dependent upon one another memories to re-awaken their own or to fill in the gaps in their own memory as referred to through Lynch’s earlier statement (see page 171). The dependency upon one another’s memories in this way highlights the process of remembering as being a collective act.

Similarly, contemporary dance practitioner Emilyn Claid reflects upon working with autobiographical narratives and emotions in her own creative practice, explaining a process of writing down memories which she would then attempt to re-construct in her body. She explains: ‘My own experiences mingled with those of my family’ echoing Halbwachs’ notions of collective memory as being dispersed amongst a group with commonalities such as a family relationship. Claid explains:

I knew when I found the appropriate gesture because the emotional memory flooded back into my body. I relived the gestures and the rhythm […] finding every detail, every turn of the head and angle of chin, storing them as kinaesthetic memory, as gestures that felt connected to the experience […] I trusted my body to re-construct the gestures as physical tasks […] Re-embodying the pose as a physical task brought a sense of grief flooding back.

2006:155-156

Whilst Claid is discussing a particular moment in a choreography which was intimately personal to her, she reveals how the moment of action, in terms
of embodying a pose remembered from within her past, triggered a strong emotion in her body, and furthermore that the emotion itself is what enabled her to reconstruct the pose in the first place. She explains how reliving the gestures and movements functioned as methods for retrieving memories regarding the intricacies of the movements, and I would also argue that ‘duration’ in Bergson’s terms is at play here. The re-surfacing of emotional memory as linked to choreographic action indicates that Claid is accessing her own experiential memory, as were the Phoenix founder members. Lynch also makes reference to the emotional experience inherent in the revival process when he goes into detail regarding how the revival process felt, in terms of the experiences of working together as a group in the studio:

[…] for me yes it did feel very very different because of where I was in the sense of my thinking but even the sense of my heart you know and my emotions, so yes for me it was very […] very different.

The reference to emotion in this statement is two-fold. Firstly Lynch is referring to the progression of his feelings since the time when the original works were created. As Bergson has suggested, the feelings of the body take on a life of their own, they evolve just as our bodies do (1911). Secondly, Lynch relates this line of thought back to the studio environment where the coming together of the group forged an atmosphere conducive to the revival task. He recognises the dynamics of the group working together as being calm and with a ‘sense of peace’ whereby the group would listen to one another’s suggestions and work together more amicably than perhaps they had done in the past, influenced by youthful experiences and dynamics. Again, this is a reminder of Bergson’s ‘lessons of experience’ and also highlights Lynch as a lived body, actively engaging with the environment within which he dwells. This also illuminates the shared nature of the creative process in terms of both the past and the present. In their work on choreographic cognition, McKechnie and Stevens situate the interactive nature of making dance as being difficult to capture as a result of the variation in individual personality and memory but moreover that ‘there are dyads and triads within the group and concomitant ideas, tensions, conflicts, attractions and defences’ (2009:40). From Lynch’s anecdotal
account, it is apparent that the way in which the group liaised and interacted with each other was integral to their ability to recollect the vocabulary.

For example, the group committed to undertake a technique class at least once per week, prior to a rehearsal of the choreography, just as they would have done as company members in the past. This process was in part a way of training and preparing the body physically, in order to develop the skills and strength required to execute the choreography to the best of their ability and to facilitate the security of warmth and working without fear of injury (Tharp 2003:19). However, it can be argued that this process played a central role in the reinforcement and re-living of past experience and moreover assisted in the unlocking of knowledge in the body as archive. Tharp explores this idea in relation to creative processes, explaining that ‘getting warm’ as a dancer does in the technique class is a ritual and that ‘Doing it in the same way each morning habitualizes [sic] it-makes it repeatable, easy to do’ (15) as a result of ‘a working environment that’s habit forming’ (17). The company’s choice to work in this way also demonstrated their expertise as dancers, their acknowledgement that this ritualistic scheduling of rehearsal time is key to their ability to work successfully towards a revival performance. Lynch refers to the way in which the company members originally worked in the studio through contributing movement phrases individually, under the direction of a choreographer. He claims that the group would be able to put those pieces back ‘together quite quickly because all of us actually contributed to that movement’ and that the ability to remember was gained through ‘a sense of working together’. The connection between the group members was visible throughout the rehearsals that I observed and is something that Adair noted in earlier research into the company’s cultural heritage:

‘The connections the company presented on stage came from the depth of understanding that they had with each other. As Rick Holgate articulated, ‘As individuals we got on really well with each other. The rapport on Stage felt so good; you could trust everybody physically, movement wise.'
The feeling created through the reliving of memories deserves more credit in terms of thinking about the body archive and the way in which archival information can be reproduced. In terms of accuracy, the feeling of correctness as an inherently embodied sensation that is not visible or tangible is highlighted in Lynch’s observation that:

[...] you know as we did it... it just came back in a way it came back to its original, you know, I think sometimes people can retain things, but then does it really come back to how it was done? And even like in a movement I know there were certain things that we did but it actually felt like that’s what we did, so we didn’t know, so for me it was like was it right, was it wrong, or was it different? I can’t really say it just, we just know that those connections were there, whether if you break it down to simple movement.

Interview 24.01.2013

Here, Lynch claims the work returned to its original state because it felt that this was the case as a result of the connections between bodies. He acknowledges that what they retained in terms of memory of the movement may not have been accurate, but this complexity is outweighed by the fact that the embodiment of the movement felt accurate in his body, therefore it could be argued that in terms of provenance, the feeling of accuracy in the body is of more value than other sources of evidence that might exist in a written or visual format. In terms of the reproducibility of the ‘original’ Taylor acknowledges that ‘Dances change over time […] But even though the embodiment changes, the meaning might very well remain the same’ (2003: 20) just as Lynch has pointed out in reference to the feeling and resemblances in the emotion of the choreographic experience from past to present. It is attributes such as these that have evaded permanence in the traditional context of the archive.

**Memory and the Digital Dance Archive**

The memory inherent in the archival body marks a progression towards a shift in thinking about the role and content of the dance archive. The
contribution of the archival knowledge retained in the body in a number of initiatives presents an opportunity for the body archive to call into question what is valued in dance archival processes. Examples such as Siobhan Davies Replay make inroads into the knowledge available in the body archive in the form of the memory of process as recordings of dancers testing out material and selecting vocabulary for movement phrases enables the user to trace the journey of a work just as the body archive contains knowledge of the process of choreographic creation but the ephemerality of this process remains incomparable via the digital platform. This is because these components remain video based and do not capture the traditional context of space and collectivity associated with dance-making and performance. Whilst the layers of knowledge available through the body are becoming more commonly represented in such platforms, they are unable to capture what the body archive can capture. This is applicable in the example of Motion Bank52 (The Forsythe Company) which is a digital choreographic project that strives to include the three dimensional effects of the body within web based resources. The platform uses innovative methods for displaying the position and dynamics of the body in space through a form of digital dance notation. Also, recent initiatives at the National Resource Centre for Dance help to illustrate the non-verbal nature of dance and the non-verbal manner through which we are inclined to revisit historic dance repertoire. The Dance and Digital Archives project53 (DDA) designed a new online catalogue which enabled the user to search across material based upon the similarities in the physical representations of the body in space (across images and video footage).

More recently, the Siobhan Davies Replay archive has also become implicit in the creation of new work; Table of Contents (2013)54 is a performance that involves a group of performers who offer an embodied response to the material contained within the digital archive as a result of their own historical references with the work represented in the archive, therefore they are invited to respond the digital archive via their own personal memories or experiences with the digital, through their bodies. This reinforces how the body archive both marks a progression towards the

52 http://motionbank.org
53 http://www.dance-archives.ac.uk/
54 http://www.siobhandavies.com/work/table-contents/
digital because of the need to see the physical body via the digital, as a means for grounding the technology within the specifics of dance but also unveils the potential for reciprocity between the digital and the physical body. These examples also illustrate how the memory inherent in the body archive is of value in the process of recall for the purpose of reviving glimpses into historic repertoire and dance experience.

**Chapter Summary**

In this chapter I have discussed the role of the dancer’s memory in relation to revival practices in dance. Through drawing upon examples from within the Phoenix founder member revival rehearsals I have highlighted the significance of the reliving of memories as a trigger for reproducing archival information within the body archive. In this thesis, I set out to address the following question:

- What knowledge is inherent in the memory of the dance practitioner?

The discussion has revealed that traces of choreographic process and experience are embedded within the corporeal knowledge of the practitioner and more specifically, memory affords new, additional source materials to those already available in the traditional archive to emerge. I have claimed that the lived experience of the dancing body resides in the archival gap between performance and the archival document and this chapter has expanded debates previously discussed in chapter 2 with regards to the notion of the body archive. The discussion has marked a departure from aforementioned understandings of the ‘body as archive’ (Lepecki 2010) as I have observed that the memory of dance practitioners can be considered as a vehicle for unlocking and remobilising something of the original essence of past performances. The experiences of the body that are less easily reduced to verbal description or written formats or ineffable such as emotion, knowledge of original choreographic intent, movement sequencing, past narratives, nostalgia, memory built up in the muscles and also knowledge of what Pearson and Shanks have termed the ‘folklores of practice’ (2001) can be considered to be re-traced through the memory of the practitioner, especially within the collective context. The important finding in relation to this question is that through my observation of the founder member rehearsal and analysis of interview dialogue, the
dancer’s body appears to store more than simply knowledge of the steps. Elements such as past social experience, anecdotes and memory of decisions made, emotional feelings and historic narratives can be considered as a source of multiple traces of choreographic processes and experiences.

Secondly, this chapter has addressed the question:

- Where does this memory reside and through what methods can it be recalled and accessed?

It has emerged through this discussion that experiences evoked through the reliving of memories should be credited as a key feature of the body archive, in terms of the way in which archival information appears to be reproduced, through social, shared and collective processes. Drawing upon notions of collective memory (Halbwachs 1992 [1952]), and my observations of Phoenix Dance Theatre’s dance revival processes of, I have exposed some of the previously hidden values of the concept of the body archive. Through this discussion, I have suggested that ephemeral connections between bodies can be considered as being manifest in their shared, fragmented memories of historic dance repertoire and the making-process. The preservation of dance repertoire through shared memory as I have argued is triggered in the body as a ‘center of action’ [sic] (Bergson in Paul and Palmer 1911:4) whereby the tacit, visceral and experiential qualities of the body forge connections between the dancers. The value of the embodied memory for the practitioner offers a sense of rightness in the movement vocabulary as something of the originality of the dynamics habits and behaviours of the group were re-captured. This outcome is also what the company was striving for, as they intended to capture something of the essence of the original and dance enables this reliving of memory in an active way. The key conclusion here is that acts of remembering in the revival context depend upon action and transference/realisation of knowledge though the body, as opposed to an external, verbal or written formats.

The final research question addressed in this chapter relates to notions of archive and bodily memory as an archival source and questions:
Can the memory of the dance practitioner be considered as ‘archival’, and how does it exist in relation to the archive?

The role of the body archive has been considered within the context of archival principles such as provenance, original order and hierarchy in particular. Each of these ideologies, when considered in relation to the body archive exposes new ways of thinking about the availability of dance archival knowledge. The active role of the body in transmitting memory that is embodied enables an arguably closer connection to the origins of choreographic process and performance experience than that achieved through the traditional records of performance. The layers of information that are built up as a result of studio processes and collaborative dance-making are to some extent re-traceable through the memories of the original performers. Accessing knowledge regarding where movement and choreographic decisions originated resonates with key principles such as original order and provenance, whereby credit is given to the original context within which a document was created. Furthermore, hierarchical concepts in the archive are mirrored in the process of reliving where relationships and group roles re-emerge and we see traditional behaviours between choreographer and dancer as being key to the success of a revival process. The body archive in dance enables knowledge that is specific to dance practice including the sense of moving collectively, spatial alignment and relationships, movement dynamic and impetus, viscerality and emotion, all of which contribute to a perceived accuracy for both the spectator and the performer. It is elements such as these that I claim have the potential to enliven and enrich the otherwise static documents belonging to the dance archive.

The body archive: memorial recollection

The contribution of the discussion in this chapter towards a wider understanding of how the body archive functions and the diagram below expands upon that included in the previous chapter (see page 132).
Figure 9: The Body Archive: Memory

The illustration summarises the overall contribution of this chapter towards constructing the notion of the body archive in dance revival processes. It reveals that the presence of the original practising bodies (choreographer/dancer) in the revival process where movement action and modes of remembering are shared triggers knowledge that has been preserved in the body and is subsequently unlocked. In specific relation to memory and the body archive as I have discussed in this chapter, the figure depicted above indicates the key elements of epistemological knowledge that are enabled as a result of embodied memory. It is through the actual execution of movement that some of the layers of knowledge embedded within the body are exposed. I have identified these to include muscular memory and tacit knowledge of the actual physical feeling of moving the body in a manner that is familiar whilst also offering a sense of collective identity through the
established set of actions constructed in the past that are being brought into the present, reinforcing the idea that collective identity is processual (Melucci 1989). The co-dependency of unlocking memory with the action of the body is what underpins this diagram for it is also the source of a collective process of recall, which in turn triggers the memory of creative choices made within the making process and the dispersion of movement knowledge across hierarchies between bodies that is recalled simultaneously with the reuniting of bodies in the rehearsal process.
Chapter 5

Spatiality and the Body Archive

In this chapter, I explore how the dancer’s engagement with space informs and influences the role of the body archive as a trigger to knowledge. In particular, I explore the ways in which the body can be considered to function as an archive in space and how the original practising body can recall knowledge of past dance experience through re-living dance as a spatial process. This chapter builds upon arguments presented in Chapter 3 regarding processes of reliving practices as triggers to knowledge. This discussion will be developed by exploring spatiality as a concept through which bodies relate and remember in the sense that spaces can function as ‘mnemonic structures’ (Connerton 2009:19) triggering embodied knowledge and memory.

In dance practice, it has been argued that ‘…time, space and motion are the media for choreographic cognition’ (McKechnie & Stevens 2009:39) and I suggest here that these elements also function as ephemeral markers capable of unlocking choreographic knowledge that is deposited in the dancing body through layers of experience. I consider how the dancer’s embodied memory of what it feels like to move in space, encounter directional and relational ‘markers’ and share dance-making process functions in relation to the body archive. This chapter highlights the importance of spatial proximities and sensorial experience between dancers as key components that challenge the disembodied nature of the ‘archive’ in its traditional manifestation. I claim that the connections forged through collective bodies in space function as spatio-temporal markers and subsequently call forth knowledge that is embodied. Furthermore, I argue that spatial encounters considered as ephemeral markers can operate as a ‘touchstone’ (Millar 2006) to archival knowledge.

In this thesis I claim that the dancing body preserves the origins and intellectual properties of dance repertoire, mirroring the concept of provenance that underpins archival practice and theory. This section of the thesis addresses the following overarching questions:
What is the role of the body archive in the process of reviving past choreography in the present?

How can concepts of spatiality be employed to understand how movement knowledge is learned and recalled in the body archive?

What are the roles of spatiality and kinaesthetic networks in relation to the unlocking of knowledge within the body archive?

In this chapter I contribute new knowledge regarding the ability of the sensory modalities of the body and bodies in space to reawaken knowledge stored in its repositories. Through exploring space and spatial encounters in the revival work of Phoenix Dance Theatre, I argue that space is a key component in processes of remembering and the re-production of knowledge. Spatial experience in dance cultivates the practice of body-to-body transmission and multiple layers of presence that contribute to the gathering and consolidating of knowledge that can be considered as archival. The re-living of dance-making processes through revival as a spatial, collective experience releases a multiplicity of information in the form of memorial, behavioural, emotional and ritualistic knowledge. These elements contribute towards the required apparatus for the successful reliving of historical dance repertoire and I claim that the reliving of historic dance practices can be re-considered as an archival process whereby embodied knowledge is recalled and re-invoked.

**Spatiality and Recollection**

In the previous chapter, I referred to the body as a ‘temporal structure of experience’ (Merleau-Ponty 1962: 97) and ‘not simply an object but a nexus of sensibility, sensitive to and adhering to the expressive world’ (Fraleigh 1987: 72). It can be understood as deeply connected to the spatial environment within which it dwells. For Lynch, the experience of returning to rehearse with the original group members ‘created a real atmosphere again where we could work’ (24.01.2013) which echoes ideas regarding the invisible or ‘virtual’ architectures which facilitate choreographic cognition/practice:

The correlation of visceral, psychic and peripheral stimuli, underlying muscular response, involves the
whole of a man [...] The whole body, enlivened as it is by muscular memory, becomes a sensitive instrument.

Todd 1937:3

The idea of the body as a sensitive instrument reflects notions of the body as a ‘touchstone’ whereby sensorial experience functions as a mode for unlocking muscular and movement memory. In the case of dance, it has been suggested that ‘recall is often multimodal such that activity in one mode triggers knowledge or recall in another’ (in McKechnie and Stevens 2009:44). It is clear from Lynch’s statements referenced throughout this chapter and in Chapter 4 that the embodied, lived process was intrinsic to the success of the revival. The collective experience of the group in space can be read through the suggestion that ‘sensation is a state in which action, perception, and thought are so intensely, performatively mixed’ (Massumi 2002: 98). This highlights the idea that the movement of the body is inextricably linked to layers of sensorial and embodied experience.

In Steven Feld’s essay ‘Places Sensed, Senses Placed’ he argues that ‘sensation [and] sensual presence’ are extensions of embodiment, because of their complex relationship with motion. Drawing on Bergson’s notion of the body as a ‘center of action’ [sic] (1911) as I have within this thesis, he recognises that the ‘active body as a place of passage for processes of making memory’ is also a vehicle for remembering, as a result of the fact that motion can draw upon the kinaesthetic interplay of tactile, sonic and visual senses’ and ‘emplacement always implicates the intertwined nature of sensual bodily presence and perceptual engagement’ (2004: 181). Drew Leder also suggests that the body as it unfolds into the present moment:

[...] is always a field of immediately lived sensation
[...] Its presence is fleshed out by a ceaseless stream of kinaesthesias, cutaneous and visceral sensations, defining my body’s space and extension and yielding information about position, balance, state of tension, desire and mood.

Leder 1990:23
Within the milieu of bodily experience, Leder identifies multiple facets that reveal the layers of knowledge that might be stored in the body archive. This continuum of experience recognises the body’s ability to locate its position in space and the feeling and distribution of weight experienced which might be considered as elements of the ‘sense of accuracy’ (Melrose 2007) that provide the necessary feedback for the expert-practitioner to continue with the execution of a movement phrase. Similarly, this continual state of being also cultivates what Paterson considers ‘involuntary memories’ as a result of haptic experiences:

Relationships between touch and memory are played out through ideas of presence and absence...or the evocative and familiar sight of the grandfather's mug is a touch that triggers involuntary memories.

2009: 782

This theory of haptic engagement can be considered as a cue to memory through the idea that a remembered sensation becomes more actual the more we dwell upon it; the memory of the sensation is the sensation itself beginning to be (Bergson 1911: 157). These theoretical viewpoints offer a context for the discussion in this chapter as they emphasise the important of the presence of the body (and bodies) in space. This is because that spatial experience of the body constructs layers of embodied experience. It is arguable that the practice of revival involving the remembering and re-awakening of movement knowledge in the original bodies re-illuminates the otherwise invisible or hidden subtleties of the group dynamics and the original essence of the past dance repertoire. This re-awakening and the execution of movement vocabulary enables the re-viewing of the historic work in a different way to how it might be experienced through the more traditional archival documents of dance where the space is flattened, mediated through an archival store and without the presence of a lived body. This is where the role of the body archive and the interplay of and dependency upon space enter into the realm of ‘archival value’.
The Dancing Body in Space

As part of Phoenix Dance Theatre’s 30th anniversary celebrations in November 2011, Sharon Watson, (Artistic Director) worked with ex-company members on an extract of a piece of repertoire entitled ‘Never Still’. Watson originally choreographed this work in 1995 and it was revived for the company in 2010. On 14th October 2011 I observed Watson and ex-company member Andiamibolanoriso Holisoa (Mbola) who originally performed the piece working on the revival of a short section of this choreography together in the studio. They were occasionally referring to a DVD recording of the recent revival by the company dancers employed at the time, the rationale being that the quality of the recording was better than some of the older video recordings and that the dancers who had performed each of the ‘parts’ were still in the company and could be identified and asked for further information about the movement. The section of the work being revived was a trio and at this particular rehearsal one of the dancers was absent. Watson and Mbola divided their time in the studio through working material out individually in the space and patching it together in closer proximity to one another and through bodily contact. Their use of breath when working together was particularly noticeable. When marking phrases of choreography together, they used their breath in varying rhythms, speeds, and levels of effort in a manner that seemed to mirror or provide the impetus for the effort attached to the movement action. In addition, as the pair was rehearsing with one dancer absent, there were times in their mapping of the steps that the absence of the third dancer prevented their ability to move past a certain phrase. As a spectator, I was invited into the space to stand in position to assist with their remembering of a sequence, acting as a spatio-temporal marker. By placing my body in the space, the dancers were able to extend their memory and execution of the sequence through completing a transition from one phrase into another, enabling the movement phrase to flow more organically. I was placed in position whilst both Watson and Mbola rotated around me, connecting my body with their own, through touching my shoulders, waist and taking hold of my hand. I was not completely still and had no prior experience of the

55 A full list of performers is provided in Appendix 7.
56 The manner in which Watson and Mbola worked can be seen in a video extract of their rehearsals in appendix 8.1
choreography, but as a living body, occupying the space simultaneously I was able to offer sensory feedback, act as a spatio-temporal marker and aid the recollection of movement.

This was a significant moment during my observation of rehearsal practices, as I had not been invited into the space to assist with the revival process in any way up to that point. In addition, this moment reinforced the idea that the absence of a person within the group also constitutes the absence of knowledge. Without the third person’s memory the dancers were unable to access their own knowledge of the work because it needed to be triggered by the presence of the third body. As a third body in the space, I was not able to contribute the absent knowledge of the movement vocabulary but through interacting with my body in space did facilitate the triggering of the movement memory in their own bodies. The gap in knowledge represented by the absent dancer was therefore bridged to a certain extent through the presence of my body in the space as an aid to remembering and subsequent progressing of the movement phrase. More striking however was the fact that by having a body (my body) in the space, the dancers were able to re-calculate the movement phrase between them, enabling them to move on with the remainder of the choreography. This process would be less straightforward when watching a video or looking at images and other notated/written formats. This is because, as Foster has explained:

> the dancer can ‘hear the sounds produced by locomotion, by one body part connecting another, by the breath and joints and muscles […] They feel the body’s contact with the ground, with objects or persons…they sense kinaesthetic indications […] the proximity of one bone to another.

2007:2

37

These ideas illuminate how, as a living body I responded to their touch and manipulation of my position in space. This situation was indicative of the irreducibility of certain aspects of dance experience into different formats, highlighting the value of the body and bodies interacting through shared experience in space and time.
Movement Acquisition as a Spatial Process

The relationship between body and space in dance is understood to function on multiple planes. It is through a series of various engagements and encounters that the dancer experiences in a space-time context. Phenomenological perspectives offer further insights into the body as a temporal construct and suggest that the binding together of movement action in space and over time constitutes the immediacy of experience (Merleau-Ponty 1962, Bergson, 1911 Sheets-Johnstone 1966). This definition of the lived body upholds the inseparability between body and space and is employed when considering the archival properties of the body and its relationship with space. Dance phenomenologist Sondra Fralleigh highlights the unification of time and motion in bodily experience as she claims that ‘we never perceive a phenomenon in static unchanging perspectives...rather as existing through time’ (1998:137). Space as a key component of consciousness is intrinsic to bodily action as it facilitates every day movement. Dance as a performed set of actions and movement phrases designed to create affective or aesthetic intent therefore depends upon the body as it encounters space (Sheets-Johnstone, 1966). It has also been claimed that the dancer and the dance are one as the ‘dancer is the moving center of the moving form’ [sic] and moreover that this form is created as a ‘spatial-temporal totality’ (Sheets-Johnstone 1979: 37). This statement underlines the idea of inseparability through positioning the body in space as a ‘totality’. This suggestion of an inextricable link is central to phenomenological concepts as I have discussed in chapter 3 where I have argued that there is value inherent within the body as the site where dance takes place. This notion arises through the relationship between the body’s space and that of the external space that it inhabits and the ‘practice system’ that they create, conjunctively. For Merleau-Ponty it is in ‘action that our body is brought into being’ because ‘[...] movement is not limited to submitting passively to space and time, it actively assumes them’ (ibid: 117). This perspective echoes the need for the lived body to accommodate the group action taking place in the studio as was described in my experience as a spatial marker during the revival rehearsals. Dance practice, as a ‘kinetic phenomenon’ (Sheets-Johnstone 1979: 13) highlights

57 See Preston-Dunlop (1998) and Briginshaw (2001, 2009),
this perspective. When considering the notion of the body archive, the idea that ‘the body’s spatiality has no meaning of its own to distinguish it from objective spatiality’ (ibid: 116) positions spatial encounter as a component that is inherent to its functioning as ‘archive’. Additionally, cornerstone principles of archival practices such as provenance ‘preserve the meaning invested in recorded information through an emphasis on the context of records creation’ (Schwartz 2006: 5) and with dance-making as a spatial process, the role of space can be read as being important in processes of re-capturing historic knowledge through the body archive.

More specifically in the case of dance, McKechnie and Stevens have stated that ‘time, space and motion are the media for choreographic cognition’ (2009:39) which positions space as a vehicle for choreographic creation. Furthermore, as I argue in this chapter, spatial experience and encounter can also be a mode of remembering, re-invoking and reawakening embodied knowledge and memory of dance practice. Bodily-space relations have been explained as mnemonic devices, particularly in the work of Bettina Blässing who explains that ‘Dancers often use spatial directions in an egocentric frame of reference, relative to their own body, as mental cues for supporting movement performance and for shaping movement quality’ (2010: 93). Blässing’s perspective echoes the notion that our immediate, internal experiences of spatial encounter are the enablers of action. Furthermore, she notes that ‘thinking, understanding and learning’ for the dancer begins with the body (ibid: 76) and therefore the body as the point of acquisition for movement and choreographic process emphasises the potential of the body as a storehouse for such forms of information. This argument can be extended further through considering the co-dependency of the dancer’s embodied tacit knowledge with space/spatiality. In my observations of dance-making and revival processes within the work of Phoenix Dance Theatre, the positioning and kinaesthetic networks (my term) of bodies in space has appeared to play a key role in the process of learning and remembering movement vocabulary.

I refer to the notion of kinaesthetic networks as a description of the certain qualities inherent in lived dance experience that are rendered invisible, non-verbal or ineffable. For example, when a group of dancers are rehears ing a movement phrase they will rely upon a relationship that exists ephemerally between them in the form of spontaneous moments of eye contact, sensory
feedback constructed through shadowing one another and moving in and around one another in the space. Also, the dancers will depend upon the sound of breath the sense of weight, impetus for action and moments of touch between one another that provide them with the ability to work physically together in the space. These elements are difficult to transcribe in any tangible format as they occur spontaneously in the lived moment of practice and therefore I refer to the combined emergence of these ephemeral markers in dance practice and performance as kinaesthetic networks.

**Body, Space, Place**

The difficulty in accessing historic dance movement repertoire is associated with the limitations of the formats of documents that capture performance and the availability of such items (as I have discussed in detail in chapters 1 and 2 of this thesis). In my discussion with Jonathan Pitches regarding the use of performance ephemera in archives, he described the process of selecting which materials to access via the archive externally to the archive/upon arrival at the building within which the materials are stored. Notions of the archive as a building, storehouse, repository, static place led Derrida to describe the archive as a ‘project of knowledge, practice and of institution […] consignation […] ‘house’ or ‘museum’” (1996: 5). However, the research carried out here reveals that this sense of dormancy and motionless can be inverted through recognising that archives ‘are not passive storehouses of old stuff, but active sites’ where ‘memory is not something found or collected […] but something that is made, and continually re-made’ (Schwartz 2006:3). It is through the lens of dance revival that such ideas are illuminated and extended further as a result of the relationship between the moving body (and bodies) in space. Studies in human experience and notions of the body in everyday life recognise that ‘it is by means of the body that space is perceived, lived – and produced’ (Lefebvre 1991:162). A number of philosophical ideas circulate around the shared functions of body and space which in turn creates a number of implications for considering the role of the body archive in relation to its spatiality.

---

58 Specialist in theatre and archival research.
The revival processes that I have observed throughout this research period happened within a particular place; the dance studio. As a space that carries a particular set of practices and rituals, the interaction and activities of the body in this context is noteworthy. The philosophy of Henri Lefebvre, in particular his theorisation of space when applied to this investigation helps to reveal the codes of the spatial interaction that form a layer of the body archive. Lefebvre claimed that all spaces are social and that space is a product which ‘incorporates social actions’ (1991: 26-27). The site within which the dance rehearsals took place for the founder member revival rehearsals differed from that which they originally rehearsed in (this was often variable at the time). However, dance studio spaces have a ritual element to their codification as it can be said that this social setting:

[...] embraces the loci of passion, of action and of lived situations, and thus immediately implies time. It may be qualified in various ways: it may be directional, situational, or relational, because it is essentially qualitative, fluid and dynamic.

Ibid: 41-42

Lefebvre emphasises the connection of the lived body in space whereby the action of the body is subject to the spatial context within which it finds itself. In the case of the dance studio, certain codes of practice exist between those present in the space in terms of the teaching, learning and observation of movement action. For example in a dance studio, the use of a sprung floor usually required that before entering the space all outdoor shoes are removed and most commonly in contemporary dance, the dancer will remain barefooted whilst in the space. Dancers tend to get changed into practice clothes before coming into the studio, or alternatively change in a corner of the space once they have arrived. There are often mirrors and definitely a sense of ‘front’ is derived from the positioning of mirrors and occasionally a curtain is available to cover the mirrors where dancers are encouraged not to be guided by their reflection. The edges of the space are considered to be ‘offstage’ so you cannot be seen if you are standing at

---

59 In the early years of their existence, much of the time was spent at Harehills Middle School and Yorkshire Dance. The revival rehearsal in 2011 took place at Phoenix Dance Theatre’s new purpose built space, opened in October 2010.
the edge. The choreographer often stands at the front or to the side of the space, experiencing the action as if they were an outside spectator. However when teaching a phrase the choreographer/whoever is instructing the phrase will enter into the centre of the space but often remain at the front so that those learning can stand behind them and be able to view the action from both behind and in the mirror, observing the correlation between their own execution of the phrase being taught with the body that is instructing them. Often this is reversed and the instructor will stand facing the group, teaching the material in opposition so as to observe the group face to face, particularly if a mirror is not available. This type of ritual is so closely bound to the dancer’s memories of making and their ability to work in a studio context that I would argue that the founder group members when entering into this ritualistic space (regardless of the fact that it was a different studio to where they had worked originally) enabled the original processes of dance-making to emerge which in turn triggered their memories of being in that kind of space because of the continuity and familiarity of the codes associated with the action taking place within the dance studio.

The behaviour of the group within the studio space cultivated a particular way of working and enabled the individuals to work in a methodical way in their traditional roles as dancers/choreographers. As Lefebvre explains ‘each living body is space and has space: it produces itself in space and it also produces that space’ (1991:170), implying that the action occurring depends upon the mutuality of the body and space. In discussion with Lynch, he noted that the recollection of movement repertoire was made easier as a result of the group returning to work in the studio together, as opposed to working independently which emphasises the value of the ritualistic processes of studio use as I outlined above as being an important cue to knowledge.

Lynch’s reflection upon the process highlights the centrality of the interaction taking place in the studio to the success of the revival of the selected repertoire:

[...] if all of us come together in the studio to remember you know Nightlife at the Flamingo (1989), Forming of the Phoenix (1982), Brain
Voice (1986) these pieces we would be able to put it together quite quickly because all of us actually contributed to that movement\textsuperscript{60}.

Interview 24.01.2013

Lynch’s acknowledgement of the group re-uniting in the studio assists in exposing new ways of thinking about this shared experience in terms of offering a mode of remembering and re-collection of choreographic experience. Furthermore, the spatiality of roles within the studio was also of value to the process of recollection and these bodies as archives also carried with them the original identity and hierarchical position within the studio. Therefore when learning movement, the group would adopt specific spatial patterns such as that depicted in figure 6 below, use shadowing techniques and offer feedback through haptic domains when moving together in space. It is also noteworthy that within the dance studio, observation of the activity often occurs around the edges of the space, the perimeter of the studio offers itself as a viewing platform for dancers to witness their peers and also rehearse their own steps without interfering with the main activity in the space.

\textbf{Figure 10: Hamilton leads Edwards and Simpson in a movement phrase during a revival rehearsal.}

\textsuperscript{60}These works were created within the first 8 years of the company’s existence; Lynch is referring to them here as key examples of the group’s collaborative dance-making processes.
Dance theorist Valerie Briginshaw recognises that the application of Lefebvre’s ideas to the practice of dance reveals that the ‘mutual construction of bodies and spaces are centralised’ (2009: 20) and in particular, Lefebvre’s concept of ‘spatial practice’ offers a lens through which this re-uniting of bodies in the dance studio can be explored further. This notion refers to the production and reproduction of spatial relations between objects whereby there is cohesion in ‘each member of a given society’s relationship to that space’ which enables the accurate functioning of the space and behaviour (ibid: 33). This idea of a cohesive relationship with the space facilitating appropriate action emphasises the important of the groups’ decision to undertake specific dance processes during the revival process. For example, the group committed to training their bodies through technique classes, undertook warm-ups and periods of cooling down, they conversed, stretched, observed their own and each-others movement in the mirrors, rehearsed with and without music, used counts and verbal cues. These intricacies of spatial encounters in the studio, I argue, assist in the reinforcing and re-enactment of group relationships and subsequently assist in the unlocking of movement knowledge and memory of the dance repertoire. The group embodied the representation of the dance studio space, to use Lefebvre’s notion of ‘representational spaces’; living it directly ‘through its associated images and symbols and hence the space of ‘inhabitants’ and ‘users” (ibid: 39). The idea of site (such as house) functioning as a ‘loci of memory’ which can be considered in parallel to the dance studio space, (ibid) reinforces understandings of the archive as a material space, as Derrida reminds us it is:

[...] in this domiciliation, in this house arrest, that archives take place. The dwelling, this place where they dwell permanently, marks this institutional passage from the private to the public.

1996:2

The archive itself has been recognised as a ‘space of embodied experience’ and it has been argued that the term ‘space’ is more appropriate that ‘site’ in relation to the archival lexicon (Schwartz 2006:6).
The centrality of the body in understanding and interpreting spatial experience and, in the case of the archive, the immediacy and proximity of the ‘original’ is closely bound, if not dependent upon the encounter with the archival material and raises questions in regards to the importance of spatial context in order for the body archive to function most appropriately. For Schwartz, this connotes ‘power’:

 [...] there is the sensual, or emotional, or inspirational aspect of the original, which might, in Walter Benjamin’s terms, be called its “aura” [...] [and] there are the physical attributes of the archival document, whether textual or visual, that in some way carry the burden of its meaning.

2005:12

Schwartz recognises that these two modes of interaction are placed at risk through new modes of archiving such as via the digital because ‘inspiration and information are lost’ when the means through which we experience the artefact itself is experienced (ibid). The main concern here is that the intended meaning of the original document is diluted as a result of the change in encounter with the document i.e. the archive user does not share the same space as the item, as it is mediated through another means.

**Collective Remembering and Identity as a Spatial Process**

The implications of collaborative dance-making and experience when it comes to the archival process can be explored further through considering the many processes and layers of experience through which dance is generated. For Melrose:

Performance-making practices[...] even when they are individually owned and individually signed, tend to be collaborative, negotiated between heterogeneous practitioner undertakings, and different types of expertise [...] negotiated live’

Melrose

2007:77
In this statement, the shared process of choreographic creation is underlined and related to the 'live' by way of contrast to that which is mediated from the live into the archive. The work of the Phoenix founder members during their revival in 2011 emphasises the relational qualities of movement creation and moreover identifies remembrance as something that is dependent upon a shared spatial experience in order to come to fruition. For Edward Casey the ‘question of space’ cannot be abstracted from the ‘question of bodily action’ (1997: 204) and therefore the manner through which the group worked demonstrated the value of the shared spatial experience in constructing their group and choreographic identity. In the previous chapter I discussed the collective process undertaken by the founder member group as a trigger to their shared memory of past choreographic knowledge, referring to Halbwachs’ claim that in order for older memory to be ‘localized’ [sic] it must be placed within a totality of memories common to the group.

During rehearsals the group would most commonly work together to remember sections of the movement in unison. In one rehearsal, David Hamilton (founder member and artistic director 1981-1987) began reminding the other members of a sequence, instructing them in a short static phrase leading into a travelling sequence. The group were positioned along a diagonal line (in view of the pathway of the phrase) behind Hamilton, so as to observe his movement and re-create this within their own bodies, simulating a traditional spatial setting for the learning/teaching of choreography. This example relates to ideas of bodily experience and attention as proposed by Mabel Todd in *The Thinking Body* as she claims that the body is capable of forming ‘appropriate responses to the environment’ and furthermore that ‘a collection of memories of past experiences is correlated with incoming stimuli’ (1937:248). This type of mechanism was apparent in the studio processes as, following Hamilton’s instructions, the group began to rehearse the phrase in unison. After this, two members spontaneously continued into the following action of the phrase and others began to follow. This was a common feature of the process, whereby one dancer would initiate a phrase and it would remind others of the vocabulary enabling them to join in, triggering a canon almost, in terms of the memories embedded within each of the dancers’ memory.
Considering Todd’s perspective, the codes of practice and traditions were enlivened on this occasion, as Lynch explains:

When we used to work before [...] if it was that person’s piece then they would just drive it and the rest would just kind of respond to whatever that choreographer or that dancer wanted but I think for us this time it was more about us actually sensing one another and what it is that we were trying…and each individual person would contribute or they'd bring something and if it wasn’t right someone would say it doesn’t feel right and they would take that on.

Interview, 24.01.2013

Through analysis of Lynch’s statement above, the collective process of recall is further illustrated as a spatial process because of the dependency upon ‘sensing’ one another as a guide towards the group dynamics. This reinforces the value of the presence of bodies in the studio space where codes of practice and the proximity of bodies to one another could be said to provide ‘qualities yielding senses of touch and permanence’ (Fisher: 2007:21). This idea suggests that the shared experience in the studio through the body enables a bodily response to the action taking place. The idea of permanence here refers to the ability to associate a moment of sensorial affect through the spatial encounter that exists tangibly through the body, echoing phenomenological ideas of the body providing the concretion for dance to take place (Fraleigh 1987)

Lynch’s reflections upon the process can also be further explored through Alberto Melucci’s work *The Process of Collective Identity* which he defines as an “action system” that contributes to the production of a collective identity within any given social group (1989: 44). Melucci’s theory is defined as a multilateral construct and each strand of this is represented in the process undertaken by the founder member revival group. Melucci states that the process of collective identity is realised through ‘a network of active relationships’ between the group, incorporating aspects such as leadership, negotiation and influence. Another element of collective identity is an ‘axis’ of action’ which is ‘incorporated in a given set of rituals, practices, cultural artefacts’ and is ‘constructed through interaction’ (1989: 44) which in the
revival process appear to be forged within the context of the dance studio. The final strand of Melucci’s concept observes that the process requires an ‘emotional investment, which enables individuals to feel like part of a common unity’ and furthermore that ‘participation in collective action is endowed with meaning…and always mobilizes emotions’ (45).

The manner in which the group worked, as described by Lynch exemplifies this process of working actively as a group:

If you’re talking about a piece that I choreographed, or any of the members’ choreographies, yes, they would have retained that choreography, or that movement phrase, or however that movement quality was, they would be able to actually do that piece in a sense of working together.

Interview 24.01.20

The working process of the group involved participating in class to warm up the body, followed by the instruction by one practitioner for the others to follow. Lynch recollects that being together in the studio felt as though the group had never been apart, each member had a role to play in the process. The use of the concept of ‘axes of action’ is particularly relevant here as the formation of the group in the early 1980s was subject to a number of similarities in terms of the identities and socio-cultural context (see Adair 2007) and their group dynamic illustrated a familiarity in their roles and relationships. Lynch’s statement that the group had ‘something that was precious’ and that this was ‘felt again’ when the group returned to the rehearsal process highlights the connectivity evoked through the process of reviving historic repertoire. This mode of remembering was evident in the manner that the group worked in the studio as illustrated in the description of the spatial arrangement of the group above. Hamilton, as the original artistic director, choreographed many of the company’s earliest works and in the same vein, he led the group in rehearsals and maintained his role as a group leader, with the others taking instruction. This affirmation of roles highlights the collective process as embedded in such spatial interactions whereby a ‘common unity’ is cultivated (Melucci: 1989:45). This idea echoes Todd’s notion of the past manifesting itself in the present.
through the cultivation of ‘appropriate responses to the environment’ (1937: 248).

Lynch described the whole process as ‘like being able to remember’ and that the process created the feeling that the group had never been apart. I suggest that this is a result of the kinaesthetic, sensory and spatial modalities shared between the group that contributed to the sense of collectivity, particularly in action, memory and identity. This layering of embodied knowledge transmitted within the studio context through the social and physical interaction re-awakened historic movement knowledge in the body archive. In the early years of the company’s existence, Ramsay Burt writing for Dance Magazine stated that ‘The personal chemistry of the group must count for something too’ (1988:9). In terms of their choreographic appeal at the time, Lynch explains that:

...those connections were there, I don’t think there was a time that we were surprised... it was just quite organic, it just all kind of like came back together really, you know like some molecules you know then they all kind of a sudden come back together...As dancers, as performers as people...as people working together as being pioneers being original it was that it was honest. It was who we are, it was what we did.

Interview 24.01.2013

This perspective combined with Melucci’s concept of collective identity as a process emphasises the importance of the originality, or authenticity of the founder member group, as I have previously argued with regards to the authentic body of performance. As the original owners of the work, the group were able to re-awaken and re-live their previous group experience of dance-making processes though being together, in human bodiliness in the studio.

These ideas highlight the significance of the body as a lived entity and its interconnectedness with spatial experience. The emphasis upon the action of the body underpinning Melucci’s concept is upheld in phenomenological critiques of dance, as Sheets-Johnstone explains:
By virtue of movement, the human body must be considered as something more than a physical structure [...] Because there is something which feels, wills and intends bodily actions.

1979: 35

Moreover, the spatial-temporal aspects of the relationship between bodies and movement can also be seen to invoke movement knowledge. In the specific case of dance ‘the studio process can be characterized [sic] as a ‘community of creative minds’ where cooperation and teamwork are essential elements of discovery and innovation’ (McKechnie and Stevens 2009:42). Typically these are the elements that escape permanence as they do not emerge or exist in a format suitable for ‘fixing’ in a written, tangible format. Such elements can be considered as invisible and ephemeral but arguably they leave their mark upon the practitioner, where they are fixed for later recall. The shared history of the founder group members can be seen to contribute to the construction of a sense of togetherness that I argue is manifest in the dynamics of dance practice and performance. Notions of ‘togetherness’ within the context of Phoenix Dance Theatre can be traced back to the early years of their existence. Similar remarks to that of Burt’s description of the chemistry between the group were made by the performers themselves following the revival performance, including Hamilton’s statement that the piece was ‘a contribution of all of us’. As I explained earlier, for Donald Edwards, the experience was ‘as if it was yesterday’ and he described performing the historic repertoire as like being on ‘automatic pilot’. The group’s embodied memories of the work were made visible through this process and their performance of the work re-captured the ‘togetherness’ that the group had experienced in the early years of the company’s existence.

Notions of collective identity and the role this plays in remembering choreography are evident through analysis of the comments made by guest choreographers working with the company for revival works. I observed the revival of Signal which was choreographed by Henri Oguike and first performed by Phoenix in 2004. I witnessed the choreography being learnt from the video, taught to the different groups of dancers, including Oguike, ex dancers and the company’s artistic management team. Oguike explains
how he had worked with the company in 1994 and describes how ‘the men and the women, Sharon was dancing then were amazing [they were] strong, physical’ and:

[...] that, combined with having seen them perform and so on, particularly as a student, going back even further there was already in my system, my nervous system if you like, as far as their identity is concerned, so coming to work with them I guess that was an influence I was already in line with…

Interview 29/06/2011

Oguike explained his process of returning to the studio to see the work that the dancers had learnt through a combination of video footage and a number of rehearsals with ex company members who had originally performed Signal. He claimed that ‘It was strange the very first day as at first it was almost like ‘wow’ that seems to be another person’s work’ and that he tried to ‘tune into’ his mindset at the point of making the work, which was ten years previous to this particular Phoenix revival. However, he continued to explain that a number of familiarities began to emerge once he began working in the studio with the dancers and:

[...] things I could remember physically contributing to the work myself, I think some of the areas that were particularly interesting to tune back in toward those areas where I worked in collaboration with the dancers to find phrases, sequences giving them some potential motives, intentions to play around with just to bring out more variation in the piece. So those bits kind of stood out, unique in a way, but at the same time it started to bring back sort of recall thought of what I was trying to do.

Interview 26.06.2011

Particularly interesting is the suggestion that being back in the studio, working physically with the dancers enabled him to trace back to his original intentions and choreographic devices, such as prompts and sequences that
were developed in conjunction with the dancers, as opposed to teaching completed choreographic phrases. The value of having the original choreographer is particularly evident here and this statement is also indicative of the value of Oguike’s presence in the studio, interacting with the dancers whilst recognizing his own affinity with the company and his ability to remember and re-formulate choreographic directions without any external aids. Fraleigh describes the impetus for choreography as something that is ‘recaptured’ when the finished dance is executed/performed (ibid: 180) and in this case the process of interaction in the studio also provides access to the original impetus behind the work.

The dancers had worked from video recordings of the work in performance and when discussing their experiences of this particular revival, the group claimed that working with Oguike and the dance cast in the studio was of greater benefit to their learning that working from the video because of the sensorial feedback through generated spatial proximities or kinaesthetic networks between the group (Sanger & Wille, 26/06/2011).

In the company revival process, rehearsal director Tracy Tinker explains that the initial stage is to ‘recreate it as much verbatim as possible’ in order to recover the ‘musicality […] subtleties’ and ‘what it should be’ as much as is possible (Interview 07/06/2011). In my observation, this mainly occurred through the use of a video recording in the studio which presented a particular challenge with regards to pathways and spatial settings in general. Dancer Phil Sanger claimed that working with the choreographer ‘challenges what you know about where you should be’, meaning that dancers would not successfully embody the ‘togetherness’ required after learning the work verbatim via the video recording. He explained that the movement cues for a change in direction or transition into a new movement phrase are altered when the choreographer is present as they are able to clarify these cues as they were originally intended, whereas this dancers have had to determine where these might be through their own observations and working processes as this information is not recorded in the archival documents. Furthermore, Sanger observed that in order for the group to learn and remember revival, choreography would always be a ‘group effort’ because the ordering of the movement without others present is difficult. This is straightforward in terms of the practicality of working with a three dimensional body in space, but also the multiple bodies functioning
as spatiotemporal markers can be considered a key constituent of the body archive, particularly through the lens of collective identity as a spatial process (Melucci, 1989) and the idea that memory is shared within groups of common purpose, as discussed in the previous chapter (Halbwachs 1992).

**The Present Body: ‘Being-there’**

In the previous chapter I referred to the work of philosopher Henri Bergson within which he connects memory and action as being co-dependent (1896). Remembering through collective processes, as explored in the previous chapter, revealed that the re-living of dance experience/choerographic process can be understood as a trigger to embodied and experiential or tacit funds of knowledge stored in the body as archive.

During the founder member group rehearsals, David Hamilton and Villmore James were remembering a phrase within which James performs leapfrog over Hamilton (who has his back to James) after running along a diagonal line towards Hamilton. The group were apprehensive about this moment and during a run through of this section James and Hamilton executed the phrase quite precisely and to their own astonishment. This moment highlighted the importance of the spatial placement of this moment in conjunction with James and Hamilton’s ability to sense where they needed to be in space in order for this moment to take place successfully. The number of steps James took and the moment of encounter where Hamilton took James’ weight as he jumped appeared to be familiar and rehearsed, yet it was the first time that the group had performed the action in over twenty five years. This encounter can be aligned with Fraleigh’s idea that the dancing body is interconnected with spatial action. She explains that the dancer ‘does not need to stop to ask where she is in space, or if she is in time with the dance. She has become its space and time’ because she knows the dance after having learnt it (1987: 181). Fraleigh claims that:

> We live space in the placement of the movement in space, where it goes, and how it is designed; but we live it as more than this. We live it wholly as embodied space.
Fraleigh’s claim is that the ‘body-of-space’ is where our understandings of space originate and therefore dance in its space-time existence is manifest in the living time and space of the dance (ibid). This inextricability between body and spatial experience is illuminated in Fraleigh’s example that the dancer does not need to take a pause to ‘ask where she is in space, or if she is in time with the dance’ because her body and the execution of movement adopts a ‘mobile perspective’ through performance (ibid: 180-1). Fraleigh’s notion of embodied space places the notion of the lived body at the core of spatial experience and moreover the duration of movement in space is understood through the lived experience of time (184). The example of Hamilton and James’ leapfrog emphasises the idea of the continuum between bodily action and spatial encounter in embodied space. The moment where Hamilton and James executed the short sequence had depended upon their ability to be in the right position/place in the space at the right time. This was not something they observed or mapped out previously, but they succeeded by executing it in the present moment.

Paul Connerton has suggested that the body is a ‘spatial field’ (2009:18) whereby space cannot be abstracted from action and moreover that bodily memory depends upon the placement of body in space. The leapfrog moment illustrates this point because it demonstrates the unfolding of memorial knowledge simultaneously with bodily action and spatial disposition that occurred by the virtue of the spatial context. This phenomenon relates to Connerton’s description of the ‘mnemonics of the body’ which recognises the incorporation of embodied social practices into a social context (1989:74). This moment is also indicative of the notion of kinaesthetic networks in action as both dancers depended upon the spatial relationship and sensory feedback in order to recall and execute this movement phrase. Connerton’s perspective extends Fraleigh’s proposition regarding embodied space as he suggests that spaces can also be understood as mnemonic structures because of the ‘social units and categories’ that are manifest in their materiality. Connerton’s perspective can be summarised through the idea that meanings are constituted through ‘everyday practical actions’ that are cultivated through ‘static medium(s) of representations’ such as the house (ibid: 19-20). Whilst Connerton’s work explores the culture of forgetting in modern societies, it can be applied here
through the idea that the life history of a dwelling is ‘interwoven with the life history of the body’ (ibid: 20) and furthermore that these histories are expressed as ‘The projection of the self, which is a bodily self onto the house [dwelling]’ along with the artefacts collected within the house ‘which give access to previous experience’ (ibid). Therefore through embodying space in movement action, not only were the founder group reliant upon the spatial setting to be able to execute the repertoire in a pragmatic way but also to facilitate remembering of the choreographic knowledge through the kinaesthetic networks created.

Co-Presence: Dancer and Audience

Earlier in this chapter, I referred to a moment within a revival rehearsal when I was asked to join the dancers in the rehearsal space in order to assist with their execution of a movement phrase (see page 190). The dancers (Watson & Mbola) depended upon my ability to reciprocate their touch, weight and spatial interaction with my body, however I had no previous knowledge of the movement that they were attempting to recall. It is therefore important to discuss the value of the co-presence of bodies in space alongside that of the original practising body (as discussed in the previous chapter) which creates a different reading of the notion of the body archive and is the main focus of this thesis. In the case of the revival works it was significant that the original company dancers returned to perform the original repertoire. The collective process of remembering movement/choreography in this instance can be explored further through ideas of performance and ‘presence’. Choreographer Emelyn Claid observes that it is:

[...] the moment of engagement-that enlivens performer-spectator relations. Performing presence is not fixed to either body but is sparked by both. It is something intangible, where receiving and giving is mixed up, thrown back and forth, and moves in the gap between performer and spectator, enacted by one and the other. Performing presence refuses to be fixed.
This statement chimes with some of those ideas proposed by Bergson (1911) that present experience in performance practices as both shared and dependent upon the engagement between performing bodies and spectatorship. This is an important recognition in view of the collective process of recalling historic movement material, as illustrated in the work of the founder members. It is also indicative of the importance of the lived moment of engagement that suffers as a result of its ephemerality when it comes to archival practices.

These ideas regarding the shared environment within which dance takes place and the suggestion of the specialities of a practice highlights the exclusivity of dance-making processes and also echoes notions of expertise as proposed by Melrose (2007). In the case of the Phoenix Dance Theatre anniversary revival performance, the relationship between audience and performers was significant as everyone present had been invited as a result of their previous role/professional engagement with the company. The function of co-presence between these two groups raised a number of questions with regards to the shared embodiment of the event and presents an interesting case for the notion of the body archive in relation to audience.

Co-presence has been described as our experience as cultivated through ‘the spatial simultaneity of the human body’ (Reason 2006:222). Moreover, this relationship can be explained as constituting a more holistic performance experience ‘because audience and performers ‘inhabit and experience the performance together’ (Zarrilli 2012: 122). This means that all those who inhabit the shared space, such as embodied observers and performers contribute to the production of the performance event or a particular performed moment, simply by being there. This is particularly true of the anniversary revival performance as many of the audience members had witnessed the historic repertoire in their original performances.

In Chapter 2 I referred to the work of Julie Tolentino and Ron Athey with specific reference to Lepecki’s notion of the ‘Body as Archive’ (2010). In this example, the original or authentic body of the performance (Ron Athey) and the archiving body (Tolentino) share the performance (or archiving) space and Tolentino depends upon the reciprocation of their shared

---

61 Previous employees including administrative and creative staff, previous directors, board members, representatives from funding bodies, family members.
experience in space to inform her process of archiving. As Lepecki explained, this ‘immediate re-enacting of a piece in order to corporeally archive it’ privileges the body as an archival site (2010:34):

In its constitutive precariousness, perceptual blind-spots, linguistic indeterminations, muscular tremors, memory lapses, bleedings, rages, and passions, the body as archive re-places and diverts notions of archive away from a documental deposit or a bureaucratic agency dedicated to the (mis)management of the past

Ibid

The elements that enabled Tolentino to carry out this exercise can also be understood as segments or ‘chunks of knowledge manifest in different sensory modalities which forge the possibility of re-appearance, in turn re-awakening movement and choreographic knowledge’. Just as Lepecki has urged that ‘a body may have always already been nothing other than an archive’ (2010: 34), I argue that the body archive also can be read as a site where original knowledge that has been deposited in the body can be recalled. I claim that spatial encounters facilitated through co-presence assist in building up a repository of embodied knowledge and memorial triggers.

In in terms of co-presence the value of ‘being there’ and the collective experience between bodies can be considered within the framework of the ‘body-archive’ proposed in this thesis. In the Phoenix anniversary revival performance, the invited audience offered their responses to the work via a vox-pop interview, and some of these illustrated a level of empathy with the bodies on stage but also evoked personal memories and embodied experiences of the company from past to present. A number of observers remarked that they felt they had been witnesses to the company’s growth and development and recalled key moments in their own historical involvement with the company (see appendix 7.3). The event triggered nostalgic responses in the audience but also an empathy with the process that the founder members and other revival performers had undertaken and they shared in the feeling that something of the original was captured. The
empathetic response illustrated by spectators reinforces Fraleigh’s concept of dance experiences and spectatorship, as she explains:

As audience and other to the dance, we experience it from our own perspective and through the dancer. The dance takes on its life between us [...] Our knowledge involves a lived field of transaction [...] In dance, the dancer and the other who perceives the dance become dynamically interrelated in a desire to reach a common lived ground through the dance.

1995: 64

Notions of co-presence recognise the coalescence between body, space, experience and sensation and extend into the experience of spectating. Matthew Reason explains that the relationship between audience and performer ‘is an intersubjective one of mutual and similar embodiedness’ (2012: 139). This idea also translates to the experience of the dancers working together in the studio, where this relationship is emulated in their participation and sitting on the sides of the space, perceiving the action. Sarah Whatley suggests that ‘the presence of a ‘live’ dancer might be said to involve the viewer, sensing in a more immediate, co-present way the dancer’s effort, breath [and] weight’ (2012:266). This brings forward the idea of a reciprocity that contributes to the overall experience of both performer and spectator and I would argue that the proximity of the experience of another’s effort, breath and weight plays a part in unlocking movement knowledge. This is because these bodily functions can act as triggers such as when Watson and Mbola were rehearsing for the revival performance and both used their breath in an exaggerated manner which echoed the effort and rhythm of the phrase they were executing. Therefore the co-presence of bodies in space and aspects such as breath that contribute to the idea of kinaesthetic networks in this thesis can be claimed as a key component of the body archive.

The observers of the revival performance acknowledged the ‘performance quality’ (Alison Beckett62 11.11.2011) and the ‘emotional feeling’ (Watson, 11.11.2011) constructed through the performance event (see appendix 7.3).

---

62 Former Company Board Member
Such ideas illustrate the notion that the shared presence between dancer and audience member creates a more immediate embodied response, but also in the case of the revival performance, embraces the embodied knowledge and memory of the spectator. It is feasible to claim that the audience member can also be considered within the framework of the body archive as a result of the fact that such spatial proximity and shared performance experience triggers memory and knowledge between both the dancer and the spectator as they inhabit the space simultaneously.

Langer has suggested that whilst the immediate spatial encounter between dancers cannot be understood to constitute ‘recorded history’, it is the ‘sense of history itself’ which acknowledges the past as being an ‘established fabric of events, continuous in space and time and causally connected throughout’ (1953: 263). The co-present experience of these revival performances enabled this continuity to manifest between dancers and audience member where shared moments within the company’s history re-emerged and contributed to the overall experience for those present. This is also true of the founder member revival group rehearsals which were regarded as a means for ‘reliving memories in the studio’ (James 11.11.2011). Much of the time in the studio was divided between actual movement action in the centre of the space but also in discussion and reflecting upon their shared youth and memories of working collaboratively to create dance work (see appendix 7.1 for video footage of the rehearsal process).

Such ideas illustrate the richness and value connected to the co-presence of bodies in space and it has been argued that this is largely dependent upon the proxemics of space. For example, choreographer Victoria Gray notes that ‘space is crucial in order to create the conditions for a relationship whereby the spectator kinaesthetically empathises with the performer’s own bodily state’ (2012: 204). In the studio context, this empathy is heightened through the interplay of body to body interactions where weight, pressure, temperature, eye contact, breath and the sensation caused by patterns of these elements contribute to a shared knowledge and understanding of the dance work. For example, Lynch explains that ‘we all did the movement at exactly the same time’ spontaneously during a rehearsal which represents the body’s capability to connect with other bodies in space through a kinetic and kinaesthetically lived experience.
Chapter Summary

This chapter has considered the role of dance and spatiality in revival processes with a view to understanding and developing the concept of the body archive within this thesis. This chapter responded to the following research question:

What are the archival qualities of the dancing body and in what ways can it be understood as archive?

I have considered the different ways in which knowledge might be contained in the body archive, using the revival work of Phoenix Dance Theatre as an example. Ideas regarding the body as a vehicle for knowledge stored as sensory data highlights the value of the body as a source of information that is inextricably linked to bodily experience. With Lefebvre’s claim that ‘[…] it is by means of the body that space is perceived, lived – and produced’ (1991:162) and ideas of embodied space outlined by Fraleigh (1987) I have questioned the role of space in the body archive. Through observation of dance-making and revival processes within the work of Phoenix Dance Theatre, I have explored the place of kinaesthetic networks of bodies in space in the process of learning and remembering movement vocabulary. When inhabiting the space together, co-presentsly, the ability of the dancers to re-live movement experience constructs a sense of togetherness and the ability to execute shared action which simultaneously unlocks movement knowledge stored in the body. In order to function as archive, the body appears to be dependent upon the milieu of time space and motion and interaction with other bodies (whether dancing or spectating).

Furthermore, the process of unlocking knowledge that is stored in sensory modalities can be associated with the spatial and collective encounters of dancing bodies in space. With reference to the revival processes of the Phoenix founder group along with concepts of ‘collective identity as a spatial process’ (Melucci 1989) it can be argued that movement knowledge stored within the body can be recalled and re-invoked through reliving group relationships, dynamics and the repeated patterns of dance-making processes. The relationship of the body with space highlights the dancing body as a spatio-temporal marker, its archival permanence recognised within the spatial, shared and collective encounters of bodies in space.
The second overarching question that this chapter set out to address asked:

What is the role of the body archive in the process of reviving past choreography in the present?

The role of the body becomes evident as an archive material through its use of spatial encounters and experience as a tool for re-invoking movement knowledge and information. In recognising phenomenological viewpoints that position the body as a bridge between past, present and future (Merleau-Ponty 1962), the idea that it is casually connected with its past is underlined. The discussion in this chapter reveals how dance revival processes extend Bergson’s (1911 [1896]) concepts of memory as being manifest in action through exposing the value and inter-dependency of shared historic knowledge, experience and bodily, spatial encounters. The intricacies of the sensations, hierarchies and traces of historical moments and events bound up in the original event and indeed impetus for choreographic creation can be traced back through the body and its layers of sensorial experience which are triggered through the present encounter.

The dancer appears to be able to recall and reinstate knowledge of historic dance repertoire as a result of haptic, sensory and spatial domains which remain elusive and ineffable and therefore ‘non-archival’, but remain in a web of memory preserved by the body archive. Through my observation of dance revival processes I have discussed the importance of the presence of bodies in space because their interaction enables the unlocking of movement knowledge through their function as triggers. This was particularly evident in the reference to the use of my body in Watson and Mbola’s rehearsal where simple being a body in space, a spatio-temporal marker, enabled the dancers to recall movement that originally involved three dancers. In terms of how this occurrence informs the role of the body archive in revival processes, the importance of a lived, spatial, active process is highlighted, whereby valuable information and movement knowledge is called forth through the presence of bodies in space.

*Spatiality and the body archive*
In the chapter I have extended the notion of the body archive as developed in chapters 3 and 4 to encompass spatial experience as a key component in the process of remembering. The function of space as a trigger to knowledge is depicted in the diagram below:

**Figure 11: The Body Archive: Spatiality**

This diagram summarises the triggers to knowledge preserved in the body archive that the spatial context of revival process facilitates, as discussed in this chapter. From the two key elements of spatial context and sensorial experience, multiple branches of information are made available to the body archive. The spatial setting in which the dancers worked revealed that traditional roles and relationships could be re-lived through dance-making practices and rituals, such as undertaking a technique class and one dancer leading the others in the teaching of a movement phrase. I also suggest that the co-presence of bodies in space is also indicative of a method through which movement recollection can take place, because of the effect of bodily process such as breath, eye contact, observing from the sides and moving together in embodied space (Fraleigh 1987). Another layer of knowledge inherent in shared spatial processes is triggered through sensory components that form cues to knowledge that is embodied. These are played out through the sensory feedback constructed through touch and
the familiar sights of one another in the studio context. The spatial setting when which valuable information can be recalled through the body archive has therefore been revealed as an integral touchstone to embodied knowledge and memory. Moreover, this spatial process of recollection is causally connected with the historic practices of those originally involved in the making process and this historical trajectory is integral to the successful functioning of spatial triggers as identified in this chapter.
Conclusion

In this thesis I have located the notion of the body archive within the context of dance revival processes. To conclude, I return to the overarching research questions outlined in the introduction to this thesis and summarise my findings. My key research questions were:

What are the archival documents of dance and what value do they present for posterity?

What are the archival qualities of the dancing body and in what ways can it be understood as an ‘archival body’?

What is the role of the body archive in the process of reviving past choreography in the present?

Throughout this thesis, I have interwoven key archival concepts with perspectives on lived experience, memory and spatiality, with particular reference to the revival processes of Phoenix Dance Theatre, in order to propose that the dancing body can be considered as an archive in its own right. Through focusing upon the work of a contemporary dance repertory company the research has explored the complexities inherent in dance reconstructive processes, specifically revival works which are created with limited access to different forms of documentation. This is a result of the way in which dance repertory companies function, whereby the archive materials generated by the choreographer during the creation of the work will remain in their possession whereas in a choreographer-led company, the materials are more likely to remain in the shared context of the company and be more consistent across the multiple works created.

This thesis has contributed new knowledge in relation to the role of the archive within dance revival processes. This has been achieved through an in-depth engagement with the process of revisiting historic repertoire as an embodied process in order to re-perform historic dance work in the present. As an observer of such practices taking place within the work of Phoenix Dance Theatre, I have witnessed the role of the body as archive in an
active dance revival context in order to make suggestions towards the value of the archival knowledge available through the dancing body.

**Summary of Discussion and Key Findings**

The thesis has addressed the complexity of obtaining information regarding dance-making and performance experience when undertaking revival of historic dance repertoire. This is often overlooked in the archive, as it is not easily transferable into a tangible format. I have proposed and examined the concept of the 'body archive', whereby the body in dance can be said to be 'archival' owing to its existence as a site where dance knowledge has been archived. Whilst I have argued that the 'absence of a usable past' has long impacted upon the historical study of dance (Thomas 2004), my inquiry has revealed that revival activities incorporating the knowledge of those who were present in the ‘original’ context of dance creation extends the information available in the tangible assets or remnants of performance. New ways of understanding the meaning and function of 'archive in relation to dance practice and performance are conveyed through my observation that it is through the active dance context that multiple layers of dance knowledge are enabled to emerge and be recalled. The discussion has identified valuable knowledge that can be considered as archival and can be made available through the body archive as a new mode of storage. The findings in this thesis offer multiple lenses through which the body archive can be understood as an archival document that is of particular value within dance revival and reconstructive processes. However it will have relevance for archival practice in other art forms and contexts, such as actor training and physical sports.

I propose that the archival documents of dance encompass the body archive as I have described throughout this thesis. The value that the body archive presents in the context of dance revival processes is that it offers lived, ineffable qualities of dance practices that contribute new information and experiential knowledge that is unavailable in the documents that are more traditionally associated with the archive. I have highlighted the specificity of the body archive as existing in the original practising body, as opposed to the archival body being a body where dance knowledge can be
placed, or stored for long term preservation through an act of transfer. My argument is that the body archive is exclusive to the original practising body, where knowledge has been stored since its first moment of conception and can be recalled through bodily domains such as embodiment, memorial and spatial knowledge, capturing something of the essence of the original work.

The first section of the thesis, titled Archival Knowledge, provided a context within which archival gaps for dance could be identified. I explored core archival principles in Chapter 1 and then I considered what was lost when using traditional archival practices for the preservation of dance in Chapter 2. I determined that the function of value in relation to the archive is constructed through the overarching principles of provenance and original order in particular. The emphasis placed upon the origination of material and the reflection of this within the organisation and management of archival material reinforced the selectivity of long term preservation. I developed the idea of the value of the origins of dance-making practice and performance in Chapter 3 through employing phenomenological concepts to position an understanding of the original body. I claimed that the lived body concept when applied to the notion of the body archive offers a way of understanding how knowledge of the dance can remain in the body. I recognised that valuable archival knowledge is constructed through kinaesthetic, sensorial experiences that can be remembered on multiple occasions and remain in a semi-active state for future use via the original practising body.

The commonality across archival materials is that all have undergone a mode of extraction from their original circumstance/context. It is this complexity that led Derrida to observe ideas of the archive as a dominant source of knowledge to be incomplete because all knowledge cannot be known (1996). Formalised processes of archiving and records management take information that is considered to be of value for future generations and transfer it to tangible formats suitable for long term storage. However, these processes overlook the implication of their very methods as being implicit in the creation of a constructed ‘knowledge’ (Cook & Schwartz, 2002). The narrowness of such approaches has been exposed through new modes of thinking about the archive as having transformational qualities because it is understood within continuously shifting contexts. To
paraphrase Cook, the archive is therefore reflective of the spirit of its times (1997). Taking this into consideration, I set out to understand how ‘gaps’ emerge in the dance archive as a result of the inability of embodied knowledge types to be reassigned to different formats and through the implication of shifting information across different generations of dancers, rather than through the original practising body. The key finding has been that the ‘archival significance’, (to borrow Jenkinson’s key term, 1922) of the body archive has been revealed through my observations of the dance revival processes under scrutiny in this project.

**How can archival ‘gaps in knowledge’ be identified in relation to the documents of dance?**

Exploring this question provided the foundation for the emergence of the body archive as a mode of preserving choreographic knowledge and experience that has the potential to extend the parameters of the materials available in the traditional archive. Shifting the focus onto dance and the role of the archive in historical research and revival practice served as a reminder that:

> The specificities of time and location in relation to multiple contexts including broadly, political, social and artistic environment, ‘dancing bodies and watching bodies...with physiological and psychological specialities’

Nicholas 2013: 243

This statement highlights some of the particularities of dance practice in terms of the contextual setting within which dance takes place. I located originality as a key component of the body archive, as a site where aspects of the initial context within which the dance emerged is preserved more authentically than in documents that exist externally to the body. Lepecki’s notion of the ‘body as archive’ (2010), discussed in Chapter 2, revealed that whilst the body as a lived entity offers a site for ‘bodily archiving’ (ibid), the examples that Lepecki refers to (i.e. Richard Move) are limited to modes of temporary storage. This is because the process of placing movement vocabulary into the body after it has undergone an extraction from the
original source dilutes something of the essence of the original work/ performance. Whilst re-enactments can offer rare glimpses into historic dance repertoire through live performance encounters, the sense of originality is still misplaced. In relation to the idea of archival value, the emphasis upon original order and provenance is distorted.

Through appropriating Lepecki’s notion of the ‘body as archive’ and applying the concept to a study of the body archive in dance revival processes, I claim that the preservation of dance movement knowledge occurs within the original practising body. Moreover, with reference to the key themes of memory and spatiality explored within this investigation, I have contributed new ideas regarding the ability of the original body to recall some of the otherwise ineffable elements of past dance practice, where feeling through reliving and feelings of ‘getting it right’ or a ‘sense of accuracy’ (Melrose 2007) are made possible.

What are the archival qualities of the dancing body and in what ways can it be understood as a ‘body archive’?

In Section 2, titled ‘Triggering Knowledge in the Body Archive’, I drew upon the themes of phenomenology, memory and spatiality, which further illuminated the ways in which the original practising body in dance prove effective as an archival material. The role of bodily memory, as discussed in Chapter 4, highlighted the significance of processes of remembering in a collective context because it enabled the unlocking of multiple aspects of memory. Through extending Lepecki’s notion of the ‘body as archive’ which underpinned the discussion in Chapter 2, the value of the original practising memorial knowledge provided new findings in relation to the body archive. In this section of the thesis I explored the type of knowledge inherent in the memory of the dance practitioner and I discussed the media of access through which this knowledge could be obtained. I presented an overview of the dancer’s memory which gave a sense of the type of information that might be available through the body as a storehouse of memory, just as the archive has been considered to be (Craig 2002). My investigation has expanded upon the ideas proposed by Bläsing that the dancer retains information such as ‘the face and voice of the choreographer, the images he gives to illustrate the movement, the comments given by the other dancers, the jokes they make and the
questions they ask’ (2012: 83). I have highlighted that such strands of information form an important layer of the body archive as they illustrate its potential to collect and categorise knowledge in the body for future recall. I have considered how such information can be extracted through the body and revealed that the re-living of dance-making processes and practices can be considered to exist in relation with the archive. I enquired as to whether the memory of the dance practitioner can be considered as ‘archival’ and I have determined that there are multiple modes for accessing the archival information, including memory including and therefore validating the role of the body archive. In particular, application of Bergson’s concept of the body as a ‘center [sic] of action’ assisted in exposing the process of shared experience and collective remembering (Halbwachs 1992) as a method of recall. The strengths inherent in the act of the original practising bodies processing their memories simultaneously are evident in the ability of such processes to re-invoke movement knowledge and a sense of connectedness, leading to a more authentic portrayal of the historic repertoire. The body enables the capturing of memories in different ways to other more traditional modes of archival storage. This was also achieved through the notion of ephemeral markers and kinaesthetic networks and these ideas were developed through discussion in Chapter 4.

**What is the role of the body archive in the process of reviving past choreography in the present?**

In Chapter 4 I developed the idea that triggers to archival knowledge are manifest in the shared spatial processes of dance practice, which allows a synthesis between the role of triggers which are discussed in detail below (see the body archive model on page 132) across both chapters 3 and 4. I enquired as to how concepts of spatiality could be employed to understand how movement knowledge is learned and recalled in the body archive. I proposed in particular that kinaesthetic networks, forged through the collective experiences of dancing bodies in the studio space, underpin the body’s ability to remember historic dance repertoire. I explained that the shared spatial environment in dance revival processes creates an interconnectedness that functions through the plane of the lived body. I have described this notion as ‘kinaesthetic networks’ and claimed that this occurrence enables a number of bodily based, experiential qualities to re-emerge across the group of bodies moving together in space. This idea
recognises that through the shared process of remembering and executing movement vocabulary, a sensory awareness of spatial relationships, dynamics and tactile forms of knowledge that exist between this group of bodies are unlocked and called forth through the action of the body and are otherwise non-verbal and ineffable.

I subsequently described processes within which the reuniting of dancing bodies in space enabled the triggering of knowledge because of their function as spatiotemporal markers, their ability to return to past roles and re-live past experiences of working together in the studio. The affirmation of a collective identity through spatial interaction and sensori-motor information called forward movement knowledge stored within the body. I therefore suggest that the key message inherent within this section of the thesis is that taxonomies of value in relation to the dance archive can be extended to include data that can be considered as relational, embodied, tacit, haptic and memorial available through the body's engagement in process.

**The Body Archive Model**

Throughout this thesis, I have illustrated the functions of the body archive and the triggers to knowledge that are constructed through bodily experience. These ideas were represented across Chapters 3, 4 and 5 and the diagram below brings these ideas together. Figure 9 illustrates how the body archive functions through a process of triggering knowledge that is embodied and is of archival value. This is due to its role in enabling the re-capturing of the essential and otherwise intangible aspects of historic dance performance. Whilst the body archive is a complex, multi-layered notion that demands more research and further explication, I have identified three main processes for discussion here which contribute to the triggering of knowledge in the body archive; movement action, spatiality and collectivity.

The notion of the body archive, as the original practising body is understood to contain traces of the process and experiential knowledge of the particular performance being revived. Additional layers of information such as the social and hierarchical relationships in place at the time of making, for example in the collective context of the Phoenix founder members). Through the process of revival, the function of the body archive as I have
discussed in this thesis depends upon three key aspects; movement action, spatiality and collectivity all of which enable the unlocking of memory to aid the revival work. It is not always the case that revival takes place collectively in a group; however through my argument I have recognised the value of the shared experience and re-living of processes and memories of the original bodies in space. The collective context is a vital component in the recapturing of valuable movement knowledge that can be considered as archival. The contribution of the knowledge of the original bodies who shared in the original making process is integral to the revival work and this knowledge can be subdivided into distinct categories that I understand to be triggers to layers of original knowledge that remain in the body archive.
Figure 12: The Body Archive Model

Origins of experience
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- Memory of making process
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- Affirmation of choreographic knowledge. Increased reliability of memory
The Original Body

The figure above reflects the hierarchical value of the original practising body in the process of recalling and re-invoking knowledge of dance repertoire stored within the body.

Process: Movement Action

Considering Bergson’s premise that the body is a ‘center of action’ whereby its ability to remember is dependent upon the active processes of the body in movement, I suggest that the experience of movement enables the unlocking of knowledge that is ‘dancerly’ (McFee, 2012) i.e. knowledge of the steps and of the original choreographic process. Through the movement action, knowledge of how that particular step or way of moving emerged can be recalled and therefore the unlocking of movement vocabulary flows as a result of the actual ‘doing’. For the dancer it is often the case that when commencing a movement phrase the ordering of actions spontaneously occurs in the moment of movement. This was evident in Lynch’s description of how it felt to remember the repertoire in 2011.

Process: Spatiality

The unlocking of memory and movement knowledge also takes place through another layer of the body archive, as the spatial context within which the remembering takes places has been implicated in the process of recollection within this investigation. The spatial context aids the recollection of movement vocabulary because of the roles, relationships and otherwise invisible kinaesthetic networks that are forged as a result. The dance studio environment within which revival work usually takes place enables the original hierarchies within a group of dancers to re-emerge and plays an essential role in re-awakening movement knowledge. This functions in a particular way in the case of dance, through the interplay of spatial interaction between bodies and the potential of haptic engagement whereby a particular touch in the right place forms a trigger towards the right movement phrase of where a new phrase begins. The role of touch, spatial proximity, eye contact, weight sharing and sensory feedback provide the ephemeral markers required for the dancing body to re-construct movement knowledge embedded in their bodies.
**Process: Collectivity**

Furthermore, the co-presence of bodies in this environment contributes to the feedback and affirmation of memory between the dancers whether the individual dancers are active in the space executing movement or observing from the perimeters of the dance space. Lastly, the collective aspect of each of these processes facilitates the construction of a shared identity, the familiarity through recognition of one another, reinforcing Melucci’s notions that collective identity is an active process (1989) and illuminating the value of remembering as a shared process and constructs an affirmation of their shared history. The identity and collective experiential knowledge of the group can be understood as a trigger to memory considering Halbwachs’ ideas in particular. To paraphrase Halbwachs, this is because groups of individuals can call memories to mind simultaneously with their recognition of one another and their shared interest in a shared past. Their resembling one another calls forth their shared memories, in this case of choreographic intent, process and performance. In summary, I claim that these three elements of the body archive are of value as they bring us closer to the provenance of historic dance repertoire because original hierarchies, order of movement generation, relationships and roles and group identities are re-invoked and accessible through these particular layers of recall.

**Implications and Recommendations for Dance Archival Practice**

The knowledge generated through the body archive model as explained above offers a new way of looking at the role of the body as archive. I have argued for the value of the dancing body as a source of archival knowledge, particularly within the context of revival processes. This has been illustrated and supported by my observations and analysis of the revival work of Phoenix Dance Theatre. In particular, the concept of the body archive is defined by the original practising body as a source of the original context or provenance of the circumstances within which the dance repertoire emerged. Through recognising that valuable knowledge of the making process and experience can be recalled through memory and spatial encounter, I am suggesting that the body archive can provide
additional information to that already available in documents that are more commonly referenced for revival purposes, such as video recordings and dance notation. However, a key limitation in this finding is that the process of dance-making is ordinarily a private, closed occurrence not designed for public engagement or involvement. If this process is to be archived then it raises ethical issues with regards to the consent of the choreographer and those involved in the making process.

The implication of sourcing the original dancing body is problematic for a number of reasons. Firstly there is the question of the availability of the original dancer to attend the rehearsals for the particular company that wishes to revive the work. (For older works, the original dancer may no longer be alive.) Secondly, the reliability of the knowledge inherent in the body is a concern, considering the deterioration of memory over time together with the body's physical ability to execute the movement as originally intended. However, it is evident from the discussion presented here that there are clear strengths in the ability of the original body to recall multiple layers of knowledge of the original repertoire, non-verbal and ineffable, capturing something of the essence of the original performance that may be lost in video-recording or notation. A key recommendation of this thesis is that the ageing dancer is more widely recognised and appreciated as a source of valuable, ongoing information that can be considered as 'archival' and is particularly useful in the context of revival processes. I am recommending that where the original bodies are available, those dancers are brought into the revival process for as much time as possible so that they can bring that level of authenticity to the work. Phoenix Dance Theatre, as key participants in this research, have demonstrated their commitment to the research findings in their recent decision to create an evening's public performance featuring dancers from throughout its past, some of whom were the first to perform the works for the company (Phoenix@Home 27th September 2014). Additionally, the Foundation for Community Dance has recently launched the ‘Elixir Festival’63 which invites older dancers to perform the restaging's of works by a number of contemporary choreographers, therefore also valuing the ability of the ageing dancer to articulate movement.

The research conducted in this study also makes a case for the value of accessing process in terms of dance-making and choreographic expertise. It highlights the implications of absent information in the archive because of the lack of documentation relating to the time of the making of dance work (Melrose 2007). The reliving of dance ritual and choreographic methods in the original practising bodies in order to revive a historic work presents a meaningful way in which something of the originality of the work can be captured. This is because dance-making processes are varied and multiple and can be considered as markers of dance expertise. Efforts to encompass aspects of dance-making process are becoming more commonplace in dance archival practices, particularly through digital initiatives. A primary example of this has been in the work of Siobhan Davies Replay archive which has embraced the ability of new technologies to ‘provide new kinds of interventions to the processes of both creating and documenting dance events’ (Whatley 2008: 250). Whatley explains that this is because the project digitised material with the intention of placing it into the archive, rather than from a more traditionally retrospective process of digitising what already existed. This, for Whatley, presented new opportunities to ‘explore a variety of ways to capture and present the raw materials’ (ibid) and subsequently contributes to the valuing of the ordinarily private and idiosyncratic processes of dance-making that can be of value to the revival process.

The value of bodies together in space as a methodology for accessing embodied knowledge has emerged as a valuable process in the work of Phoenix Dance Theatre. A key implication is that the role of the original body as an archival source depends upon appropriate spatio-temporal relationships, preferably with those other bodies who were also originally present at the time of making, or with the correct number of bodies to assist with the unlocking of movement knowledge through physical contact (as was the case when Watson and Mbola used my body as a sort of marker during some of the revival processes referred to in this thesis).

Dance-making activities within the studio context are becoming incorporated into the archive and as a result the potential for the body archive and more traditional archival materials to work in tandem can be considered. This is particularly the case within new innovation into digital practices of archiving as I have briefly referred to in Chapter 2 of this thesis. The permanence of traditional archival management and storage methods has resulted in the
search for ‘stable, widely adopted methodology’ for dance to have the capacity to
document ‘itself in robust and ‘readable’ forms’ (Whatley 2010: 79). However, I assert that the role of the body archive offers itself as a valid methodological tool, particularly in the case of revival processes, due to the mobility it offers as a living entity where flow, dynamic and momentum in spatial movement practices are maintained.

The limitations of the lived body as it deteriorates present increased difficulty in terms of accessing the contents of the body archive that are of value, particularly within revival processes. There are also implications of memory and forgetting; just as the archive can omit material that at the time does not constitute value, so can the body lose hold of valuable information as a result of processes of time, ageing and death. The difficulty in accessing material stored within the body archive that is limited to processes of re-living in collective spatiotemporal contexts is a particular concern. When the body reaches a point where it is no longer able to execute movement or remember the steps, or even feel what it was like to dance the movement, the role of the body archive is increasingly vulnerable; therefore the life span of the body archive material remains ambiguous. A parallel can be drawn here between the processes of deterioration also faced by traditional archival materials. In the prelude to this thesis I referred to my awareness of the age of the paper that I had touched in an archive. A sense of the age of the document was transmitted through the feel and appearance of the paper, but it was also crumbling and likely to deteriorate beyond legibility in due course. There are analogies between the efforts to conserve materials that will inevitably decay with age and the inability of the body to remember and physically execute historic movement repertoire. Both hold value as archival materials, even if they cannot be maintained beyond their natural lifespan.

In light of traditional archival methods the genre of contemporary dance faces the difficulty that the dance-making process is ordinarily private and not intended for the archive. The archive is understood to provide records of key events and decisions made and in the case of dance it overlooks the ‘nature of the work that finishes the work’ (Melrose 2006) in the case of dance-making expertise. The dance-making process is also one of selection and the traces of decisions made with regards to aspects of movement generations such as vocabulary, dialogue, impetus, anecdote, creative context and emotion, and I am privileging the body archive as a
vehicle for accessing some of these different layers of knowledge. Furthermore, I am suggesting that in the context of dance revival processes the body archive is of particular value because it can be considered to contain some of this information that escapes permanence within the traditional archive but can be re-captured through the reliving of process and subsequent triggers as I have identified in the diagram on page 191.

Key Recommendations

In relation to the practice of dance revival work I suggest that the notion of the archival body could be of use in the following ways:

- The body archive offers a way of capturing something of the essence of the original work that exceeds the capabilities of video recordings or written notes and is therefore a source of enrichment for dance revival work.
- The body archive should be employed in an active capacity in a studio setting in order for the original knowledge of the work to be realised. This is because it creates a context that is presumably similar to the original context within which it is emerged and therefore enables the knowledge to re-surface in a similar way to its original creation, unlike discussion/interview/diarising experience in other ways.
- Capturing process in the form of anecdotal narratives and details of the experiential qualities of dance-making and experience is of potential value to the archive and should be considered during periods of creation.

In terms of dance archival practices, it is recommended that:

- The archivist endeavours to trace knowledge of dance-making processes to enrich existing archival materials in acknowledgement of the value that this information has for the provenance of the records in existence.
- It would be useful for archivists to include on the catalogue description, where possible (and with permission), the details of the location, duration and the participants involved in the making process in order to inform the user of the original circumstances of the work’s emergence, and provide
information with regards to where the embodied memories of the repertoire might reside.

**Considerations for Future Research**

Overall, this thesis is likely to be of interest to dance archivists, as well as archival scholars in more general terms. It is also relevant to those investigating the revival work of contemporary dance companies, particularly repertoire companies, dancers, choreographers and scholars of dance, and to performing arts scholars more broadly. For those investigating the archival practices of dance, the exploration of the role of the body as an archival source supplementary to traditional performance and theatre ephemera will assist in understanding and further problematising the impact of dance’s ephemerality upon the archive. For dancers, choreographers and dance scholars, this discussion will assist understandings of how the body archive can enhance revival work in dance. Also, more widely, this thesis brings new perspectives to bear upon the layers of knowledge deposited into the body through performance making processes, and offers ways of thinking about how active processes of recall might aid understanding of historic performance practices.

This project has specifically referred to the work of Phoenix Dance Theatre who as a contemporary dance repertory company creates work within one genre of dance and performs the work of choreographers commissioned by the company, rather than creating work in-house. Therefore, in terms of future research a feasible approach would be to develop the concept of the body archive across multiple genres and practices of dance-making, i.e. ballet, kathak, tap dance and dance improvisation. Further research in this area could be conducted into these different types of dance contexts and different dance forms to consider how the body archive model might function and fit within other archival options. I have also referred to dance-making in a traditional studio setting whereas future research could address the variation in sites and spaces for dance-making i.e. site-specific dance practice) and the relationship of the dance setting to the function of the archive. Relationships with space and place have the potential to affect the role of the body-archive in practice, in particular the spatial context within which choreographic knowledge can be recalled as has been addressed within the dance-studio context in this thesis.
A key area for further research is in relation to the ageing body and the impact of deterioration of memorial knowledge within the concept of the body archive. This research also has a future in the exploration of the influence of the body archive upon value judgements in dance archival practices as a result of the acknowledgement made through this research that archival knowledge exists in and through the body archive.
Appendices
Appendix 1

Phoenix Dance Theatre Archive Contents: an overview

Material:
Publicity records and theatre ephemera including programmes, posters, flyers, publicity images (print/negative and CD digital formats); film - performance and rehearsal footage (VHS, Mini DV, DVD) from 1985 onwards; papers - finance records, minutes, correspondence, records relating to the repertory e.g. costume & lighting design, floor plans, fabric swatches, choreographic notes, images, music and lighting cues; audio records - cassette tapes of interviews, music (on cassette, CDs, minidisc); education records – minutes, VHS (branded materials previously for sale), photography (digital and print), education resource packs, DVDs of Phoenix repertory; costumes.

Formats:
Paper, audio-visual, digital, costumes.

Phoenix Dance Theatre Archive Contents

Filing Cabinet 1

Drawer a-
Repertoire Files, production/photographs/costume lists and designs A-G

Drawer b-
Repertoire Files, production/photographs/costume lists and designs H-O

Drawer c-
Repertoire Files, production/photographs/costume lists and designs P-S

Drawer d-
Repertoire Files, production/photographs/costume lists and designs S cont...- X

Filing Cabinet 2

Drawer a-
Marketing Ephemera (i.e. programmes, publicity flyers/leaflets and miscellaneous promotional materials) approximately 1981-2012(excluding 2002-3) one folder containing collaborative publicity.
Drawer b-
Press reviews/cuttings/articles, originals (needs conservation attention-glued to non-acid-free paper) 1982-2001, 2004-2008 including one miscellaneous file containing material relating to external companies connect to Phoenix.

Drawer c-
International Press reviews, articles including or about Phoenix and company Press Packs and Press Releases. Miscellaneous folder containing various cuttings and press quotes (possible used in exhibition or display).

Drawer d-
Scrapbooks/artwork
- Pam Rex-Phoenix Dance-a notebook, Phoenix-Rima-artists note
- Phoenix Dance Costume Designs
- Phoenix Dance Company in Jamaica March 16-20 1991
- Untitled Scrapbook/photograph album (palm trees coastal images)
- Phoenix Calendar
- Collection of Materials belonging to Ricky Holgate
- 18 loose oversize publicity images (b/w)
- 1 box of publicity images 97-98 (underwater shots)
- 1 bag containing oversize images (late nineties publicity)

Filing Cabinet 3
Drawer a
- Touring venue Information A-M, including contracts, agreements, show reports, lighting plans and miscellaneous correspondence.

Drawer b
- As above N-Z

Drawer c
- International Venues and Festivals A-Z (as above including programmes and publicity materials)

Drawer d
- Dancer headshots from early founder years-2000 (incomplete)

Filing Cabinet 4
Drawer a
• Board meeting minutes and AGM minutes dating approximately 1985-87, 1995-2008
  Drawer b
• Various meeting minutes, AGM 1995-2004, QRM 2002-2004, Business Plans & correspondence, various other meeting minutes, funding correspondence and company information (currently sorting)
  Drawer c
• Building project paperwork and correspondence.

Audio Visual Material

• 7 archive boxes of video, 5 of which are listed and 2 of which remain unsorted. Overall contents include repertory, promotional material, rehearsal footage and the work of external dance companies. Also a number of off air recordings.
• 1 box of LP’s
• 1 box of film reels
• 1 shelf of Miscellaneous videos
• 1 shelf of Betacam recordings and DV Cam and DAT tapes
• 1 shelf containing mini DV tapes and DVDs of repertoire
• 2 boxes of audio cassettes and CDs

Photography/Artwork

• 1 portfolio of posters
• 43 boxes of posters of varying sizes (will contain duplicates)
• 1 small box of DVDs of publicity images

Other/Miscellaneous

• 1 shelf of A4 files containing press cuttings
• 1 office cabinet containing historic material relating to the company education work. I.e. video, study guides and correspondence/paperwork.
• Costume:-approximately 5 boxes of costume and 1 hanging rail of costumes no longer in use (a large number of costumes were donated to the West Yorkshire Playhouse Wardrobe Costume Hire). It is worth noting that when the company revives historic work, they re-use the costume where possible.
• One box of material donated by critic Stephanie Ferguson, under appraisal at present.
• Wallet of material donated by Chris Nash, mainly images and programmes featuring the company (also a number of NSCD programmes).
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Appendix 3: Sharon Watson Interview Transcript

Today is the 11th February 2011, I’m Laura Griffiths and I’m here with Sharon Watson, artistic director of PDT in her office in Phoenix Dance Theatre’s HQ in Leeds and we’re going to talk today a little bit about the history of Phoenix particularly the identity of Phoenix and Sharon’s understanding and Perceptions of Phoenix through its history.

So initially I thought I would ask if you considered Phoenix to have perhaps a collection of classic works in its overall repertoire throughout its history, if there was any works that you perhaps identified as being characteristically Phoenix in that and it might come on to my next question but I think perhaps this is a bit more of a question of what are the characteristics of Phoenix and what works perhaps?

Well I think the works that I would say the public our audience have sort of honed in to have made it semi classical because we don’t tend to use those terms but what we would pull together as a classical programme for example may well be something like Haunted Passages which we did pull back. I guess to some degree Longevity because of its message and its contexts… the works of Shapiro and Smith yes its strong athleticism and its vibrancy… moving it further into maybe the late eighties or early nineties I guess the work of Didy Veldman I guess that pulls into a it could become so I mean these are some of these works hadn’t been seen since the company delivered them and I think when you’re thinking about what the company looks like and the kind of the works that I think would be aesthetically pleasing to the audience, those kind of throughout the years those are the ones that I think we really kind of would be identified as Phoenix Classics.

And is that mainly because of the whole the idea of vibrancy and athleticism is that in the movement itself the movement of those the actual vocabulary?

I think so I think what’s interesting that each of the choreographers especially in the earlier days the choreographers they really tried to get under the skin of the dancers, more so than just bringing something which and I think Didy Veldman’s work was already created on the company it wasn’t derived from the dancers and it didn’t have that kind of essence the creative essence from the dancers and it has a very different feel and I think in terms of what the dancers are able to deliver then that work becomes something of that nature…You know I mean Longevity was created on Phoenix and likewise well Haunted Passages wasn’t actually but for some reason there was a narrative of the ta which really connected with the company in its delivering. Shapiro and Smith, they both had an energy that was just electric and the work of Tom Jobe as well I think is one of the ones who is probably representing an identity in the company so, you know I think the subtleties are in there but I think there is that it’s the works that you wouldn’t expect to see on any other company, or delivered in a particular way so yeah its trying to package that is quite difficult but its there it is there.
And so on the other side of that then were there any different choreographers who come in with a work that they have already created perhaps do you think there have been some that have been less successful because they don’t Phoenix or they have come with an agenda that perhaps doesn’t match what Phoenix were doing and they have had to work around that…

I don’t know I don’t, I mean there have been works that I have questions whether that was a Phoenix piece and whether that should have been there I mean Jeremy Nelson’s work was a questionable piece of work for me as a rehearsal director at the time and wondering where this was taking the company and it wasn’t a work that I felt was actually was derived from a kind of emotional content or I mean even a physical one to be honest I don’t know it was just something that was very superficial in terms of what it was. But you know I mean the audience did enjoy it I wouldn’t say that it wasn’t accepted but I didn’t feel that it kind of seeped into the roots of the company. which other works there are a few other works that again I just feel that perhaps were a little bit out there I mean the work oh I have forgotten his name now… And this is a personal thing I would say… the work with the Jimi Hendrix track it will come back to me but I felt that the components of that again were just so extreme and I couldn’t get my head around the concept of the work and so it was very difficult for me to kind of accept and buy into it, I thought the dancers delivered it incredibly well and all the right elements were there but it again it just sat on the surface for me it didn’t get the trait of anything

So what you’re saying is that the audiences reception and appreciation of the work...

Well I think they tell us what works they really do and the previous artistic directors I believe also you know those that have really tried to give the audience Phoenix message a Phoenix theme I think they have to think very hard about it because when you get it wrong you get it really wrong [laughter]

So that’s probably had a big influence on the choice of works that you have chosen to revive in the present but more specifically what is the general purpose for Phoenix to revive work?

You don’t throw away thirty years of history, you really don’t I mean you know any good business as such any good organisation will know that you can really draw on the gems that you have within your organisation and within your company history and make good use of it and I just still feel that those works have stood the test of time they are very vibrant, they do the job and yes they we shouldn’t our history because that’s exactly what’s put us where we are today and we have got thirty years to choose from and I think it’s fantastic it’s like being in a sweet shop [laughter] yeah and some of them won’t be the ones that have been highly profiled but I think when you are thinking about pulling a rep together you need to be able to balance those works and the ones that I feel perhaps haven’t had the same kind of exposure might well be something that I choose because I know that the next season of
work requires something that's a little bit new, a little bit less... and its really pulling all of that together that...

**So are you considering your new audiences as well as your old audiences?**

Absolutely, you have to I mean you have got your loyal followers and of course you know that they will continue to be there and so you give them a flavour of the past but you have to got to introduce them to new things you know we don't have a swan lake and I know that people will continue to pay to see the same Swan Lake but I'm sure if you kind of added something else to that flavour you will begin to draw in new audiences so yes absolutely that's very important to us and I think that's why we its important that Phoenix stays a rep company...

**And so is there a set group of works you know with each tour does that affect the choice at all In terms of if you are touring four works which one will fit within the other three.**

I have that dilemma right now [laughter] I think 2012 I think is round the corner and its trying to think about what is going to be our revival work and I've got a bit of an idea but it kind of what else have I got coming into that and ...new choreography and balance the choreographer for me and its not an easy decision because sometimes its an unknown and I’m edging my bets at the moment because of the information I share with a choreographer and the request that I make from them that I absolutely stick to it because it throws my plans out of the water

**And I'm sure the dancers that you have got available to you today that impacts upon the choice of work, how far do you think that impacts upon, is it more about the work or how that's going to look with the present dancers…?**

It’s a hard one [yes] because, I actually worked on Never2Still with the current company and Never Still was the work that I choreographed on the original dancers of that piece.

And what I got from them was very different to what I have recreated with the new company and I have had to do that because the one that is very different, I wouldn’t say that their physicality is different but their language and vocabulary was different, and in order for me to get that same satisfaction or conversation of range and diverse activity within the piece I had to talk to them about their experience to pull that in to slightly adapt the work so that it still fits with never still do its its a challenging one I mean I think the dancers I have today are they work in a very different way and making sure that I utilise what they have and also the works that will show them to their best because I think obviously the choreographers that are creating the work wasn’t thinking I don’t thinking twenty years ahead of themselves, thinking that the dancers are going to look very different or that they’re not going to be black dancers or whatever it is so, you can look back at the history I have to see how works will reworks themselves on a new company.
And how far do you think the identity of the original work changes when you re-work it in the now because you are having to rely on the dancers experiences and their understanding you know you are drawing on themselves do you think the work is still identifiable now or do you think?

I don’t know, I think it changes for each choreographer for each piece of work, I think Philip Taylor did a great job with Haunted Passages but I suppose in one way we knew that Haunted Passages transpired to other companies because we have seen it. So we already knew that there was a change that could actually work, I think what he did was that the design of the work was slightly different just knowing that initially the cast was all black in this case the cast are European and even the colours of the costumes that had he had to look at and probably the lighting the design so something as simple as that actually does resonate, so to give it the strength as well that the work needs you probably have to just dig a little bit deeper so that actually we’ve addressed everything. Not many of the steps were changed so I think that was quite nice but it did actually…

Absolutely….

The other one that’s coming back but I think again… its one of those that we’ve seen on the original choreographers we have a double cast and now we’ve got again a double cast so it does it does change. I had a conversation recently which I think was interesting someone, joe public said I hope they don’t bring back this particular work because I don’t want to ever see it with anybody else and I thought… it made me feel like that one will never be done again because those dancers will not step back in that studio to produce that work and I thought about that and it just sort of resonated with me for some reason. If I was to really believe that that work could not be recreated then it stays and it never comes alive again and I, you don’t know quite how that would work for me.

It is interesting in that whole original identity and the body being the work perhaps those dancers actually are the work. You know with the work you are creating now because of course you have choreographed Melt and you have choreographed it with the dancers you have got now, how would you envisage that if it were to be revived in twenty years from now?

It would be an honour and I just feel that for one it would show, it would grow twenty years from now I would love to know that Melt is still going, however they redesign with the dancers because I think that’s where it comes from I think you take the concept and you hand it over to the dancers and eventually the dancers tap into their own instincts and that for me it can continue to do that, you will have things that slightly change and I think that’s a positive rather than a negative in that respect I would like to think that maybe the cast could be all women at some point if that was what was needed just because the vocabulary …. And its just…
So coming back to this idea about the revival of the work and to actually keep the vocabulary the same, how authentic do you think the revival needs to be, if you think about authenticity of a work and how far you are going to make sure that the steps remain the same, you talk about the concept of the work and there is a tension there with regards to how important the concept/narrative of the work as opposed to the actual vocabulary. You talked earlier about the characteristics, the vibrancy etc. and the success of work because of that idea…. Essence of the work, the qualities of a work that are important rather than the actual.

I don’t… I mean it … [laughing]

Perhaps the execution of a work and that’s why its important that the dancers bring their own identities?

I think so and I think what’s interesting I think is for a choreographer to accept that you can be fed from the other side you know to keep something alive. It is and I think you’d have to end up taking each one individually because actually there is something there is one work that we had in the rep and that was absolutely drawn from a cultural perspective, now I questioned that if that work was something that was going to be brought back I actually thought that that work wouldn’t and it couldn’t happen and I actually thought (and I’m going to bury myself here) I don’t think it could happen because the lifestyle and the activity that was happening then was so so specific to those individuals they literally lifted it from a life experience and put it on to the stage so you almost recreate the living room that these young people were experiencing the people that were there, I think its so honed in on that that I actually don’t think that that would transpire. You would actually have to recreate it again with a modern with a new modern family or a modern situation or current situation. So that wouldn’t, it wouldn’t be the same work absolutely not, no.

Then maybe, the other works that we do have, yeah its, a choreographer will always want to grow as well so I think allowing themselves to be fed with the same concept but not necessarily the same steps, similar energy but produced in something else, so its it’s a bit of six of one and half a dozen of the other I don’t know if that’s an answer, yeah I think you have to take the work individually, the work that was done by David Hamilton and the guys in the early days, would that work for Phoenix now, probably not, because again its one of those things that’s so individual to those to those male dancers [pause] it wouldn’t look the same because those dancers weren’t trained in the same so what you’re going to get is something that is physically raw and you try and recreate it on dancers that are very refined so you are asking them to almost imitate something that isn’t naturally in them.

It interesting because that is one of the things that…core of phoenix one of those early works it is the original in a sense that is what’s shaped the company if you like….narrative that Phoenix has taken since then that means that that is exclusive to that time and those bodies
I think so and I think up until David, David...David's time with the company and then Neville taking over it was I mean, the company had to grow at the end of the day and I think the essence of what David was trying to do was to story tell and that was really at the heart of what and how they were doing it, they did it with the tools that they had at the time, now Neville taking that baton on and still storytelling is still the same but it its kind of the journey is still continuing but I think he had different tools to do that with. The tools become more refined as you say, then again you get another another look at the company but it hasn't lost anything, I think that its brought it in its brought it in house. I think Neville's tools gave us the new female aspect of it which opened up another area of work, another look at the company so those stories are still going through, the essence is still there.

*So would you go as far as to say that storytelling is the essence of Phoenix?*

I don’t think I could say that I don’t think I could, am I avoiding saying that? Only in the sense that I think there is a literal sense in storytelling but I think, I don’t know actually, maybe I can say that it is about storytelling, not in this classical sense the way you have your classical narrative stories but I don’t think there is something about the there is always a kind of, I don’t know if it’s a physical story that goes with the... what’s the word...

*So if I had a suggestion perhaps that what you thought is essentially Phoenix*

No I wouldn’t [laughter] I mean I don’t know because there’s very few of Phoenix’s works that actually have that storytelling within it the abstract is probably more of what we do but it hasn’t derived from that

*It is interesting that you still mention the physicality*

I think that does come through...

Energy and the vibrancy that, it really does take it off the page in the sense that it’s not everybody that can do it and I really truly believe in that’s what they have kept.

Perhaps a little bit off topic in what we have just been talking about but I’m just interested because you use the term revival specifically for these works and I wondered whether if you are talking about trying to keep the steps the same perhaps, in most of the work the steps have remained the same and I know the choreographers aren’t necessarily working from movement scores, but why did you decide to use the term revival was that your decision was that just how it came about.

They are they are revivals...

*How would you define that and what it is you’re doing?*

I suppose
As opposed to saying it’s a reconstruction, a rework or a re-interpretation a modern interpretation... that might be a bit extreme but I’m just interested about the decision to use the term revival…?

Re-constructing is [pause] its not a terminology that I identify with and I don’t think it’s a terminology generally used within the dance sector as such I mean I think its more of a textbook terminology and there may be something of a visual… terminology I think when you’re an audience member and you are reading something that says a revival its goings to… I it automatically identifies with something that you’ve been an experience of perhaps, instead of using the word reconstruction I mean I think that could become…that’s too broad as far as I...it works for me I think its just too broad and it doesn’t hit home its kind of it has too many connotations behind it that doesn't really doesn't says what it means.

And so we could say that they are reworks because we talked about using new bodies and perhaps those new bodies bring something different to the work?

I think rather than trying to I mean a revival is trying to keep it as much as possible to its original format I think you are going to get moments where it changes just because you know I mean a dancers range of flexibility might not be as it was in the original cast and you’re going to have to make those minor adjustments I think is what it is as opposed to kind of thinking that the whole thing is going to be reconstructed with so many variations that could come as a result of that. I think there is something about trying to keep it true to its essence and just accepting those smaller changes that there are that need to be made. If a choreographer, I mean some of these works are so old if you miss something off a video, and there were video recordings that you are working from then you have to fill that gap and it might not be that very movement so its as much as possible you are trying to keep it to its original format.

How do you and the company approach the revival process, we have talked about selecting works, what it’s the actual physical approach rehearsal process.

Philip Taylor has done, was the first of those revivals, and I think we gave the dancers the recordings of the shows that were done by the original cast and some of that those steps were literally learnt ...from the video from in order to give it some work when he... the material when he arrived for him to do whatever he felt was appropriate with those but its easily done its like... you could read it and then deliver it and so that’s the process I think in terms of doing it from a video, they learn it verbatim in that sense and then the essence of actually the thing that is missing from a video is that you don’t get any of the dialogue you don’t get any of the language behind it kind of keeping the story to allow you to get into any of the characters, so great we have still got the choreographer around to get him in to fill those gaps...
So in terms of the documentation of the dance you think that the film is probably the most, the thing that you most rely on?

I think we do yes, yes, I think its an unfortunate situation that money does come into it but in order to start that from the beginning from you know from scratch where the choreographer and the dancers meet and the start that process together it does cost to have a choreographer for that level of time, so money being an issue there we can get the job done prior to and then give them the tools when they arrive, so its and I think those things are very important that the choreographer actually is able to have a hands on relationship with the dancers with the new dancers but I think again the concepts and the ideas come from the choreographer so absolutely cut out the middle man and feed it straight in.

So in terms of educating the dancers about the context of the original work is that, do they get that from the film itself or is there a…choreographer and do you think there is a dialogue about the original context of …

Yeah absolutely I think you get a feeling from a video obviously there is no text to it but I think I do think one of the things that was interesting about haunted is that having danced it myself Azz and I had many conversations about what did it feel like for you and just to see whether there is a correlation there whether there was an understanding of us being in the same place you know me twenty years ago and her in the present and whether the ideas which he was taking forward actually really fitted in with the original idea of the choreographer. And I thought that that was beautiful I thought that, I mean she felt quite pressured at times, its like, its different we are in a different place with it you may well be delivering those steps as I did back then you are in a different place with it and your experiences are very different so what you hang on that information is not something I can give you I can share it with you but you're going to have to find you r own language and ideas and ideologies about it or whatever it is but you are going to have to find that and go with it, we can compare notes later.

And so did it at all, your experiences of Haunted Passages, did it change you understanding of the work seeing it in a different time without dancing it did it feel...

It did feel different because, I'm experiencing it as an outer body experience which I don't think I've had the pleasure of doing so yes I think what’s registered in my body in terms of even the absence of the timings is still in my body that was unbelievable kind of going through that but the slight differences in where a dancer would put an emphasis on a particular movement, or how they will soften something which I think you know for me its, how close to the body it comes as opposed to yeah just very subtle differences and it did I was able to stand back and look at it and say well look it's a different work.
And did you at all work physically in the studio with Azz or the other dancers on it, were you actually involved in the movement yourself?

No I didn’t I didn’t’ give myself that pressure [laughter] its hers, its hers and think its enough that I was there and I danced it and I think just observing the dialogue between the choreographer and the dancers and obviously having my experience in the b… I think that was more than enough…

So you didn’t pass on any...

Well of course if Azz had a question I mean there is one particular movement in there where she’s constantly kind of falling on her leg and as much as Philip was feeding her information it was like, Sharon, lights costume how did you do it? Because actually that’s something that Philip didn’t do lights and costume in that respect so I could feed her that information of how I felt dealt with it, yeah just kind of helping her in that way but I waited for her to ask rather than feeding that I was able to do it.

We have come on to the topic of Haunted Passages and how did you think that it sat within the performance repertoire of that tour, how do you think that work stood up to the other works, do you think it looked historical?

I think it did actually, and I think for the right reasons, absolutely I think I mean over the years with my time with and away from the company, one of the things that people have always said is oh it was so nice to see that work again it was so nice and there’s a number of them that people just in passing have gone god its about time Phoenix did that work again and I’m thinking actually all of this has been subconsciously all of the time I think you know that there is an opportunity now to actually give them what they have been asking for, so that was the first one and now I yeah it did look historical but it didn’t look dated I think that it had its place we had something very modern very current about you know what’s going on in the world today, something very abstract, something full of vibrance [sic] something it’s a bit like a wedding isn’t it [laughter] and I think it yeah it does and it does just kind of give us the foundations I think a little bit that those kind of not maybe with the company it sort of, I hope the curiosity of what else is in the bag is kind of brought for forwards.

So how did you approach the casting for the original works especially considering you have been in it yourself, how, it’s a very general questions but what I am trying to get at is were there any difficulties in casting the dancers?

I don’t think so, I’ve not got a huge company, is sort of its one of three females and two of three for the men so it was really quite and that was down to the choreographer in finding whatever it was for the role, I mean I think if the company grows there will be times when as I think I mentioned earlier about us trying to re-stage something before a choreographer comes and works on it, in haunted passages that’s quite a simple process to do, I think for example Bebe Miller’s Spartan Reels when there are nine dancers and I
think it is how do you match them up and of course you do the male for male and the female for female king of roles but if there’s four females how do you then allocate the roles, and actually to some degree you don’t you skip over that and you, you do very generic kind of casting and hope that the choreographer will see the same thing that you are seeing and you could encourage a choreographer to work it through that way but usually I like to give the choreographer the opportunity to say… its that person, yeah, and so far that has worked for us, thank goodness because otherwise we would have one dancer going at it and maybe the others not so but I think our company dancers at the moment are so varied that really it could be anyone.

So its interesting it seems that the choreographer still has the voice is still the ultimate voice in that work both past and present, and what I think is interesting is that Philip Taylor’s been back to do HP and he has also he has created a new work, with one of his more recent choreographers within this tour, so that suggests to me that Philip Taylor has got something of the essence of Phoenix [he has yes]… [laughter]. There has been an historical work in the autumn tour and a new work in the spring tour is quite interesting

That for me when I spoke to Philip and he was kind of questioning and I said look Philip its Phoenix that’s exactly what we are about, we are about being able to take from the past and bring to the future, you represent that for us, you know I mean the fact that he’s a home grown lad you know and he has gone away and he has done all of these things, he actually understands the company and that for me is the job done, I don't have to go through all of that and talk to him about what the past means to the company and why its important to hold on to various, its there he was there when he was creating that and he understood what was going on at the time and then he is able to kind of project that through to the future and we have ‘What it is’ in the current rep, so, its an easy easy [laughter] easy decision to make if I’m being honest, and there are other choreographers who actually have that in terms of the past and what I'd like to do with them in the future just because I guess that essence will be there without me really having to dictate that to anyone…

So there is a symmetry there in the rationality, perhaps around of Phoenix…its interesting that in his past experiences of working with Phoenix this was heightened because of the cast then whereas now as you mentioned earlier you have a very European cast and so I wondered, obviously it still works but this might be a question for Taylor himself, but it it is interesting that he has that locality but your dancers don’t match up to that now…

Also, Philip didn’t stay in Leeds, he has been out there he has travelled the world, he has been out there a long time and that essence of actually having a very vast range of dancers that he has worked with and a very strong classical he has done all of that and that’s where I think we are now, we have a range of dancers and so he has got something to pull on, to be able to give them so the contrast is not actually rubbing up against its actually marrying quite well. So, his experience of being away is great to bring back
And so his choreographies have lived up to your expectations for what Phoenix wants to …

[laughter]

So very important then, will you still revive historical work do you think [yes] and will you still use the same processes of selecting, rehearsing, presenting?

I think, I might have a few problems in trying to use that exact process because some of the works are not greatly recorded, we may have lost a few bits but I think if its, if I’m able to work with the choreographers on that then I’m able to bring that back in its full glory, and I think it just gives the choreographer that opportunity as well to make sure that actually those areas where we have gone a bit fuzzy and a little bit diluted that they can put their mark on it and be happy with whatever that transition of movement so, but yeah I think so I think we can only go back so far as I say we have got thirty years I think the first, probably the first three years is probably the most dodgiest in terms of documenting and, and its concepts could well be worked on but then I don’t know whether we would really get a revival of the work. So that would probably have to be… maybe that is a re-work or reconstruction of an idea or a concept, and in that way then yes that might be the case but as far as I can I think it’s I think its about being able to hold on to the original.

That would be interesting wouldn’t it because it would almost it might reveal a lot about the essence of Phoenix, if you were to take as much as you could …from a work but without having a full visual record of it it would be interesting in patching that together in the present.

You could experiment and I think that actually some of the works that some of the original choreographers are still working, yes but you know, time has played it part, it would be interesting to see how they would be able to feed into that because I I wonder how much of that is still actually very visible in their bodies and maybe it isn’t and so its hard to say, it would be a good experiment, and then exactly how you term that, what is it at the end what do you have at the end of it.

So with your experience you talk about the limitation of material available to you, will that change or has that made you more aware now of how you document? [Absolutely]

Absolutely, I think in my role as tour and rehearsal director, it was essential that I documented the conversations, the ideas, the costume design, the lighting design, obviously the response of the dancers breaking down the sections. Some of it seems a bit tedious but actually when I need to hand something over top a dancer its like you need to watch all of this so that you understand it because there are areas that I probably aren’t physical, I didn’t dance it, but I could record it so its essential and I think Tracy has a slightly different method now of recording information. Also for our resource packs I think some of those, that information gets missed and its vital that we have the interviews from the choreographers and that the process in the studio some of those vital words come at that crucial moment when the choreographer is having to delve into a way of working and actually find the
language to pass on to a dancer, you can sit back and you don’t always get that when you know when you are on the outside but once you are in there that tends to be when it happens. And I think to have that recorded is amazing.
Appendix 4: Tracy Tinker Interview Transcript (Extract)

I don’t know if this is an unanswerable question. Not necessarily to do with the audition, but what do you think you say about having that eclectic mix and it is very true that in the Phoenix tours those four pieces that are in that evening performance can be completely contrasted in terms of the artistic style of them, if that makes sense. What do you it is that perhaps pins those together, that makes it work as an evening’s programme specific to Phoenix? I just wondered if you have any insight in terms if you are using different Choreographers, you have Sharon in there who is the artistic director; you have got her work in there. May be it is the fact that it so eclectic that makes it Phoenix.

I don’t know, I think I am just going to answer this question off the cuff, because I think I had my own company for a long time so I have not worked for the company for a long time. There used to be in one era of the company a very clear answer to that. But I think the company has changed and I think that it still has its identity that the company has moved a lot and it would be really nice to say its because of this which was what may be, it was really clear one thing you could really just point at and say that was Phoenix and I think it is more difficult now. The company is in a different era, in a completely different era. I think since I have worked for them what under pins for me is you have extremely strong dancers with extremely big personalities on stage who give 200% and buy into and are utterly committed. Even if they don't like a piece they fully, utterly commit themselves to that piece in terms of you know the different pieces you have in an evening because not everyone is going to have something - everyone is going to have a piece that is not their bag, commitment and character and strength. Strong dancers and I think especially with this group and this also something that is very difficult you are not going to know this in an audition process is how the group will gel. So you could have 6 amazing dancers, you have 6 amazing dancers in there who actually don’t gel, don’t get on. We are lucky the majority our professionals gel, it adds to that factor.

Is that generally in terms of gelling on a personal level and an artistic level do you think?

I think the personal level is important but I think you can gel artistically in the studio without that and I think that is probably more the level I am talking about.

I don’t know what your opinion of Phoenix was before you started working here or do you think there is any shift in what you thought what it would be like working with Phoenix to how it actually is or how in terms of working artistically with Phoenix. Is it how you expected it to be?

I think so, my first job was with a rep company and I think a rep company is pretty unique...its Sharon’s job to go out there and find those choreographers
that make us different to other rep companies and she is doing that. She’s bringing in new young, young and upcoming choreographers. Bringing in rep pieces, older archive rep pieces from the company working with established choreographers she is trying to give the company, artistically, rep wise, and a different taste. Even to what it had when she was the rehearsal director so I think its as expected, there are no surprises really.

You made the point to me recently about the fact that when someone does take on employment with Phoenix it is very much made clear that the training is still on going?

I think that that is the core problem is the training in the schools however I do think and this is where here in Phoenix it is identifiable to Phoenix that we still train the dancers when they are here we don’t just give them class, warm them up, we do sometimes but generally the training is ongoing. I think it comes from a very old principle of the contemporary dance theatre. Bob [Robert Cohan] used to say to those dancers that they had come out of the school, they go into the company and the training continues and that they would not be ready unless they had done 10 years in the company, that was their training and I think it is kind of that old philosophy that a dancer still needs to be trained is what Phoenix does.

How does Phoenix go about that? What are the principles?

Well this is a difficult one, this is a tricky one. Phoenix and Sharon’s interest is to keep the Graham and to underpin the core training with Graham it becomes increasingly difficult to do this. I trained in Graham, its a long time ago its not technique I continued even though I think it is very, very beneficial. So I can only teach basic Graham because I won’t teach what I don’t know. So I can only teach basic Graham really. Sharon can teach Graham, Sharon is really busy so and there are not many teachers out there anymore that can insert its a kind of a technique that anyway in the form that I teach it, in the way that was taught to me is a watered down version of Graham and it is someone else’s take on what Graham is so it is getting more difficult with the Graham technique and well I have been a full director, I just believe in good dance principles. I could teach ballet, I could teach a basic graham class and I could teach what my class that I feel really comfortable teaching and that I know it is not even an eclectic mix it is just good dance principles and you know hopefully working on the right thing. Working on the bottom of the body as strong as a ballet dancer, being able to use those muscles, define those muscles to the shape of the body and also be able to move the upper body and shifting the leg as a contemporary dancer so to kind of marry both those principles, put those principles into the same training which is what I do. So I do floor work but not necessarily contractions. I believe it trains the body, I believe it trains the dancers I think good dance principles that’s my way forward because I am not able to take the training forward to the level that I think Sharon would like as artistic director of Phoenix. I just can’t do it. I can bring in the right people to do it but I can’t personally do it I have to find my
way to still train them up to the level to the standard that we expect and I think
I am doing that

Do you think the dancers should attempt to make the choreography look the
same as it originally was or should it look good or should it just slot into their
current repertory, the current work without looking dated if that makes sense
what do you think their job is in terms of reviving archival works in the
present?

I think the dancer’s job is to recreate it. I think that is what the dancers job is
and if the first stage and I think there are stages in that recreation so I think
the first stage is to recreate it as much verbatim as possible I think that is the
first stage. So you get the steps back, you get the musicality of it back, you
get the subtleties, what it should be back as much as possible. Then you can
go on to stage two which is making it your own. Hopefully the choreographer
comes back and works with you and then they have the right, that their job at
that stage to say ‘you know what this would look better if you try this, if that
doesn’t work for you or take it onto another stage of it becoming lets take
Signal for example, Signal in 2011 or 2012 when it will be performed.

Do you think when you talk about the strengths of Phoenix dancers being
creative and the characteristic performance of the dancers? What do you
think the challenges are for the dancers and what do you think the challenges
are for those people that you do find at auditions coming into a company like
Phoenix do you think there is anything different about them coming into
Phoenix having to adapt especially the idea of having to go on training?

I think some new dancers coming into the company probably will, I think there
could be conflict of thinking I’m a professional, I’m doing fine I’m responsible
for my body and being taught. I think when we first started with the new
dancers there was a little resistance to that but it doesn’t take long for them to
buy into it. A little careful nudging in the right direction or as I call it punching
the key boards and they buy into it…I think once they start seeing the results
of it they start seeing that they are actually a lot stronger and a lot more
capable of a broader spectrum of things they start buying into it pretty quickly
and if they don’t they are going to fight the whole way and they are going to
be terribly unhappy just because that is the way it is.

To finish on can you have talked about the standard of the dancers that these
auditions at Leeds they
Appendix 5: Edward Lynch Interview Transcript

24th January 2013, Phoenix Dance Theatre, Meeting Room.

Prior to this meeting we did a reunion of the founder members as part of the thirtieth anniversary of Phoenix….and that was in November 2011….and that was amazing again after probably about 20 years of us not being together, coming back together to actually, create something for that event was quite moving in fact, it was quite touching as well, we was in the studios for about 2 months working once or twice a week on an evening…members had to come all the way from Swindon, from Birmingham [laugh] so, but the five of us actually got together… and it was just absolutely brilliant, it just like, reminded us of when we first started back in 1981 you know just putting something together and everybody contributing to the idea and coming out with something special in fact but also capturing that uniqueness that we had when we first started so that was an amazing experience after years of not actually working together…

…It was like being able to…. remember I think is the word, remembering how we used to work how we put pieces together and its quite amazing ‘cause quite a lot of the, the ideas or even some of the movement of the pieces that we did all those years ago again came back and I think that’s quite interesting to see that, I think its because we, we retained…retained the movement because I suppose it was to do with we did it so many times [laughs] you know when you do something over and over and over again it just becomes second nature really and I think because we performed those pieces and that kind of movement for a very long time it was like it just kind of like all came back but I think, I think for me the most… exciting time when we was rehearsing or something that happened which was quite amazing was one time when we we’d learnt the choreography we had learnt the piece and then we all just, it just kind of came out of nowhere we all did the movement at exactly the same time, it was what you call you know that perfection when a group of people come together and they’re in unison, and we had only been working together for probably about 5- 6 weeks one day a week and all of a sudden it just happened in that when we did this movement phrase and we all jumped at the same time our arms and our legs and everything as if we’d been, as if we hadn’t been working together it felt that we’d never stopped working together, that was the unity that we captured in the studio when we was rehearsing and that just well it blew my mind and you know it definitely did for the other guys I think we were all amazed we said as we were doing it you know obviously there was mirrors in front of us and as we just all said ‘did you see that’ it was just an amazing thing that happened, and it just showed the unity that we had when we worked together and I suppose that’s what makes a company, when a company can actually unify and come together and they are really tight not just in body and not just in movement but for me also in spirit as well because that was a connection that happened for me at
that moment in the studio so that really, even me talking about it now really just moves me, I think that made it for me….Then obviously when we actually performed on the night that was also another, real kind of moving experience.

So what moment was it? What piece was it in?

It actually was…it was in… it was actually in a piece that was linked to the kind of style that I was kind of like, that I kind of led in Phoenix in the early days which was more like the jazz kind of side and it was actually trying to kind of like to re-capture Nightlife at the Flamingo which was a piece that I choreographed all those years ago [laughs] and yeah we just did like a movement phrase, it was quite a jazzy quite fast movement probably about 5/6 6 counts of 8 and we all just did it together it was tight we jumped at the same height, our legs went out at the same level, do you know what I mean? We actually just felt that you know that unity that connection, so yeah its just amazing that sometimes movement retains, and if you do it in a certain way… it has a connection. And I think because of me and that style as well and because for me now you know I’m very much more about the spirit of movement I think that’s how I obviously received it that time and I think the guys were kind of like shocked and they said you know ‘how did that happen’ and I was like well you know thinks happen in the spiritual that we have no control of…so yeah it was very Jazzy and it was very fast but we kind of like hit it all together and on count, yeah if there was a time that I could say that we were like on it, that was the time, yeah…

So what was different about it that time around? Considering 20 years have passed? What this had changed?

I think each individual person had changed in a sense of their thinking of the art form of dance and everyone went off on their own kind of journey. Some went off on just a dance journey, certain members went and researched more into the culture, their culture of dance, cultural dance and for me it was those elements that came into the studio you can realise that, you realise that a lot of us had gone on a journey and we were able to bring that back to the studio whereas we all went on a journey together, we were working together, we all went on separate journeys but to then come back it was like the sharing of those journeys and where we were as dancers as and artists as well. So that’s what was different whereas we all experienced the same thing at the same time because we were working together all those years ago, but to come back together that was the difference really because everyone was at the a different point or a different place but then it was about how does that unify again, and I think it was through the actual movement vocabulary that members had been exploring or trying to find or why do I dance, what is it about dance? You know I mean how do I like to dance, what is the actual expression I think, so it was those elements that came back that’s what was really different. I suppose for me, because mine was a spiritual transformation, you know that actually really connects with who I am today, I think I brought that element in and they recognised that that was different than some of the other elements that actually came in, in a sense of development
of you as a person but also you as a dancer, I think actually it's about the development of person that makes them the dancer or it becomes very peripheral, it becomes very surfaced but when you really want to tune into what a real dancer is, what actually is it you have to go into the soul, which is the emotion which is the expression which is the thinking which is the will and then you find out what that person's really about, and I think for me that what I had been searching and looking for when I left Phoenix but the members brought in different elements, that what made it different.

_How did that affect/change your relationships in the studio? Did it feel any different because of those things?_

Yes, yes it did, feelings', feeling is a hard one because obviously you don't want to, no one wants to put their feelings on anybody else, do you know what I mean? So for me yes, for me yes it did feel very very different because of where I was in the sense of my thinking but even the sense of my heart you know and my emotions, so yes for me it was very very very different, I think the the other members they understood as well they actually understand that way or that feeling, they've had experiences of that feeling and I suppose when I'm talking about that feeling I'm talking about a spiritual feeling at the end of the day, you know, the spirit of the dance is something that is still to be captured by dancers and by people so, I suppose because I was because I'm very strong in that that actually was quite that kind of like created a real atmosphere again where we could work and we were able to, I don't know, there was a sense of calmness a sense of peace actually in the studio and sometimes when you know you're working as a group sort of you have different dynamics and sometimes people get frustrated or 'I want to do' you get like that, but for us you know, for me there was a sense of peace and a sense of more listening, to each other and kind of like, ok lets try this, lets try that, how about this, that doesn't feel; right, there was a lot of that going on which sometimes when we used to work before it was very much if it was that person's piece then they would just drive it and the rest would just kind of respond to whatever that choreographer or that dancer wanted but I think for us this time it was more about us actually sensing one another and what it is that we were trying to do so its a very different way of working…and each individual person would contribute or they'd bring something and if it wasn't right someone would say it doesn't feel right and they would take that on. In a way it wasn't really for me it wasn't really about us it was about the spirit within us and the spirit of dance that is still in each one of us if I'm going back all those years that's what made us unique, that's what made us original, that's what made us different, that's what makes us pioneers of contemporary dance.

On that note, you discuss the sensing and emotional feelings, what about the remembering of the movement, how it was in the studio now and then, how did the movement feel in the body?
How did the movement feel in your body, then?

When you were working in 2011, how easy was it to identify with that movement again?

It was very very easy [right], and I think like I said because of our different journey’s our approach was different, for me it felt very much like the beginning, it felt very much new but new in the sense of I can’t, its like new ‘I can’. And I thinks that like I said because of the changes of how we each one of use thought about dance and stud, it wasn’t like a physical challenge, it didn’t need to be a physical challenge because it wasn’t about, even though all those years ago people would say that Phoenix was very athletic and you know could jump and all that, we could still jump, 20 30 years on we could till jump, we could still turn, we could still barrel turn, we could still split jump, we could still do things but it’s the way of how we thought about doing those movements, whereas before it had a raw edge so we would just do it whereas we would actually , our thinking would be different so then it would feel different. So for me, that’s why we were able to retain some of the movement, not doing it how we did it back then because obviously we were teenagers, and when you’re a teenager you’ve got energy and you just go and you don’t think about it where we were able to retain it but able to also think about how we could do it differently.

So if you were to thinking about what you wanted the audience wanted to get form that then, what you wanted to achieve in this version, the collective vision for you all coming back together, how would you summarise what you wanted the audience to see?

I suppose, I suppose, for us, it was just we could have just gone on stage and just walked around, because, because…it was who we were that actually made Phoenix, more about our characters, our personalities, even our way of how we made, even the way that we moved our bodies physically, our expressions, I think that is what we wanted an audience to kind of get really, actually being able to retain some of the movement and to do it as how we did it all those years ago I think that was a little bit of a treat for an audience, especially those people who had seen us all those years ago and the comments were oh you haven’t changed, its still the same ‘wow, you guys can still do it’ so for me the audience probably got what they came to see which was the original Phoenix members actually performing. So they go us in body, but also got us in movement and expression as well because we were actually able to retain some of the movement that we that we did, so people would go ‘I recognise that, oh I remember that jump, I remember Edward ‘toastin there I remember you know David jumping over there I reme-…, so people actually who had seen us all those years ago were actually able to pinpoint…ok yeah…so for me the audience got the original Phoenix, it would be different if we did pieces that we did put on other people, but they actually got the originals, so for me that’s really what we went out to do really, so that in a way that’s kind of honouring Phoenix.
Do you think there was something in the fact that it was all of you that made it easier to bring that movement back?

Yes yes, that’s quite...

I’m thinking about if you were at home would you have been able to work out the choreography as opposed to being in the studio with everyone else?

I think, obviously if your taking about a piece that I choreographed, or any of the members choreographies, yes yes they would have retained that choreography, or that movement phrase, or however that movement quality was, they would be able to actually do that piece in a sense of working together, obviously its easier because certain people remember certain things more than others and they ‘oh yeah I remember that, oh I remember this one’ so straight away you actually move that piece on quicker because there’s more of you, and that’s also how we worked as well, when we ever created pieces even though there was a person who actually was leading, the contributions came from other people so if you talk of say like forming of the Phoenix, people contributed to the actual choreography, it wasn’t like how choreography is done today where one person comes in and then choreographs it, I mean sometimes choreographers actually get the dancers to create phrases and do it this way do it that way, so that’s how we worked, so if all of us come together in the studio to remember you know Nightlife at the Flamingo, Forming of the Phoenix, Brain voice these pieces we would be able to put it together quite quickly because all of us actually contributed to that movement.

So where do you think its retained? Speaking as a dancer, if you could physically say the movement is here, where would it be?

I think for some, the movement is retained in different places, and I believe that for me anyway there are certain places that I have retained mentally and certain things that I’ve retained physically, I can just remember something and it just comes back in the body and then there’s also things that I’ve retained because it was a feeling when you did that piece, actually that’s where its retained, its retained in your, for me, I your heart and stuff so there’s a feeling, or you’ve got the feeling of that piece, whatever that piece was there’s a feeling about it so you remember it you remember it from that way. So yeah, there’s different places where movement is retained as a dancer.

And is that something that’s quite personal to you or shared between the group?

I think its, in just coming back together I think it was shared definitely it was shared…yes…yeah

And so do you think it could ever be re-created?

Phoenix original?
I'm thinking about, I get a sense that this was a different experience for a number of reasons, but I'm just thinking that there was obviously a feeling a connection, a number of relationships bound up in your experience of Phoenix from 20 years ago, but then another layer from this revival. If you were to do it again—would the feeling still be the same?

I suppose as dancers, you are always moving I don't know, I can't speak for the other members, other original members, but for me I'm always moving, I think if we were to say come back and do...yeah...come back and do I can't think of a piece...Square Won for example, we could do it, I don't think that's a problem I think we could come back and do it, but then for me would it stand...today...because things move on, choreography moves on, dance moves on, expression moves on, its always moving, at that time it worked amazingly and how we worked together was fantastic so if we were to come back together again, we came in 2011 of we were to come back together again in 2014 it would be different because people will have moved on, physically, mentally, spiritually, emotionally we will have moved on because it's the person that makes the dance at the end of the day it depends where you are that's why sometimes you see dance which is self-indulgent, that is people that's where people are they see dance which is about self, you see dance which is open, you know those choreographer or those dancers are pen, so it depends where you are. And obviously on each individual journey it depends where you are, to how you express, to how you perform to how you dance to how you work with someone to how you connect with where you are as a person, that's what makes the dance for me.

Did you remember anything differently? Any moments when you thought yes I've got that or any moments where something surprised you because it was different to how you remembered?

Er... [pause]... Unless I really connected with that moment... I don't think anything surprised me, you know as we did it it just came back in a way it came back to its original, you know, I think sometimes people can retain things, but then does it really come back to how it was done? And even like in a movement I know there were certain things that we did but it actually felt like that's what we did, but it actually felt like that's what we did, so we didn't know, so for me it was like was it right, was it wring, or was it different? I can't really say it just, we just know that those connections were there, whether if you break it down to simple movement, I don't think there was a time that we were surprised by or we thought that was it but this was it, you know, it was just quite organic, it just all kind of like came back together really, you know like some molecules you know then they all kind of a sudden come back together. I think that's what actually, again when it came to that point when there was that unity of like, molecules actually just linking together its like 'wow', if anything it was like 'wow I didn't expect that' but generally just actually rethinking retaining bringing back the movement that we did then it just kind of just happened.

What was authentic about that performance that you gave?
I think it was very honest. As dancers, as performers as people as people as working together as being pioneers being original it was that it was honest. It was who we are, it was what we did.

Is there anything that I haven’t asked that you would like to express about your memories?

What are your most vivid memories of Phoenix past and present? The highlights maybe?

There’s so many, I my whole vocation as a dancer as a person with Phoenix was absolutely amazing, I don’t think there was a time where I actually felt this is wrong, you know and I suppose it’s like, it’s like it’s like you are being led. It’s like you are doing things and you’re not actually worried about it and I suppose that’s just me that just me that’s just how I’m created, even now don’t worry about anything I just allow things to actually happen. I don’t get frustrated I don’t, why it doesn’t achieve anything. So its like my memories of Phoenix as a performer, a teacher a choreographer it was amazing, I wouldn’t I would not change it for nothing, it was a brilliant time and even when I look back now I think ‘wow’ you know, maybe it would have been all different if we were a different kind of company or different kind of people but what it was amazing and that will always stay with me you know, we are, we are all the originals are Phoenix’s, we are actually the bird. You know we have that because that was the ethos that carried us through for all those years you know we are like the bird that dives into the fire and so we never stopped learning and it was also about an experience you know you would go from something being an experience and then you would learn from that so its about being renewed all the time, and I believe that coming back on and doing that, the 30th celebration I think we were all renewed again, whether we would say that or not, we were renewed we came back we worked together we were under Phoenix and something happened and whether they, whether the other guys I’m not, I know for me that’s something happened and it confirmed to me that Phoenix is more than what you see. And some people carry that and some don’t. I’m amazed and I’m excited still to know that I carry that.

What are the things that you don’t see? What is it that’s more than just what you see? What are the characteristics of that?

I suppose its things like, simple things isn’t it...peace, kindness, working together, soul, but good soul you know, because our souls our hearts and our thinking and even our world can be rubbish, but of its right then those good elements to actually carry and go beyond the surface and do you know what I mean, that’s what I hold on to that little bit deeper, when you look at the bird in that sense its very mystical there’s something about it and so what...what some members or people who have gone through Phoenix haven’t captured is that, we had that because we were the first, just then, and like I say we just got on and did what we did but we didn’t actually know that there was actually something carrying us, and you know people can look at I and get very
spiritual and go because that… but for me it was something that was precious that we had, and I think you know I think that came back when we came on to do that rehearsal, we felt that again, well I did, and I can't speak for I did and that's renewed me to actually look at Phoenix differently, whereas sometimes people still look at Phoenix as it was, I don't because that was then and what it is now. So you have to still, and it's still got little elements of that but its different and I think sometimes people want to hold on to that that's happened already and that's not good. I let that go years ago, so that's not a problem, so I can see Phoenix as Phoenix Dance Theatre as it is today and not trying to re-capture, you can't bring something back that's already gone and I think sometimes that's a mind-set of choreographers artistic directors… that what the problem is sometimes. You create what you need to create now, and let it have types elements of those things that makes it connect with a people with an audience, that's their front view, not trying to bring something back because that's gone, it's not about looking back its about pressing on to what's ahead, I'm going for this, that's what vision is that's what goal is and I think that's sometimes what artistic directors or choreographers or teachers need to be thinking about, where is it going, you know and I suppose that's just me because that's how I think about it, that's how I you know understand it that's how I actually sense it and feel about it. So I'm never still, I do move, I'm always moving and I'm acceptable to change, you know, change is a good thing people struggle to change the way they do things, I don't I think change is good so for me that's why I can see the difference in Phoenix dance theatre as it's called today, its not Phoenix Dance Company its called Phoenix dance theatre its been through different changes sometimes just called Phoenix, Phoenix Plus, there’s lots of different names that Phoenix has had but today its…

What do you think those traces of the past are? What has Phoenix carried with it if anything?

I think, and that's what I'm saying you know its hard because everyone is different. Every artistic director is different. That's a questions for whoever is leading Phoenix, because at the end of that day it's them as artistic director, it's their vision, its their whatever they've retained of their experience of dance and you know being with Phoenix to what they still hold today. When Neville Campbell. The second director of Phoenix, he brought in that Phoenix as being a repertoire company, that's what he wanted, he wanted Phoenix to represent choreographer, he felt that that was more than something that actually come from the company. So that was different, that was his vision, that was his artistic direction, I didn't have a problem with that as a dancer, you see some dancers did, that's why they left, so now Phoenix became a repertoire company which is why its different. Very different, its not actually Phoenix its actually about the choreographers and the artistic direction of the artistic director, you can't bring back something that was original that was created out of nothing, you can't do that do you know what I mean. So that's what I'm saying except Phoenix, for me the name is still there and obviously people associate Phoenix with different, if I was to say to somebody just on
the street-if they knew about Phoenix they would say ‘oh yeah its them guys’ people still say that today, do you understand… They are an international and national touring company ‘are they oh wow I thought they were’ do you see so Phoenix have moved on but a lot of people have stayed where they are so that’s what I’m saying that’s the thinking of people who have been through Phoenix as well, you’ve got to move on you know something he company has moved on you can’t try to go back. So for me, yes they’ve still got the name in a sense of what’s under that name is something different and for me that responsibility is the artistic director, whether they want to take little things of what has happened in the past and try to re-create then then that’s really up to them really. It’s got to come from them, not someone who isn’t connected to the company, not even an original member because that’s not that artistic director’s vision. So it’s a massive responsibility for anyone who wants to or is directing Phoenix.

END
Appendix 6: Phoenix Dance Theatre 30th Anniversary

List of Performances and Performers
11th November 2011

Donald Edwards, David Hamilton, Villmore James, Merville Jones, Edward Lynch, Gary Simpson

*Never Still* (Sharon Donaldson [Watson], 1995)
Pauline Mayers
Mbola
Godiva Marshall

*Heart of Chaos* (Darshan Singh Bhuller, 1993)
Steve Derrick; Martin Hylton

*Covering Ground* (Shapiro and Smith, 1994)
Tony Louis
Sharon Watson
Gee

*Longevity* (Gary Lambert, 1994)
Gee
Tony Louis

*Nightlife at the Flamingo* (Lynch, 1989)
Performed by the Phoenix Youth Academy

*Spartan Reels* (Bebe Miller, 1992)
Seline Derrick

*Sacred Space* (Philip Taylor, 1991)
Pam Johnson
Dawn Holgate

*Cornered* (1999, Adams & Sotiya)
Andile Sotiya
Warren Adams

*Class* (Darshan Singh-Bhuller, 2009)
David Hughes
Melt (Watson, 2011)
Azzurra Ardovini, Chihiro Kawasaki, Genevieve Watson, Phil Sanger
Josh Wille

Appendix 7: DVD, Rehearsal and Performance Footage
Contents:

Appendix 7.1: Excerpts of rehearsal footage from the Phoenix Dance Company founder member rehearsals
Dates of Recording: 8.10.2011, 22.10.2011, 05.11.2011

Appendix 7.2: Excerpts of Sharon Watson and Mbola’s shared rehearsals
Date recorded: 14.10.2011

Appendix 7.3: 30th Compilation of performance extracts and vox pops, anniversary event 11.11.2011
© Phoenix Dance Theatre/ Johnny Walton
Date recorded: 11.11.2011

Appendix 7.4: 30th Founder member group revival performance 11.11.2011
© Phoenix Dance Theatre/ Johnny Walton
Date recorded: 11.11.2011
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