Introduction

2012. The Fundació Antoni Tàpies in Barcelona hosted choreographer Xavier Le Roy's *"Rétrospective"*, a performed exhibition. In parallel with the exhibition, and in collaboration with Museu d'Art Contemporani de Barcelona (MACBA) and Mercat de les Flors, a conference was organised: *Expanded Choreography. Situations, Movements, Objects*, with the following description:

> In the last few years the term "choreography" has been used in an ever-expanding sense, becoming synonymous with specific structures and strategies disconnected from subjectivist bodily expression, style and representation. [...] Choreography is today emancipating itself from dance, engaging in a vibrant process of articulation. [...] Simultaneously, we have seen a number of exhibitions in which choreography is often placed in a tension between movement, situation and objects.[1]

A few months later, artist and writer Mårten Spångberg (who had also collaborated in the MACBA conference) published in *Spangbergianism*:

> An expanded choreography owns the future. [...] The future belongs to choreography but only if it acknowledges its potentiality as an expanded capacity. Choreography is not the art of making dances (a directional set of tools), it is a generic set of capacities to be applied to any kind of production, analysis or organization.[2]

The term "expanded choreography" had been circulating for at least a few years before this exhibition and publication, in the most unexpected discursive contexts – ranging from a 2006 text on ethnographic approaches to education (noting that

---

1   Expanded Choreography. Situations, Movements, Objects…, Conference presentation, MACBA 2012, http://www.macba.cat/en/expanded-choreography-situations (August 2020).

2   Spångberg, Mårten: Seventeen Points for The Future of Dance, 2012, https ://spangbergianism.wordpress.com/tag/choreography/ (August 2020).

it 'will have to include an expanded choreography of participatory stances'[3]) to a rather surprising type of business-processing model implicating 'an algorithm for expanding choreographies'.[4]

Expanded choreography is an elusive notion. There is no single, organised, expanded choreographic movement – no body of theorists or practitioners who claim a conceptual/artistic territory. There is no full consensus about the meaning of the term, and how one answers the question of what expanded choreography is indicates and reflects their view of choreography *tout court*. If choreography is related to a disciplinary arrangement of bodily motion, expanded choreography can be practiced by military officials and gender norms; if choreography is related to patterns of motion, expanded choreography can appear in the development of a fractal; if choreography is directed towards dancing bodies, expanded choreography can encompass the dance of non-human materialities. Moreover, as is the case with further widely-debated terms – "non dance", "conceptual" dance, "post-dance"[5] – the very construction of the expression "expanded choreography" subjects it to criticism; the adjective "expanded" implies both a core from which expansion occurs (raising the question of what that core may be) and the potentiality of limitless widening, where everything becomes (expanded) choreography, emptying the term of meaning. But despite such issues, expanded choreography has benefited from relatively wider acceptance than other terms – most notably, it has been used by practitioners, including Mette Ingvartsen, Dragana Bulut, Dalija Acin, and Spångberg.[6] Thus – in contrast to artists' resistance to terms

---

3   Powell, Kimberly: Inside-Out and Outside-In: Participant Observation in *Taiko* Drumming, in: Spindler, George & Hammond, Lorie A. (eds.): *Innovations in Educational Ethnography: Theories, Methods, and Results*, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum 2006, p. 62.

4   Decker, Gero: Process Choreographies in Service-oriented Environments, MA thesis, Potsdam: Universität Potsdam 2006, p. 41. In parallel, "Choreography"tself had been metaphorically activated in discourse about fields ranging from digital technology to biology: Parker, Philip M. (ed.): *Choreography: Webster's Timeline History 1710-2007*, California: ICON Group 2009, pp. 35, 38, 43, 45, 47.

5   On these terms cf. Adolphe, Jean-Marc & Mayen, Gérard: La 'non-danse' danse encore, 2004, http://sarma.be/docs/784 (August 2020); Roy, Xavier Le & Cvejić, Bojana: To End with Judgment by Way of Clarification, in: Lepecki, André (ed.): *Dance*, London/Cambridge: Whitechapel Gallery/MIT Press 2012 [2005], pp. 93–95; Andersson, Danjel, Edvardsen, Mette & Spångberg, Mårten (eds.): *Post-Dance*, Stockholm: MDT 2017.

6   Ingvartsen, Mette: *Expanded Choreography: Shifting the Agency of Movement in* The Artificial Nature Project *and* 69 Positions, PhD thesis, Lund: Lund University 2016; Bulut, Dragana & Linder, Adam: Mit dem Körper schreiben / Writing with the Body, in: *Jahresring* 61 (2014), p. 178; Acin, Dalija: Exercise Book for Choreography of Attention 'Point of no Return', undated, http://dalijaacinthelander.net/eng/work_exercise.html (October 2018); Spångberg: Seventeen Points for The Future of Dance.

such as "conceptual" dance – it persists, presenting the historian and theorist with a phenomenon to be addressed.

This book is not an attempt to pinpoint – to define, to stabilise – expanded choreography. Rather, in this lack of clear definition, this book multiplies conceptions of choreography. In this sense, expanded choreography may be seen as an encapsulation of the contemporary choreographic field's open-ness to re-definitions of choreography – what Bojana Cvejić has called '*concept ouvert de chorégraphie* [open concept of choreography]'[7] – not only widening already-existing notions but also asking what *else*[8] choreography can do, what else it can work with, what else it may be. To be sure, other terms could have played the same role. "Expanded choreography" has, however, the advantage of avoiding dichotomous negations – as in the binarity of "not-dance" – replacing them with an opening of potentials. This avoidance of a negative definition reflects and coincides with a wider theoretical and practical interest in choreography "itself", beyond its dance-making capacity. For example, in 2012, Elena Basteri, Elisa Ricci, and Emanuele Guidi developed a project titled *Rehearsing Collectivity: Choreography Beyond Dance*.[9] In 2008 – four years before the MACBA conference – the journal *Performance Research* published an issue 'On Choreography' edited by André Lepecki and Ric Allsopp. A year before that, the research-oriented website CORPUS surveyed dance professionals on 'What does "choreography" mean today?';[10] rather than converging on a single answer, the responses pointed towards multiplicity, or expansion.

It is not only in the present that this choreographic multiplicity can be discerned; it is also found in choreographic history. It is important to remember, in effect, that it was only from the 19th or even early-20th century that the main meaning of "choreography" came to be associated with the act of composing a dance.[11] Similarly, it was chiefly in the 20th century that dance-making – and by

---

7   Quoted in Knolle, Vera: Du Visqueux au concept, avec retour possible. Plaidoyer pour une 'dance (post)-conceptuelle', in: Cvejić, Bojana (ed.): "*Rétrospective" par Xavier Le Roy*, Dijon: Les Presses du réel 2014, p. 300.

8   The reoccurring question of "what else" is inspired by William Forsythe's interrogation, 'What else, besides the body, could physical thinking look like?'. Forsythe, William: Choreographic Objects, undated, http://www.williamforsythe.de/essay.html (August 2020). See also Manning, Erin: Choreography as Mobile Architecture, in: *Performance Paradigm* 9 (2013), http://www.performanceparadigm.net/index.php/journal/article/view/134/133 (August 2020).

9   Basteri, Elena, Guidi, Emauele & Ricci, Elisa (eds.) : *Rehearsing Collectivity : Choreography Beyond Dance,* Berlin : Argobooks 2012.

10   CORPUS: Survey What does "choreography" mean today?, 2007, http://www.corpusweb.net/introduction-to-the-survey.html (Archive copy from October 2015).

11   Cf. Foster, Susan Leigh: *Choreographing Empathy. Kinesthesia in Performance*, Oxon/New York: Routledge 2011, pp. 40, 43; Moal, Philippe Le: Chorégraphe, in: Moal, Philippe Le (ed.): *Dictionnaire de la danse*, Paris: Larousse 1999, p. 543 on the derivative "*chorégraphe*" [choreographer];

extension choreography – became essentially bound to a moving human corpore-ality.[12] The related definition of choreography as an organisation or arrangement of moving bodies in time and space – based on its association with the medium of corporeal movement, irrespective of the adherence to a norm of dance – is also historically situated in the 20th century. These points call attention to the historio-graphic fact that choreography as the arrangement of moving bodies in time and space can be dissociated from choreography as dance-making – and vice versa, choreography can be practiced as dance-making while not engaging with human bodies in motion. But, more crucial still is that the term "choreography" itself first appeared with an altogether different meaning, in the title of French dance mas-ter Raoul Auger Feuillet's 1700 treatise *Chorégraphie, ou L'Art de décrire la dance par caractères, figures et signes démonstratifs* [Choreography or The art of describing dance through characters, figures and demonstrative signs]. Within Feuillet's treatise, its context, and for the following several decades, "choreography" literally signi-fied the writing of dance, i.e. dance notation, while dance-making was practiced without the label "choreography". Beyond a definition that renders choreogra-phy coextensive with a history of dance-making or the arrangement of bodily motion,[13] therefore, even a cursory glance into choreographic history shows that these are only chronologically-situated parts to a more complex story.[14]

While historical accounts of choreography often focus on the passage from its function of writing to that of dance-making, these meanings of choreography are not exhaustive. Chronologically situated in the very "transition" from the early-18th century's choreography-as-writing to the 19th and 20th centuries' choreography-as-dance-making, Edward Nye has argued that, in the 18th-century theatrically-oriented genre of the *ballet d'action*, "choreography" acquired the meaning of "dra-maturgical structure" or "dramatic composition" and "choreographer" was used as "composer of the dramatic action".[15] For example, he provides an excerpt from

---

Brandstetter, Gabriele : Choreographie, in : Fischer-Lichte, Erika, Kolesch, Doris & Warstat, Matthias (eds.) : *Metzler Lexikon Theatertheorie*, Stuttgart/Weimar : J.B. Metzler 2014, p. 54.

12   Cf. Foster, *Choreographing Empathy*, p. 44; Lepecki, André: *Exhausting Dance: Performance and the Politics of Movement*, Oxon/New York: Routledge 2006, pp. 3-4.

13   The task of elaborating a choreographic history – overlapping but not identical with a history of dance – has indeed started to occupy the field of Dance Studies. Cf. Foster: *Choreographing Empathy*, pp. 15–72; Klein, Gabriele: Essay, in: Klein, Gabriele (ed.) *Choreografischer Baukasten. Das Buch*, Bielefeld: transcript 2015, pp. 17–49.

14   For more information on points made in this paragraph see Leon, Anna: Between and within choreographies: An early choreographic object by William Forsythe, in: *Dance Articulated* special Issue *Choreography Now*, 6:1 (2020), pp. 64-88.

15   Nye, Edward : 'Choreography' is Narrative: The Programmes of the Eighteenth-Century *Ballet d'Action*, in: *Dance Research* 26/1 (2008), pp. 42–59, esp. pp. 42, 46, 48. Similarly, Susan Foster enumerates that, according to Noverre, elements ensuring the plot – including choosing the subject of a ballet, structuring its scenes, directing dancers' actions – were crucial elements

a 1770 *ballet d'action* review to suggest that "choreography" may refer to the dra-
maturgical development of danced drama:

> Mlle Allard plays the part of Medea, Dlle Guimard Creusa, and Sr Vestris plays
> Jason. The latter is without a mask, and surprised the audience by the energy of
> his performance, not only as a dancer, but also as an actor. He gives his character
> all the sublimity than one could wish for. The passions are painted on his face
> with a nobility, a truth, a diversity that is inexpressible, and which shows he
> has a singular talent for the stage. [...] Mlle Allard, for her part, has a vigorous
> spring [*une vigueur de jarret*], has hard and fiery eyes which characterise quite
> well the fury of a jealous woman, and the depravity governing every movement
> of Mlle Guimard's indicates the extent of her desire to please and to seduce. This
> choreography [*chorégraphie*] was devised [*imaginée dans le principe*] by Noverre, the
> man who has greatest genius in this genre.[16]

Thus, although Jean-Georges Noverre referred to choreography as notation – as
did Gasparo Angiolini and many of their contemporaries[17] – choreography may
have been a far more complex notion in their context.[18] Still more meanings of
"choreography" might need to be added to these; Susan Foster, for instance, also
identifies certain 19th-century uses of "choreography" referring to the teaching
and learning of dance.[19]

---

of choreographic work, and presents the work of choreographers in the 18th century as both
the staging of the ballet's story and its adaptation for a published programme: Foster, Susan
Leigh: *Choreography and Narrative: Ballet's Staging of Story and Desire*, Bloomington: Indiana
University Press 1998 [1996], pp. 75, 101–102.

16   Nye: 'Choreography' is Narrative, p. 45, translation by Nye; see p. 46 for his interpretation
of the quote. Nye takes his argument a step further, suggesting that "choreography" may
also have referred to the written ballet programme – a libretto-like document describing
the danced narrative's plot. Nye, Edward: *Mime, Music and Drama on the Eighteenth-Century
Stage: The Ballet d'Action*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 168–169. This aspect
of choreographic history may have contributed to a persistence of narrative in (ballet) chore-
ography, at least in France, for more than a century [Chapter 7].

17   Noverre, Jean-Georges: *Lettres sur la danse et sur les ballets*, Lyon: Delaroche 1760, https://gall
ica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/bpt6k108204h/f1.item.texteImage.zoom (August 2020) BnF, pp. 2, 362;
Dahms, Sibylle: Choreographische Aspekte im Werk Jean-Georges Noverres und Gasparo
Angiolinis, in: Klein, Michael (ed.): *Tanzforschung Jahrbuch* 2 (1991), pp. 93–94, 108–109.

18   Slightly later, in the early-19th century, Jean Faget also spoke of choreography as 'this art
not only of notating the steps and figures of the dance, simple technical expressions, but
of putting into action all the riches of pantomime, of composing for this mute language a
story, a plot, an intrigue, a knot and an ending'. Quoted in Foster: *Choreography and Narrative*,
p. 167.

19   Foster: *Choreographing Empathy*, p. 43, p. 226 note 56.

"Choreography" may then refer to an engagement with dance-making (whatever the dance product may be), or with the human body in motion, or both at the same time; it may also refer to practices, like notation, that cannot be subsumed under these definitions. Inversely, practices relevant to dance-making and arrangements of corporeal motions are parts of choreographic history without always being defined as "choreography" in their particular context. From dance-making to dance notation, from arrangements of moving bodies to composition, from the development of danced drama to practices that are choreographic without being called choreographies, a constellation of transformations points to the fact that choreography is better conceptualised as choreograph*ies* – not reducible to a singular meaning or practice but, rather, a network of historically-situated ones.

This plural choreographic history is not linear or sequential,[20] composed of a series of discrete paradigms replacing one another. Rather, different construals of choreography synchronously coexist; and, instead of pursuing a unidirectional chronology, they reappear at different historical moments, transforming in response to their diverse contexts. For example, choreography as a notational project re-emerges in the writings of modern dance artist Rudolf Laban [Chapter 8]; as kinetography, it integrates the 20th century's focus on movement in the conception of choreography as writing:

> choreography, means literally the designing or writing of circles. The word is still in use today: we call the planning and composition of a ballet or a dance "choreography". For centuries the word has been employed to designate the drawings of figures and symbols of movements which dance composers, or choreographers, jotted down as an aid to memory [...] My study of some hundred different forms of graphic presentation of characters of the different alphabets and other symbols, including those of music and dance, has helped me with the development of a new form of choreography which I called "kinetography". [21]

Choreography as notation – a writing that (pre)scribes the future performance of motion – has been employed more recently as well. Lepecki,[22] for instance, refers to Thoinot Arbeau's 1589 treatise *Orchésographie* – which also includes notations

---

20   For a criticism of a singular-, linear-, chronologically-organised history see Thurner, Christina: Raum für bewegliche Geschichtsschreibung. Zur Einleitung, in: Thurner, Christina & Wehren, Julia (eds.): *Original und Revival: Geschichts-Schreibung im Tanz*, Zurich: Chronos 2010, esp. p. 10 and Thurner, Christina : Time Layers, Time Leaps, Time Loss: Methodologies of Dance Historiography, in: Franko, Mark (ed.) : *The Oxford Handbook of Dance and Reenactment*, New York : Oxford University Press 2017, pp. 525–532.

21   Laban, Rudolf: *Choreutics*, London: MacDonald and Evans 1966, p. viii.

22   Lepecki, André: Choreography as Apparatus of Capture, in: *TDR-The Drama Review* 51/2 (2007), pp. 120–123; cf. also Siegmund, Gerald: Choreographie und Gesetz: Zur Not-

and whose title prefigures Feuillet's term – in his theorisation of choreography as a practice of disciplining, ruling the body and/or dance – an 'apparatus of capture', the law according to which the dancing body should move. In this way, the historical association of choreography with a notational project contributes to a contemporary conceptual link between choreography and the disciplinary control of the embodied praxis of dance.

Moreover, different construals of choreography engage in frictions with the practices they are surrounded by and which they aim to describe. For example, while Feuillet's (pre)scriptive notational project was consistent and contextually associated with the aim to centralise power over dance matters (institutionalised through the foundation of the *Académie Royale de Danse*), it may also have offered a possibility of resistance to the control of dancing bodies [Chapter 2].[23] Similarly, the 20th century's focus on bodily motion as the primary characteristic of both dance and choreography was defied by scenographic, musical, and textual inputs in multimedia choreographic work; or by the dephysicalisation of movement through its technological mediation. Choreography may also allow positioning with respect to specific *kinds* of practice, privileging some over others. Thus, in the 19th century, August Bournonville argued that 'the choreographer who only composes according to a given programme is no more advanced than the musician who only orchestrates others' melodies'[24], implying that "just" developing dance steps is a less-worthy application of choreographic work. Likewise, in the early 20th century, while "choreography" meant "dance-making", it could also refer to specific genres of dance-making that were viewed negatively – writer Fernand Divoire,[25] for instance, used the label "choreography" to derogatorily refer to classical ballet, which he looked down on. [26]

Therefore, contemporary "expanded choreography" appears as a non-centralised network of practices and ideas probing what "else" choreography may be, while choreographic history appears as a collection of interlinked – but not linearly, smoothly-connectible – paths. What choreography has been in Western dance history is therefore as variable and complex as contemporary (expanded) choreography; the two are at times in accord, at times in tension. This book is a

---

     wandigkeit des Widerstands, in: Haitzinger, Nicole & Fenböck, Karin (eds.): *Denkfiguren: Performatives zwischen bewegen, schreiben und erfinden*, Munich: epodium 2010, p. 122–123.

23   Glon, Marie: *Les Lumières chorégraphiques: Les maîtres de danse européens au coeur d'un phénomène éditorial*, PhD thesis, Paris: Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales, 2014, p. 219.

24   Bournonville, August: *Letters on Dance and Choreography*, London: Dance Books 1999 [1860, trans. Knud Arne Jürgensen], p. 58.

25   Divoire, Fernand : *Découvertes sur la danse*, Paris : Crès 1924, p. 34.

26   For the information in this and the preceeding paragraph: Leon, Anna: Between and within choreographies.

historiographic exploration of the interval where these accords and tensions develop. It proposes a simple operation: to look at expanded choreography through its ties with choreographic history and investigate this history as potentially relevant within the contemporary "expanded" choreographic field. Interweaving present expansions with choreographic histories, this book considers how they can enrich one other. This includes how expanded choreography, with its lack of singular definition – begging the question of choreography's own definition – can be addressed from a historical viewpoint, nourishing contemporary interrogations with insights provided by choreographic history; and, vice versa, how expanded choreography may contribute to, and foster, the recognition of a multiple choreographic history. Contrary to an insistence upon valuing novelty and a "forward" sense of history, this trans-historical approach seeks relations with the past as manifestations of a ruptured linearity – and thus points to long-term connections as signs of the contemporary relevance of the past.

Looking at the contemporary choreographic context in which "expansion" appears, as well as at a multiple choreographic history, this book notes the distance that both can take from dance-making and human bodies in movement. Contemporary choreographers' – from William Forsythe's '[c]horeography and dancing are two distinct and very different practices'[27] [Chapter 6] to Jérôme Bel's '[c]horeography is just a frame, a structure, a language where much more than dance is inscribed'[28] – distance from dance is as widely discussed in contemporary choreographic theory as it is practically present in contemporary choreographic works. In parallel, recent historical studies – Nye's arguments on *ballet d'action* and Marie Glon's work on Feuillet are both cases in point[29] – also manifest historical distinctions between choreography and dance-making. A de-essentialised, non-dance-specific view of choreography in contemporaneity and a choreographic history not coextensive with dance-making are thus recognised. The historiographic links between them have not, however, been adequately discussed. Discourse on expanded choreography tends to insist on its presentness and perspective towards the future. For instance, when Spångberg writes that '[t]he future belongs to choreography but only if it acknowledges its potentiality as an expanded capacity'[30], the linearly-forward temporal aspect contributes to the perception of a rupture from a dance-centred choreographic past. A similar point can be made about choreography's relationship with moving bodies. In the dance field of the early-21st century, immobility is widely accepted as valid choreographic material –

27   Forsythe: Choreographic Objects.

28   Quoted in Bauer, Una: Jérôme Bel. An Interview, in: *Performance Research* 13/1 (2008), p. 42.

29   Nye : *Mime, Music and Drama on the Eighteenth-Century Stage*; Glon: *Les Lumières chorégraphiques*.

30   Spångberg: Seventeen Points for The Future of Dance.

from the staged stillness of Ivana Müller's 2006 *While We Were Holding It Together*, to the drug-induced, almost total lack of motion of Trajal Harell's 2009 *Tickle the Sleeping Giant # 9 (the Ambien Piece)*. As for choreographic motion, it is equally unproblematic in encompassing the non-human – be it animal as in Luc Petton's *Swan* (2012), or inanimate thing as in Clément Layes' *Things that Surround Us* (2012) and Ingvartsen's oft-cited *The Artificial Nature Project* (2012) – and the non-performative realm – notably though the notion of "social choreography" and the application of choreographic concepts to the social realm and kinetic behaviour within it.[31] Once again, however, the preponderance of the non-human and non-kinetic in historical choreographic approaches has yet to be fully interwoven into contemporary viewpoints. The contemporary world's overabundance in things, its struggles with ecological conscience and the advent of the Anthropocene, its "mobility turn"[32] but also its critique of motion[33] have penetrated the choreographic field, expanding the range of entities and practices that are seen *as* choreography. The loosening ties of historical choreographies with moving bodies are, in this context, yet to be further interrogated and put in relation to contemporaneity.

To challenge – be it in history or contemporaneity – choreography's distances from dance, movement performance, and the human body undoes its association with elements that remain fundamental in the dance field's (and beyond) construction of choreography. But, it also raises crucial questions about the very conceptions of dance, body, and motion, interrogating the tacit equation of corporeality with humanity, motion with visible displacement, dance with any artistic or aesthetic canon. In the current context of ecological urgency – of realising our unavoidable entanglements with non-human agents – and of virtual, instantaneous exchanges, our understanding of the human body as an autonomous, unitary carrier of the subject, or of movement as a necessarily-incarnated process of physical displacement in space, are questioned. Against this background, gazing back to historical "expanded" choreographies can reveal diverse, non-essentialised conceptions of body and movement that have always rendered these notions malleable. The common study of historical and contemporary expansions can therefore point to the particularities and variabilities of choreographic frictions with dance, motion, and the body, interweaving a de-essentialised chore-

---

31   Cf. for example Klein, Gabriele: Das Soziale choreographieren. Tanz und Performance als urbanes Theater, in: Haitzinger & Fenböck: *Denkfiguren*, Munich: epodium 2010, pp. 94–103; Hewitt, Andrew: *Social Choreography: Ideology as Performance in Dance and Everyday Movement*, Durham/London: Duke University Press 2005.

32   Cf. Wilkie, Fiona: *Performance, Transport and Mobility: Making Passage*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan 2015; Urry, John: *Mobilities*, Cambridge: Polity Press 2007.

33   E.g. Sloterdijk, Peter: *Eurotaoismus: Zur Kritik der politischen Kinetik*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp 1989.

ographic history with equally-complex genealogies of dance, corporeality, and movement.

By questioning the equation of choreography with the teleological function of dance-making and human corporeality as its primary medium – again, be it in the past or the present – the specificity of choreography is further detached from any ontological claim about singular, or essentially apt, means of artistic expression. In this way, choreography's numerous interdisciplinary connections, as well as its co-evolutions with other art forms, are accounted for. Choreographic expansion is inscribed in a wider context, wherein choreography increasingly entered visual arts institutions; collaborated with scientists and researchers outside of the dance field; articulated its practice in academic contexts; and reacted, and moved towards, the digital, defying modernist claims of artistic "autonomy". Recognising choreography's plurality of media and forms of expression – as well as its interactions with other arts – from a trans-historical perspective integrates choreographic history with interdisciplinary art histories, recognising crosscurrents and common frameworks.

This de-essentialisation of choreographic conceptions is a methodological and historiographic imperative for dance studies. It is, however, paralleled by, and potentially akin to, choreography's ubiquity; it seemingly moves towards an indiscriminate application of the term – much like, as Kirsten Maar[34] describes, has happened with terms like performativity and performance. This ubiquity can turn the notion of choreography from being plural – multiple specificities that are de-essentialised, shifting, in reinvention – to being vague and less-analytically constructive. An attempt to historiographically ground the plurality of choreographic ideas and practices by insisting on their concrete particularities contributes to viewing expansion as a collection of specificities, rather than an undefined space.

Undoing modernist claims to choreographic medium specificity and an attachment to the irreplaceability of dancing bodies also allows choreography – once more, both of today and of the past – to be seen as a practice defined not by its purportedly-autonomous medium of expression, but rather by complex interactions of aesthetic, artistic, educational, practical, institutional, sociocultural, and political factors that are always contextualised, situated, discursivised, and performed. Critical Dance Studies has provided fascinating analyses of the extent to which a claim of modernist autonomy has coexisted with unacknowledged (and, at times, highly-problematic) positionalities – as illustrated by Susan Manning's writing on Mary Wigman's "absolute" dance being inscribed in a con-

---

34   Maar, Kirsten: Exhibiting Choreography, in: Butte, Maren, Maar, Kirsten, McGovern, Fiona, Rafael, Marie-France & Schafaff, Jörn (eds.): *Assign and Arrange: Methodologies of Presentation in Art and Dance*, Berlin: Sternberg Press 2014, p. 105.

text of proto-fascist aesthetics,[35] or Foster discussing U.S.-based white modern dance's claims of kinetic universalism.[36] Layering these thinkers' critiques, this book posits that choreographic politics is not limited to the – more-or-less disciplinary, more-or-less democratic – treatment of dancing bodies, but also needs to address the politics of a widely-construed, not-only-corporeal choreographic practice. A corollary of these claims is the problematisation of choreographic authorship; as will be made manifest in several of the chapters that follow, it is not only the creators of dance steps, or the organisers of bodily motions, that may be attributed the authorial role of choreographer.[37]

Based on these considerations, this book identifies trans-historical echoes between contemporary and historical expansions, in order to illustrate common aspects in sources from different historical moments, thus developing choreographic histories that are not subsumed or reducible to a history of dance-making by putting the human body in motion. It is imperative to disentangle this project from that of developing "the" history of expanded choreography – a search for its "precursors". Indeed, no direct continuity or deterministic causal connections are assumed; this diachronic approach was chosen not to *unite* what is apart in time, but rather to *juxtapose*. [38] Juxtaposition, here, is the creation of a particular relation – one that is based not on preconceived, *a priori* commonality, but on the view that it provides a space for the unforseen to appear. In other words, the commonalities identified between contemporary and historical choreographic expansion are not taken as signs of an essential similarity, but generate, through unexpected togetherness, new perspectives on each of the elements involved. For the development of this approach, this book draws from Georges Didi-Huberman's notion of *dysposing* [*dysposer*]; this neologism admits the act of *disposing* in the sense of arranging – since '[*o*]*n ne montre, on n'expose qu'à* disposer [one can only show, one can only expose, by *disposing*]' – but troubles it by focussing on the selected elements' '*différences, leurs chocs mutuels, leurs confrontations, leurs conflits* [differences, their mutual chocs, their confrontations, their conflicts]'.[39] To *dyspose* may allow grouping historically-distant cases by embracing heterogeneity, and speculating on the generativity of considering them together.

35 Manning, Susan A.: *Ecstasy and the Demon: Feminism and Nationalism in the Dances of Mary Wigman*, Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press 1993.

36 Foster: *Choreographing Empathy*, p. 52.

37 Relatedly, Ana Vujanović writes that 'choreography is being investigated today separately from dancing, leading towards a new authorial practice of performing art'. Vujanović, Ana: The Choreography of Singularity and Difference. *And Then* by Eszter Salamon, in: *Performance Research* 13/1 (2008), pp. 123–130, p. 130.

38 This use of juxtaposition is indebted to Didi-Huberman, Georges: *Quand les images prennent position: L'Oeil de l'histoire, 1*, Paris: Les Editions de Minuit 2009.

39 Ibid, p. 86.

There are dangers in circulating between present(s) and past(s) in this way. By using expanded choreography as a perspective through which to approach historical practices, this book activates contemporary concepts in the reading of the past, invoking the all-familiar figure of presentism – the projection of contemporary (choreographic) values and practices onto the past. Hans Belting warns: 'it is worth making the distinction between the art historian [...] who wrote about the history of art in order to propose lessons for the art of his own day, and the art historian [...] who was merely unable to avoid seeing historical art with eyes trained from recent art experience'.[40] To maintain an awareness of the distance separating histories and contemporaneities, while simultaneously investing in this distance as creative historiographic territory, this book draws from Mieke Bal's notion of a "preposterous history", developed in her study of contemporary perspectives on baroque art, and introduced by Ramsay Burt to the dance-historical field.[41] Bal writes:

> Like any form of representation, art is inevitably engaged with what came before it, and that engagement is an active reworking. It specifies what and how our gaze sees. [...] re-visions of baroque art neither collapse past and present, as in an ill-conceived presentism, nor objectify the past and bring it within our grasp, as in a problematic positivist historicism. They do, however, demonstrate a possible way of dealing with 'the past today'. This reversal, which puts what came chronologically first ('pre-') as an aftereffect behind ('post') its later recycling, is what I would like to call a *preposterous history*.[42]

Both Burt and Bal refer to artistic practices "revisiting" or evoking the past, but preposterous history may also contribute to a historiographic methodology that admits the inevitability of present-influenced views of the past, and allows it to become an explicit object of research. It is indeed preposterous to look at, say, 15th-century dance practices through the lens of expanded choreography; the choice to do so is not an insistence on a nostalgic continuity of expanded choreographic history, but is, rather, based on the fact that this juxtaposition may multiply our present ways of seeing the past, thus making 15th-century dance practices relevant to contemporary expanded choreography. In this context, preposterousness is the expression of a desire to engage with history from the

---

40   Belting, Hans: *The End of the History of Art?*, Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press 1987 [1983, trans.Christopher S. Wood], p. 14.

41   Burt, Ramsay: Undoing Postmodern Dance History, 2004, http://sarma.be/docs/767 (August 2020).

42   Bal, Mieke: *Quoting Caravaggio: Contemporary Art, Preposterous History*, Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press 1999, pp. 1, 6–7.

consciously-situated viewpoint emerging from the contemporary phenomenon of expanded choreography.

If expanded choreography is a historically-situated shift in our way of thinking about choreography, the historical (re-)reading that it allows is, to a certain extent, symptomatic of the present – it is an indication *about* this present. Hal Foster captures this bidirectional relationship between present and past when he refers to the notion of the parallax, defined as 'the apparent displacement of an object caused by the actual movement of its observer. This figure underscores both that our framings of the past depend on our positions in the present and that these positions are defined through such framings'.[43] What is at stake here is not a repetition or "authentic" return of the past, but its very formulation as a factor in conceptions of contemporaneity. Instead of a *déjà vu* (a cyclical sameness), the specificity of the present's newness can be understood in relation to the past, and not as an isolation or a break from it.

Circulating between past and present, and in order to acknowledge the potential bidirectionality of relations between contemporaneity and history, the chapters that follow are not organised chronologically. Part 1 discusses sources from the sparks of the macro-historical period of modernity to the turn of the 18th century – a period during which the term "choreography" was coined, although its use as "dance-making" was not yet in effect. Examining treatises from the Italian Renaissance [Chapter 3], and mid-17th- [Chapter 1] and early-18th-century France [Chapter 2], it discerns the limits of a dance, or moving-body, conception of choreography in pre-18th century sources, and identifies alternative conceptions of choreography contained within them, relating contemporary expandedness to historical eras in which currently-dominant notions of choreography were absent. Part 2 fast-forwards to the late-20th and early-21st centuries – the period surrounding and including choreographic expansion. Analysing performance [Chapter 5], video [Chapter 4], and installation [Chapter 6] works by contemporary choreographic artists, it articulates their manifested conceptions of choreography less as instances of a generalised and undifferentiated expansion than as a collection of specifiable, expanded choreographic singularities. This allows them to bidirectionally branch out to historical choreographies. Part 3 jumps back to the earlier-20th century, when dance-making and embodied motion became essentialised as core, definitional aspects of choreography, thus contributing to the dominant vision of choreography today. By investigating choreographic practices of the historical avant-gardes [Chapter

---

43   Foster, Hal: *The Return of the Real. The Avant-Garde at the End of the Century*. Cambridge/London: MIT Press, 1996, p. xii. For a methodological reflection on bidirectional relationships between past and present see also Thurner, Christina : Time Layers, Time Leaps, Time Loss, p. 525.

7], as well as modern [Chapter 8] and early post-modern [Chapter 9] dance,
Part 3 addresses the multiplicity of coexisting choreographic conceptions – expanded and not – within 20th-century modernity. It thus replaces a discourse
of choreographic modernism with one that relates 20th-century choreographic
approaches to expanded aspects of (previous and subsequent) historical periods.

Given the constructed nature of historiography's periodising, this book accepts that any question a historian asks will influence the periodisation they
pursue. This resonates with Isabelle Launay's words:

> *une des finalités du travail historique est de périodiser, c'est à dire de rechercher la co-*
> *hérence d'une époque et de définir un moment de rupture annonciateur d'une nouvelle*
> *époque. Si périodiser constitue un puissant outil heuristique de la démarche historique*
> *pour poser des cadres et faire apparaître des problèmes, encore faut-il garder à l'esprit que*
> *ces périodes, en tant que telles, n'existent pas, et veiller à s'écarter de toute tentative de*
> *réification.* [one of the aims of historical work is to periodise, that is look for the
> coherence of an era and define a moment of rupture, announcing a new era.
> If periodising constitutes a powerful heuristic tool in historical work in order to
> place frameworks and make problems appear, one must still keep in mind that
> these periods, as such, do not exist, and ensure that one keeps a distance from
> any attempt of reification].[44]

Given, as well, the chronological scope of these sections, their content has been
modulated by a radical focus on the particular – overall, they are nine micro-histories that populate a macro-historical argument; their juxtaposition creates
an open territory to which further cases can be added. Each chapter is therefore
purposefully written both as part of general and stand-alone arguments; with the
exception of certain intratextual cross-references, the reader can meaningfully go
though chapters individually and in any order. The specificity of each case means
they do not function as "representatives" of a – chronological or other – "whole";
none purports to "stand for" the period it was situated in, even though each
provides a vision of what that period may have been. That is why there are more
than one case presented per Part. More specifically, Parts 2 and 3 address artists
whose works have (partial) temporal overlap, illustrating the complexity inherent
in specific shared moments – and aligning with Christina Thurner's proposal
for a spatial model of history that explores the synchronous diversity effaced
by chronological linearity.[45] Inversely, Part 1 includes examples that are not
chronologically simultaneous, and their juxtaposition challenges the expectation

---

44   Launay, Isabelle: *A la recherche d'une danse moderne: Rudolf Laban, Mary Wigman*, PhD thesis,
      Saint-Denis: Université Paris 8, 1997, p. 24, emphasis added.

45   Thurner, Christina : Time Layers, Time Leaps, Time Loss, esp. pp. 528–530; Thurner: Raum
      für bewegliche Geschichtsschreibung, p. 10.

that a chronological period is understandable through a generally applicable, singular, and linear tendency. The selected cases' irreducible particularity is paralleled by their not being exhaustive, as expansion is identifiable in other ways outside, or even within, the periods considered.

In telling this story of a multiple, expanded choreographic history, the geographical focus of this book is limited to (Western) Europe. Examples discussed include texts by French [Chapters 1 and 2] and Italian authors [Chapter 3] that have become mainstream in pre-20th-century European dance history; a piece by a Swedish company [Chapter 7] and the ideas of a Romanian artist operating in 20th-century France [Chapter 9]; the work that a modern choreographer born in Bratislava, active in Germany, did in the United Kingdom [Chapter 8]; a contemporary piece that a choreographer born in the United States, active in Germany, made the Netherlands [Chapter 6]; and, finally, 21st-century works by a Spanish [Chapter 5] and a French artist [Chapter 4]. This European focus is due to multiple reasons. Some are pragmatic, like the availability of sources within a sustainably-accessible range. The main reason is, however, the very notion of expanded choreography and the choreographic history to which it relates. Choreography is a culturally-sensitive notion whose understanding is never a-contextual; both expanded choreography and the multiple choreographic histories that serve as this book's departure points are products of a Western perspective, based on the words and practices of mostly Western artists and dance writers. While, then, this book does not approach expanded choreography *as* a Western phenomenon – it does not ask how the specific cultural, political, social, institutional, artistic, etc. context of the West formed choreographic expandedness – it assumes that this context is structurally present in the very notion of expanded choreography, without implying that non-Western choreographic practices cannot, or do not, include instances of expansion. The decision to select particularly European cases – as opposed to the wider notion of the "West" – recognises that, while there are several complicities and links between European and non-European Western choreographic history, these links are historically situated and contextualised as well; they cannot be assumed to be trans-historically constant and equally characteristic of all the historical periods discussed. This choice was also made based on a desire to re-locate specificities within the notion of the "West" without projecting an *a priori* unity. This European corpus is indeed, and crucially, but one among multiple dance-cultural *loci*, and does not purport to contribute to the universalising tendency that often characterises Western dance history. The European local, moreover,

does not refer to Europe as a postulated cultural totality but to several European sub-localities, only some of which relate to expanded choreography.[46]

Even within this limited focus, what appears in contemporary expanded choreography and choreographic history is a momentous plurality – a profoundly anti-essentialist image of a choreographic field that is characterised by, and invites, historiographic acknowledgement of complexity, variety, and change. Indeed while the term "expansion" may, as noted above, imply a core – a stable state or starting point – from which to expand, if choreographic history is multiple, expanded choreography is not a step in a series of linear evolutions, but, rather, a collection of new dimensions in a multi-directional, complex territory. Inversely, by underlining a plural and expanded choreographic present, choreographic history may also be more fully understood in its plurality. Juxtaposing chronologically-distant but conceptually-associated examples, this book argues that expanded choreography does not mark a rupture or distance from the past, and that it is not reducible to the contemporaneity that invented the term. By identifying the historical bearing of expanded choreography, it stresses the need to de-centralise and de-essentialise choreography's link to dance and/or human bodies in motion in historiographic discourse, and therefore the need to include practices not subsumed under these notions in choreographic history. Expanded choreography is an elusive notion, but it is also a territory in which the semantic scope of choreography can shift; what follows is an attempt to fill its elusive territory with a recognition of different conceptions of choreography forming – both in contemporaneity and in history – a constellation of multiple specificities.

---

46   On these points cf. Klein, Gabriele: Die Welt des Tanzes. Zur historischen Genese und politischen Relevanz von Universalität in der Tanzgeschichtsschreibung, in: Thurner & Wehren: *Original und Revival*, pp. 81– 90.