

Conclusion to Part 2

Just a link, a click, and a small-sized window; red, black, and yellow lines appear and disappear, form and split planes, cross each other, zoom in and out. To get the lines moving, an algorithm has been at work, patiently processing and translating positional data into visual forms – a series of programming instructions give rise to a graphic dance. The lines, planes, and underlying code are performing expanded choreography. A woman is naked; she wears a mask and high heels; she cries and rolls; she tangos and speaks. A screen shows blurry images; a blue light invades the space; reflections multiply both images and space; sounds circulate, words are repeated, music booms and murmurs. The woman, mask, heels, steps, images, screen, light, sounds, words, and music are, together, performing expanded choreography. A group of willows are planted in a field in a small Dutch city. Pulled by wires, the willows bend and bow to the water; they form an arc, a natural half-tunnel, part of an artificially-constructed but not-entirely-human-dependent landscape. This group of trees, in their slow growth and progressive movement towards an arched shape – along with the wires and everything that surrounds them – are performing expanded choreography.

Arguably, Mathilde Chénin's lines are performing expanded choreography because they are remediations of actual, embodied motions, images of a dance that took place [Chapter 4]. Arguably, Olga Mesa's *Solo* is an expanded multimedia choreographic piece, where an embodied practice of dance is complemented by a wide array of other media [Chapter 5]. Arguably, William Forsythe's Dutch willows are an expanded choreography because they are gracefully – or painfully – *dancing*: their leaves dance in the wind, their bodies incorporate choreographic form; their being-plants rendering their dance an expanded choreography [Chapter 6]. These are all justifiable claims. But, a multiple choreographic history points to expansions of choreography that are not only widenings, but also shifts and changes in what choreography is and how it is conceived. From such a perspective, Chénin's lines and planes are not only choreographic because they are rooted in bodily motions; they are also choreographic because they propose a multiple choreographic ontology based on choreography's in-

formational content, adapting to and transformed by different media. From such a perspective, Mesa's *Solo* is not only choreographic because it includes a moving and dancing human body, accompanied by sound, light, text, and other physical presences; it is also choreographic because it is an assemblage of relations, unfolding in the dynamic – albeit immaterial – space between its components; it is fruit of a praxis, rather than type of product. From such a perspective, Forsythe's Dutch willows are not only choreographic because they are micro- or macroscopically moving-dancing; they are also choreographic in their stillness, in the virtuality of their non-movements, and their capacity to turn choreography into a tool for understanding their being. In other words, these works are expanded choreographies because they contain notions of what *else* (expanded) choreography may be.

These three manifestations of choreographic expansion are not an exhaustive overview of the contemporary choreographic field's experimentations, nor do they point towards a unified, singular, essential quality that characterises the expanded choreographic field as a whole. Rather, they portray expanded choreography as a collection of different ways of envisaging choreographic "eliteness"; they are parts of a multiple choreographic history because they, too, contribute to its multiplication, its non-linearity, its diversity. They also contribute to this history because – in their sporadic intersections, scattered convergences and agreements – they contrast a hybrid, alternative paradigm to entrenched conceptions of choreography.

This plural paradigm refuses set notions of the human body, motion, and dance. In contrast to corporeally-essentialist choreographic approaches, it does not treat corporeality as fixed, but, rather, posits it as complex and multiple. And in contrast to a refusal of the body, it spills beyond the human by finding commonalities with other species and develops relations of mutual influence by entering non-anthropocentric wholes. Similarly, rather than engaging with stillness as a negation of motion, it questions the equivalence of motion with displacement and explores novel conceptualisations of the kinetic – as change, dynamic existence, virtual potential. Rather than excluding dance, it engages with it in transformational ways, as material to be dephysicalised, a source of information, a member of a composite assemblage. In other words, it proposes a less-essentialised view of what body, motion, and dance can be. Relatedly, this differentiated, expanded-choreographic paradigm refuses a stable choreographic ontology. Treating non-human materialities as choreographic agents, it dissolves hierarchies that bind the choreographic to a specific *type of thing* – the privileged medium of human corporeality. Pointing to the relational between-space or informational content as choreographic, it posits that choreography can be immaterial, intangible, invisible. Shifting focus from its produced "objects" towards praxis-of-creation or even a quasi-ideological tool, it dislodges chore-

ography from the (im)materials it is made of and that it makes. This variable paradigm also plays a role in expanding choreographic authorship – ranging from interdisciplinary creative teams (e.g. in Mesa's work) or interdisciplinary aspects in a single artist's practice that multiply their skills and methodologies (e.g. Mesa and Chénin) to a decentralisation of the human creator when non-human agency contributes to the emergence of choreography.

The plural, expanded-choreographic paradigm finally posits a choreographic politics that both reflects and feeds into the condition of the early-21st century. Against a background of ecological crisis, it proposes a choreography that allows non-anthropocentric communities of beings to enter into horizontal relations and participate in the emergence of often-unforeseeable results. Through the notion of relation as an existing entity – as it appears in Chénin and Mesa's works *via* Massumi [Chapters 4 and 5] – it posits relationality as a constitutive aspect of being, pointing to the limitations of (human) subjects conceived as autonomous. Based on a focus on virtual potential for motion and action – as it appears in Forsythe's work *via* Erin Manning and Gilles Deleuze [Chapter 6] – it concentrates on potential worlds already inherent in daily experience, rather than possible worlds that are detached from a reality perceived as inescapable. The expansion of choreography is concurrent with major ideological shifts towards a view of the world as a complex, interconnected entity that unfolds unpredictably; it is this world that it reflects and it is to this world that it contributes, through its own reconfigurations.

This inscription of expanded choreography in the present does not, however, presuppose its isolation *within* contemporaneity. Expanded choreography's links with choreographic history are multiple and bidirectional; adopting an expanded-choreographic perspective towards the past, in a parallaxic¹ movement, allows this past to feed into visions of an expanded present. From a methodological and historiographic standpoint, choreographic history is active in these analyses of present expandedness by hypothesising a multiplicity of choreographic shifts, rather than a widening and linear directionality. But, choreographic history is also active in the echoes between Saint-Hubert's non-medium-specific dramaturgical order [Chapter 1] and Mesa's multimedia practice of arrangement [Chapter 5]; between Raoul Auger Feuillet's corporeal, graphic, and sign-based choreography [Chapter 2] and Chénin's tripartite kinest works [Chapter 4]; between Domenico da Piacenza and Guglielmo Ebreo da Pesaro's choreography following natural principles [Chapter 3] and Forsythe co-choreographing his installation with a group of trees [Chapter 6]. These echoes

1 Foster, Hal: *The Return of the Real: The Avant-Garde at the End of the Century*. Cambridge/London: MIT Press, 1996, p. xii.

are not markers of resemblance – a court ballet was a radically different spectacle than Mesa's low key, ethereal *Solo*. Nor are they revivals – Chénin's approach is precisely *not* an attempt to recreate a notational practice. Nor are they pointers of linear continuity – there is no causal relation between Domenico's *balli* and curved trees in a Dutch field. Rather, bouncing in the juxtapositional space between past and present, they are indicators of mutual relevance that manifests common problematics despite diverse responses: diverse ways in which choreography has been non-anthropocentric; diverse ways in which it has detached itself from the necessity of displacement; diverse ways in which its ontology has been conceived, from multiple materiality to immateriality; diverse ways in which its authorship is practiced; diverse ways in which it has been inscribed in political and ethical contexts that go beyond human corporeality. There is neither smooth continuity nor rupture between contemporary expanded choreography and choreographic history. There is, however, a necessity to place both in common, macro-historical frames of reference – and thus to envisage histories of expanded choreography.