

Recovering and Reanimating ‘Lost’ Traces: The Digital Archiving of the Rehearsal Process in Siobhan Davies RePlay

Whatley, Sarah

Pre-print deposited in [CURVE](#) September 2014

Original citation:

Whatley, S. (2013) Recovering and Reanimating ‘Lost’ Traces: The Digital Archiving of the Rehearsal Process in Siobhan Davies RePlay. *Dance Research*, volume 31 (2): 144-156. DOI: 10.3366/drs.2013.0073

<http://dx.doi.org/10.3366/drs.2013.0073>

Publisher:

Edinburgh University Press

Statement:

The article has been accepted for publication by Edinburgh University Press in *Dance Research* at <http://www.euppublishing.com/doi/abs/10.3366/drs.2013.0073>

Copyright © and Moral Rights are retained by the author(s) and/ or other copyright owners. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This version may differ to the published version. This item cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s). The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

CURVE is the Institutional Repository for Coventry University

<http://curve.coventry.ac.uk/open>

Recovering and reanimating 'lost' traces; the digital archiving of the rehearsal process in Siobhan Davies RePlay

Sarah Whatley

When I work with dancers I want everyone to contribute but the material eventually has to have an accuracy to be able to go through the eye of a needle without fraying. I am the person who will see everything from an external perspective. The dancers have the internal knowledge, which they explore and we use each other's eyes to provide feedback and gain the accuracy. Material is tested to see if it demonstrates what we wanted or shows us something else more potent.¹

The above comment, by British choreographer Siobhan Davies (1950 -), made in conversation with playwright and performer Tim Crouch during 2009 offers an insight to Davies' approach to her dance making process. As is the case with many other contemporary dance artists, the increased access to digital technologies and social media provides a means by which Davies is able to reflect upon and share her thinking behind process, and consider the nature of rehearsal and her relationship with those she works with, in particular her dancers².

Traditionally, the dancer's rehearsal studio is an embodied space and historically a private space. But since the availability of simple-to-use capture technologies (flip cameras and so on, which entered the market in the mid-2000s), the dancer can readily record and review her own experiments and explorations with movement, particularly when at the early stages of composition. The ease by which these digital films can be posted to sites such as YouTube and Vimeo, for personal archiving or for wider distribution, allows these temporary and previously private 'memory objects' to enter the public domain. In as much as the filmed records of dance events that were made for public viewing can be regarded as spectacle, these rehearsals may then be

spectated in the same way. Concomitantly, the increasing desire to capture dance's history in ways that privilege the embodied experience of the dancers rather than through the more traditional methods of documenting the 'after' of the event (by scholarly critique, production photographs, notation scores and so on), these filmic traces provide viewers with alternative experiences of the dance, and dance scholars with data for different kinds of analyses.

In this article I am going to focus on the capture and archiving of a large number of rehearsal tapes, which were generated by dancers working with Siobhan Davies and now available for users to view on the Siobhan Davies RePlay digital archive³. Some of these films are specifically identified as 'scratch tapes'⁴ (hereafter 'scratches') and this naming is important in how they are presented for viewing and analysis. But in all cases, as raw and unedited residue of a previously private process, the films are what remain of an intelligent process that is rarely available for public scrutiny.

When made available alongside films and other documents relating to performances, these scratches offer a unique insight to the process of making, the choices made by the artists; what is left out and what is featured. More saliently these scratches, which are the debris that is left behind by capture technologies, gain, it might be argued, cultural capital through their inclusion in the archive, and when made available online. Even though they are presented after the dance goes public as a 'live' event, visitors to the digital archive may, however, not appreciate the implicit distinction between records of the rehearsal/creative process and the dance event/performance. Presented as a curated collection they may therefore inadvertently appear to be ontologically the same as the dance 'product', thereby unsettling the viewer who might

understandably assume that the previously (and necessarily) unseen private stage of the choreographer's expert practicing is unavailable for study. As memory objects, they also raise questions about what memory means in this context, whose memory is privileged (the dancer, the choreographer, archivist or viewer?) and what happens to 'memory' when rendered through a complex archival process.

Preserving expert knowledge: Siobhan Davies RePlay

The Siobhan Davies RePlay digital archive was launched in the summer of 2009 with funding from the UK's Arts and Humanities Research Council. The project was, and continues to be a collaboration between Siobhan Davies Dance and researchers at Coventry University. Davies is one of the UK's leading choreographers. Her work extends over four decades and reflects many of the major shifts in contemporary dance in Britain. She has played a role in several of the UK's leading dance companies⁵, navigating a path through the 'mainstream' towards her own company work, thereby making a significant contribution to the British dance ecology. Davies has always expressed a sense of responsibility to her art form and has for some time been concerned to evolve her practice and its communication 'so that the work can contribute to movement being further recognized as an equal and distinct medium alongside the other arts: a medium in which thought, feeling and action are all contributors to the process of making, are able to be visible in the moving body'⁶. This desire and intention seems to have its roots in much earlier explorations; writing in 1991, Peter Brinson, who was such a vital voice in dance in the 1980s-1990s, remembered Davies 'as a singularly thoughtful,

concerned artist when she danced with Ballet for All at the beginning of the 1970s⁷. In particular she had a deep sense of responsibility for her art' (Brinson 1991: 41). The archive therefore offers the viewer a chance to see how her practice has developed since her very early choreographic projects for London Contemporary Dance Theatre in the 1970s and participates in Davies' will for dance 'to construct a physical and retrievable past'⁸.

Inevitably, there are relatively few documents of her early work compared to her recent projects, reflecting the more robust methods for documenting and cataloguing dance. My own interest in creating the archive was in how different kinds of records of the dance when assembled together and distributed freely online might generate new meanings and new understandings of dance, and in particular, of Davies' choreography.

The archive includes a significant number of videos of dance performances, captured either 'front-on' in theatre auditoriums and often with little editing, or filmed for broadcast, together with photographs, scans of performance programmes, publicity and marketing items, audio and text (including journal articles, scholarly papers, draft designs, artist notes and some notation scores). Much of this content has not been seen before or was generally inaccessible to the public. As Davies continues to make work, content is added to the archive (which currently exceeds 5000 digital assets) and the way this is organized continues to develop as her work evolves⁹.

Building the archive meant acknowledging that every stage of its development required numerous curatorial decisions. Finding a balance between making a 'library' and an elegantly designed website was a key aspect of the work¹⁰. Reconciling the desire to provide access to everything

that we could source for the benefit of the user, with the concern to exclude or restrict access to some content, was therefore an important part of the development process. The intention was always to make the archive free to access and available to all, but acknowledging that the rehearsal tapes were of a different nature, and to give the dancers who feature in these tapes the confidence that they would only be available for the 'serious user' (free registration is required to access this collection¹¹).

A lot of the expert knowledge about the content (and which was needed to create the metadata) resided with Davies herself, or her dancers. This was particularly the case for the rehearsal tapes. Many were not labeled accurately or lacked detail that would be useful to the user (venue, date, specific choreography to which they relate) and the sensitive nature of this collection needed someone who Davies and the dancers could trust to make judgments about what to include and what to leave out if the film was unsympathetic, unrepresentative or unsuitable. It required us to think carefully about the ethics of distributing content that was never intended for public consumption, however valuable it might be for researchers. To help make these important decisions, Deborah Saxon, who has worked with Davies as a dancer since 1991, was recruited to the archive team.

Saxon was able to identify and name much of the rehearsal tape content and helped with careful negotiations to protect those who feature. As a dancer herself, she had an insider experience of how her own agency as a performer might be retained or compromised through the digitization, selection and cataloguing process. By involving Saxon, Davies was signaling that she values the social process that is vital to how her company works; what Randy Martin

describes as the 'social totality that embodies choreographic authority and dancerly totality' (Martin 1985: 65)¹². Davies speaks to the importance of collective practice, saying '[i]n our case we are a group and it's incredibly important to me that we find a more vivid expression of how we work as a small community. Although I am the instigator, the observer and the editor, I am encouraging the idea of a group of people bringing all their knowledge into the making of a particular work and in doing that we have both to remember and forget ourselves as part of this process'¹³.

Nonetheless, the proposal to include the scratches did raise interesting responses from at least some of the dancers. Most were pleased that what were previously 'lost' or unseen records of their contributions would be recovered and archived. For others, tensions from the past resurfaced, reminding them of their earlier anxieties about authorship and the creative decision-making process. For many, however, the archive became a valuable repository for this footage, which they could freely visit, research and draw upon for their own interests.

Collecting the rehearsal and scratch tapes

Nearly 40 individual choreographic works are currently included in RePlay and rehearsal footage is associated with approximately half of these. There are a considerable number of rehearsal tapes, filmed at various stages of the choreographic process, reaching back as far as Davies' revival of *Plain Song* (1981) for Rambert Dance Company in 1991 and as recent as *The Collection* (2009). In most cases the dancers film the footage as part of their rehearsal activity; consequently they are regarded as neutral records and no credits are

published for the camera operators. When named 'rehearsal' tape and particularly when associated with works made for Rambert Dance Company, the footage tends to refer to work that is 'set' and being run-through in the latter stages of the rehearsal process so is not primarily for the benefit of the dancers. The dancers appear to be in a pre-performance mode; the camera is a proxy for the audience and the dancers are 'performing' for the camera. These tapes offer an insight to a quite different rehearsal culture, which reflects the difference between the working practices of a major repertory company, such as Rambert Dance Company, and Davies' company practices. For the former, filming the work prior to performance is likely to be primarily for preservation purposes, to support the work of those responsible for rehearsing, restaging and documenting a dance, such as notators and rehearsal directors. In Davies' company, with no extended company team of notators, rehearsal directors and so on, there is a greater sense of shared responsibility between Davies and her dancers for the dance work and any further performances, so the recording of movement within the making and rehearsal process is primarily for the dancers' and Davies' benefit. However, whilst it is acknowledged that the intervention of new technologies that provide tools to support the rehearsal process within the professional dance environment in recent years may also have a bearing on this distinction, the broader culture of the rehearsal settings may still be regarded as markedly different.

Prior to Davies moving into her own building in 2006¹⁴ she rehearsed in a wide range of hired halls and other spaces. The footage of her own company rehearsals offers insights to more than just the dance. The different environments feature on the tapes¹⁵, as do the broader activities and

operations of the rehearsal (dancers warming up, 'marking' movement, resting, observing, and so on). What is commonplace for the dancer becomes, perhaps, a different kind of spectacle for the viewer. The mystery of how dancers collaborate and the social aspects of their work environment are revealed. For example, the rehearsal footage associated with the 1998 revival of one of Davies' most popular (and frequently restaged) works, *White Man Sleeps* (1988) includes several tapes of Gill Clarke and Paul Old working through a duet section in Mary Ward Hall, London, whilst the other dancers are warming-up or observing. There is playfulness in their attempts to master their sequences and the camera zooms in to a moment that is hardly visible on either the staged version or on the film, but is, as I have argued elsewhere, a noteworthy motif within the whole dance. Clarke stands close behind Old, 'listening' as she knocks gently and repeatedly on his back¹⁶. It is a rare moment when (presumably under Davies' direction) the rehearsal camera zooms in to capture what is an intimate and otherwise 'unseen' moment so the pre-performance footage marks out the moment, underlining the potential significance of this subtle action.

It is not until *Bank*, choreographed in 1997, that the rehearsal tapes are described as 'scratch tapes'. There are 24 scratch tapes associated with *Bank*, some as short as ten seconds long. As Saxon explains on the archive:

The recording of this 'scratch tape' footage is a method of banking ideas that could be returned to at a later point in the making process. In the early stages of development the dancers were encouraged to record most movement sketches without judgment so that the work could develop without preconceptions. The material is often raw and undeveloped and many of these fragments did not appear in the final work. Some of the original tapes were damaged or in some cases like *Birdsong* completely missing. Where there were many hours of footage we tried to where possible to select material which had a linking thread to the final work. These were some of the factors

which influenced the selection of scratch footage to be included in the archive. In some ways it is quite a patchy record of this process but hopefully gives the viewer some insight into the making of the work¹⁷.

This commentary reveals several interesting aspects of how Saxon (who is herself subject of some of these scratches and nominated representative of all the dancers) describes the footage. The acknowledgement of 'selection' confirms that this is a thoughtful collecting process and the 'linking thread' is inevitably a judgment, which can direct viewers to search out connections between the scratches and the final work, whether or not they are intended. The reference to recording 'without judgment' hints at a process of the dancer trying to disregard any thought of the spectator, or to remove herself from the role of the spectator when behind the camera. The tension between the value of storing ideas whilst keeping movement sketches provisional and unfixed, mirrors the friction created by archiving (so fixing) the unfinished. The connection is clear between 'banking ideas' and the title of the choreography; *Bank*, which in its construction 'used a bank of ideas generated by looking at many visual patterns from different cultures'¹⁸. The description of the work, as provided on the archive, continues by emphasizing the importance of the rehearsal process in creating the work, which may well signpost to the viewer the value of the scratches:

The dancers began the rehearsal process by imagining the printed pattern within the whole volume of the body or parts of it, the structure of the pattern informing the movement. The second stage of this process included two or more dancers finding a further pattern to inform how they should relate spatially¹⁹.

This narrative can help guide a reading of the scratches.

Some later works have a more extensive bank of scratch tapes. *In Plain Clothes* (2006), the work that was choreographed to open the new building

has more than 50 scratch tapes. Coincidentally, work on the archive began at the same time so Davies was (perhaps) already thinking differently about the value and purpose of documenting and preserving her work. The theme of *In Plain Clothes* also emphasizes 'process', rehearsal, and the importance of memory in the generation and archiving of dance. Both Davies and the dancers wanted to mark the new studio, to begin to fill it, not only through the activities of rehearsals but also with the sediment or memory of conversations and ideas that help to make a new work. Several professionals from fields outside of dance watched some of the rehearsals and talked about their own work with the company; conversations which triggered the foundation phrases of the work. In this context the scratches hold particular resonance, providing access to the dancers' physical play with these diverse ideas.

The scratches sit side-by-side with the film of the performance in the archive; but more than in any other choreography, the footage blurs the division between process and output, making clear Davies' interest in recreating the intimacy of the rehearsal in performance. The dyadic nature of the films also mirror what Davies described as the 'hinged pair' of the performance and the talk by the (other field) professional prior to the performance; they are related but do not explain each other²⁰. The scratches illustrate in interesting ways the development of the movement material. For example, in several danced by Tammy Arjona (TA1-TA9) the evolution of what becomes a shared and central movement phrase within the whole dance is tracked through her experiments with accumulating gestural sequences, beginning close to the body, responding to the fragmented music score, and

gradually developing (in TA9) to her reaching further out into space, shaping the phrase that is more recognisable in the final dance²¹.

Later on, *The Collection* (2009), which was a series of collaborations that looked at the interfaces, connections and disconnections within contemporary art and dance, made for a gallery space, amassed nearly 100 rehearsal tapes. The substantial rehearsal footage is unusual because though described as 'rehearsal tapes' rather than 'scratch tapes', they reveal much of the early experiments. More exceptionally, and surprisingly, Davies also appears in the tapes, experimenting with movement ideas through her own material disappears in the public event²². Before 2009, Davies is absent or quietly observing out of shot, so the viewer is left to imagine what the original task or instruction was and how movement was initially sourced. There is no footage of Davies talking to or directing the dancers. These filmed records of *The Collection* seem therefore to have a different purpose, reflecting her move into a new environment for her creative practice (the gallery rather than the theatre) and her new role in relation to her performers (curatorial rather than choreographic), so the footage becomes a dossier of this changing outlook and vision.

What do these memory objects tell us?

'Everything shouldn't be finished because nothing is finished in our lives. There needs to be a future to keep the work alert'.

Davies in conversation with Edmund de Waal²³

Davies' own interest in including the scratch tapes in the archive is perhaps two-fold. Throughout the creation of the archive she has been motivated by the desire to make dance more generally accessible and to find ways to communicate the particular knowledge that is dance. Questions have been

sharpened. How is dance a form of knowledge? What is choreographic thinking? How can embodied processual knowledge be exposed and shared? She has also always acknowledged the considerable contribution of her dancers, which is made evident within this collection.

By making available what Susan Melrose claims is generally unavailable to the expert spectator, and which Melrose describes as the '*expert-intuitive operations* [which are] *central to discipline-specific expertise in general, and to decision-making in dance and other performance modes in particular*' (2009: 29; italics in original), the scratches, which expose something of the dance-making process, arguably reveal something of the 'expert collaborations and [...] the catalytic effect attendant upon these' (Melrose 2009: 29).

We witness the dancers negotiating through and with the body, solving physical challenges, and negotiating their role within the wider dance project, whether as observer or participant. By capturing the dancer close-up, the footage provides access to detail not seen in the films of the performance events. The intimacy provided by the camera's proximity to what is often a single performer offers the viewer a more somatic engagement with the dancer, and the repetitive nature of some of the scratches provides us with access to the dancer's 'thinking' process, the ways in which dancers approach tasks differently and how they function as a social group. The dancer's 'habitus'²⁴ emerges as vital to the way in which the dance takes shape and is traced through the scratches as well as through the dancers' own commentaries, which accompany the tapes²⁵. Consequently, the rehearsal and scratch tape collection offers up a new kind of virtual field for other forms

of enquiry, such as anthropology, which might in turn generate new readings of the dance.

These readings may be tested further if the scratch does not appear in the final dance. Might these scratches then be reconstructed to recreate the dance in new ways? And might these memory objects gain value over time and disrupt the (privileged) status of the dance work or do they remind the viewer of the expert practices that constitute the dance? The identitarian question raised by Isobel Ginot, and which she claims 'is always articulated around a project of political analysis: relationships of power, relationships with the norm' (2007: 261) seems to be invoked here.

Conclusion

The rehearsal and scratch tapes show the journey from studio to public event; documenting what is discarded and what remains. The scratches bring back, or 'find', what were previously 'lost'. What might have reasonably disappeared entirely and only exist, if anywhere, in the memory of the dancer (or, or and, in the dancer's muscle memory, to emerge in altered ways perhaps in later dances) they return, replete with information, questioning the evanescent properties of dance.

There is a distinction between 'rehearsal tape' and 'scratch tape' as they appear on RePlay. In simple terms, the rehearsal footage relates to movement already made and being refined, whereas the scratch is in development and not yet fixed but the distinction can be blurred; rehearsals frequently result in changed movement and what is rehearsed may disappear altogether from the final performance, whilst the scratch may become fundamental to a

choreography. Together the tapes record the historic experiments and relational processes that constitute the work. But having access to these multiple versions means that the dance is constantly shifting and resists any stable meaning.

Situated within a digital dance archive, the tapes play their role in satisfying our fascination with the past but also serve to keep the process of *making dance* in circulation through those who visit and use the archive. In their contribution to archival resources the tapes are subject to rendering through editorial and curatorial procedures so are, it might be argued, subject to what Lepecki describes as the archive's inevitable act of exclusion and misplacement, predicated as it is on its own onto-political performance as one of endless memory failures (2010: 30). Lepecki's essay is specifically addressing 'archive' in relation to the recent interest in choreographic 're-enactments'²⁶. On one hand the scratch tapes might be thought of as the reverse of re-enactments. As documents of the stages *before* the dance is made they *enact* the thinking process of the choreographer and the dancers. Alternatively, by revealing the construction methods, they *unmake* the dance whilst offering source material for other artists to reconstruct or *re-enact* the dance work. The scratch tapes might be viewed alongside the various comments by the dancers in relation to their scratches, as well as the several analyses, descriptions and reviews of the performance events, providing a rich data bank of 'corporeal events and kinetic things' (Lepecki 2010: 37).

What is perhaps most interesting is that the scratches bind the dancer to her or his role and contribution to any one particular dance; Tammy Arjona, Gill Clarke and Paul Old are uniquely identified with a choreography as we

trace, in Goodman's terms, the 'history of production' of the work (1968). So perhaps this is a reasonable claim of authorship, but a close reading of this evolution reinforces that Davies retains authorial responsibility, not least because of her inclination towards recreating and restaging work²⁷. I am thus inclined towards McFee's argument (2011: 82-84) that the dancer is agent, essential in her instantiation of the dancework, but not 'maker' (therefore in McFee's terms, equivalent to 'artist') even though the persisting evidence of a unique embodiment is vital to the identity of the dance in question. And because each scratch and rehearsal tape is accompanied with a specific citation on the archive, so users who quote the film cite the specific dancer/s, as well as the work to which it is attached, the scratches may enter the canon and accrue value over time equal to other (digital) dance objects.

Conversely, such exposing of the 'sacred' rehearsal process might for some diminish the impact of the performance event. Without them the mysterious and intangible properties of the choreographic process would then be preserved, reinstating the nostalgic lens through which we connect with past dances. The value of the scratches lies perhaps in their reflective properties, which can tell us more about the relationship between dance artists and instruments of capture and thus have broader impact on how we contemplate the future preservation of dance. Do they accrue cultural capital? Well, perhaps they do. By documenting, exposing and making public the cultural knowledge of dance, and in this case Davies' dance, it is made more visible, is circulated freely online, potentially gaining social and economic advantage by being more able to stake a claim in the digital economy.

Decades of viewing dance on video means that these filmed representations might seem to be poor substitutes for the real-world dance experience. But through them we might feel a more intimate connection and kinaesthetic engagement with the dancers as they apply themselves to resolving a physical, conceptual or aesthetic question or 'knot'. They are also useful pedagogical tools²⁸ and help to animate our dance heritage in ways that support the appreciation of the dance event. As Ann Dils reminds us in her thinking about what new technologies offer us, 'we need to be cautious about expecting any one medium to capture dancing. We need all the translations of performance possible...as each captures motion differently and each feeds our storehouse of image and associations (2001: 469). Siobhan Davies RePlay provides many different kinds of translations and representations of the dance, and the rehearsal and scratch tapes are a valuable part of this collection, not replacing but enriching and augmenting our experience of live dance.

NOTES

¹ In conversation with Tim Crouch and published on the Siobhan Davies Dance company website; <http://www.siobhandavies.com/conversations/about.php>. The conversation was one of eight that took place in 2009 between Davies and eminent artists and practitioners from outside the world of dance entitled 'Conversations Around Choreography', and started with Davies asking the question 'Do you recognise choreographic practice in your work?'

² Since 2009 Davies has begun to make process the outcome of her work. A clear example of this turn towards process is her 2012 project *Side-by-Side* in which Davies invited two artists; dance artist Laila Diallo and craft artist, Helen Carnac to work alongside each other to investigate the act and process of making over a six-week residency. Described as 'an investigation into making' which had no finished product, the two artists were commissioned to collaborate and document their making/rehearsing/discussion/resolving process by image, text, film and object, which was then presented to a live audience as well as online to a wider public via a blog as a project in progress. See: <http://www.siobhandavies.com/sidebyside/>.

³ See www.siobhandaviesreplay.com

⁴ The term 'scratch tape' is taken from its usage in data processing where it refers to a magnetic tape used for temporary storage, which can be reused or erased after use.

⁵ In addition to London Contemporary Dance Theatre, with whom she started her career, Davies has choreographed for Second Stride, Rambert Dance Company, The Royal Ballet, CandoCo and English National Ballet.

⁶ Siobhan Davies, email to author, 6 February 2013.

⁷ Davies toured with Ballet for All for one year, in 1971.

⁸ Siobhan Davies, email to author, 6 February 2013.

⁹ *The Collection* in 2009 marked a shift in Davies' career towards projects involving a number of other discipline experts and which were made for galleries rather than theatre spaces. These new projects have provided a challenge to the existing archive architecture but have benefitted from the knowledge gained through the archive development about how to record and retain records of the making process, thereby generating substantially more content to add to the archive.

¹⁰ Building the archive meant dealing with numerous tasks. One of the most demanding aspects of the project related to copyright and IP. Permissions had to be sought and licenses agreed with all those who contributed to the archive.

¹¹ Registration is also required to use the virtual scrapbook, which provides users with a tool to save searches and label them, for personal research, or for sharing with other registered archive users. The scrapbook is a useful support for researchers, educators and students. The registration allows users to include scratch tapes within the scrapbooks.

¹² Dancer and social theorist Randy Martin provides a detailed account of his own involvement in a dance rehearsal, drawing attention to the social experience of making dance. His analysis is valuable for thinking about how Davies (and other contemporary choreographers) engage in working collectively with their dancers, arguing that 'the movement from first rehearsal to performance traces the transition from symbolic authority, external to and bounding social action to an abstract authority contained within and expressed through social action of a totality' (1985: 57).

¹³ In conversation with poet and novelist Lavinia Greenlaw and published on the Siobhan Davies Dance company website;

<http://www.siobhandavies.com/conversations/greenlaw/index.php>.

¹⁴ Siobhan Davies Studios is in Southwark, South London; see

<http://www.siobhandavies.com/studios>.

¹⁵ Davies hired a variety of spaces for rehearsals, mostly in London, including the Mary Ward Hall in Euston and Dean Street in Soho. She also rehearsed whilst in residence at Roehampton University in the 1990s and at the Royal Academy of Dance for a year during 2002.

¹⁶ I discuss this action and its meaning in my unpublished doctoral thesis (2002) and develop this thinking in Whatley (2005).

¹⁷ Deborah Saxon, 2009, published on Siobhan Davies RePlay, see:

<http://www.siobhandaviesreplay.com/record.php?id=352&view=metadata>.

¹⁸ See: <http://www.siobhandaviesreplay.com/record.php?id=97>.

¹⁹ See Summary of the work on RePlay:

<http://www.siobhandaviesreplay.com/record.php?id=7>.

²⁰ As part of the process of compiling the archive we researched and prototyped new presentations of the digital objects for two dance works, *In Plain Clothes* and *Bird Song*. Named as 'kitchens', these microsites are designed to provide users with access to the many ingredients that went into the making process, organised according to their role in the 'cooking' of the work. The kitchen for *In Plain Clothes* is designed to give a visual representation of the 'hinged pair' concept, and in doing so juxtaposes rehearsal and performance to allow the user to read across and between the different filmed records.

²¹ See: <http://www.siobhandaviesreplay.com/record.php?id=360>

²² In the live performance of *Minutes*, Davies is sitting in the gallery softly voicing numbers that seems to provide some kind of structure for the dance. As the performers leave the gallery space a pre-programmed drum plays what we are told is 'an unseen dance performed by Davies', artist Anri Sala's *A Solo in the Doldrums*. It may be that the 'unseen solo' is what is seen on the rehearsal tapes. I discuss this event in Whatley (2010).

²³ In conversation with ceramicist Edmund de Waal and published on the Siobhan Davies Dance company website; <http://www.siobhandavies.com/conversations/dewaal/index.php>.

²⁴ I refer to the term 'habitus' following Bourdieu (1993) who proposes that habitus becomes embodied in individuals and within a social group when the same objective conditions are shared through mutual adjustment, even if such harmonization is unconscious. In this respect, the habitus of the dancers in Davies' company results from the shared practices and social structures that determine the culture of the rehearsal environment.

²⁵ The dancers' commentaries are included in the kitchens' see *Bird Song* and *In Plain Clothes* on RePlay. See: <http://www.siobhandavies.com/thekitchen/birdsong/> and <http://www.siobhandavies.com/thekitchen/inplainclothes/>.

²⁶ Lepecki provides a close reading of three artists' re-enactments of early modern dancers' choreographies. These artists are Julie Tolentino, Martin Nachbar and Richard Move.

²⁷ Additionally, Davies' increasing interest in 'publishing' online via the company website, which includes conversations with experts from other subject domains (such as those cited in this article) provides the reader with a sense of her authorial responsibility as a choreographer.

²⁸ For example, the JISC-funded D-TRACES project (Dance Teaching Resources and Collaborative Engagement Space) brought dance students at Coventry University together with dancers from Siobhan Davies Dance to explore RePlay as a source for researching how to capture and document the students' own rehearsal scratches for reflection and critical analysis; see <http://dancetraces.wordpress.com/> to find out more about the project.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brinson, Peter. (1991). *Dance as Education: Towards a National Dance Culture*. London: Falmer Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. (1993). *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Dils, Ann. (2001). Absent/Presence, in Dils, A. & A. Cooper Albright (eds.) *Moving History/Dancing Cultures: A Dance History Reader*. Durham: Wesleyan University Press, pp. 462-471.

Ginot, Isobel. (2007). Identity, the contemporary, and the dancers, in Franco, S. & M, Nordera (eds.) *Dance Discourses: Keywords in dance research*. Abingdon, Routledge, pp. 251- 265.

Goodman, Nelson. (1968). *Languages of Art*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.

Lepecki, Andre. (2010). The Body as Archive: Will to Re-Enact and the Afterlives of Dances. *Dance Research Journal*, 42/2, Winter: 28-48.

McFee, Graham. (2012). *The Philosophical Aesthetics of Dance: Identity, Performance and Understanding*. Binsted: Dance Books.

Martin, Randy. (1985). Dance as a Social Movement. *Social Text*, 12, Autumn: 54-70.

Melrose, Susan. (2009). Expert-intuitive processing and the logics of production: Struggles in (the wording of) creative decision-making in 'dance', in J. Butterworth, & L. Widschut (eds.). *Contemporary Choreography: A critical reader*, Abingdon, Routledge, pp. 23–37.

Whatley, Sarah. (2010). The Spectacle of Mediated Dances: Making and Looking at Dance in New Spaces. *Society of Dance History Scholars conference*. <http://sdhs.scripts.mit.edu/proceedings/2010/>.

Whatley, Sarah. (2005). Dance Identity, Authenticity and Issues of Interpretation with Specific Reference to the Choreography of Siobhan Davies. *Dance Research*, Vol. 23.2, Winter: 87-105

Whatley, Sarah. (2002). *Beneath the Surface; the Movement Vocabulary in Siobhan Davies' Choreography since 1988* (unpublished PhD thesis, University of Surrey Roehampton, 2002).