

zu hören, die Aufnahme klingt im Tempo verzerrt, und wie in einer didaktischen Übertreibung sind die Motive herausgestellt und gedehnt. So hört es zumindest der Verfasser, wenn er die Erinnerung mit der Aufnahme vergleicht. Er ist damit aber nicht allein unter denen, die damals dabei waren. Man mag darüber spekulieren, was das bedeutet – den Musiker, der es miterlebt hat, kann es nicht überraschen.

So verbindet sich die Kommunikation der Musiker mit dem Hervortreten der Klänge aus dem Nichtwissen, dem das unmittelbar davor aufgelöste Wissen vorausgeht. Wobei mit „aufgelöst“ nicht aufgehoben gemeint ist. Das Wissen ist gegenwärtig, aber nicht in fester, greifbarer Form, sondern die Teile scheinen wie auf einer flüssigen Oberfläche zu schwimmen mit unfesten Konturen: Das Erarbeitete ist zu Möglichkeiten geworden. Die sich aber wiederum nicht als Auswahl bieten! Allein das Hindurchgehen der Zeit und allem, was sich in ihr bietet, durch diese Möglichkeiten hindurch, bindet diese und verfestigt ihre Position und Umrisse ins für dieses eine Mal Gewordene. Und das Beispiel der Aufnahme zeigt, dass die Gültigkeit eines solchen Musizierens nicht aus dem Zusammenhang ihrer Entstehungsbedingungen zu lösen ist.

Vielleicht ist so am genauesten der ideale mentale Zustand des Musikers beim Spielen, im Entstehen von Musik¹⁰ zu beschreiben. Und vielleicht ist so auch zu erklären, warum – und das sei hier noch kurz angefügt – das gesprochene Wort so schwierig zu finden ist für die Prozesse des Entstehens von Musik und warum die formalisierte verbale Kommunikation zwischen den Musikern so rudimentär und flach sein kann angesichts solcher feinsten geistiger Vorgänge – und dennoch wirksam ist.

Zusammenfassend soll ein Satz gewagt sein, der die Frage nach der Kommunikation der Musiker untereinander im Allgemeinen und im Orchester im Besonderen beantwortet:

Das Sprechen lenkt die Einstellung, das Sehen öffnet und bestätigt die Räume, das Hören stiftet das Jetzt – aus dem die Musik immer einmalig entsteht.

10 Nach allem Vorhergegangenen ist es wohl fast überflüssig zu sagen, dass mit „Musik“ hier nicht das bloße Umsetzen von Noten in Klänge gemeint ist, sondern das Entstehen von musikalisch-geistiger Wirklichkeit, das Einlösen dessen, was Noten zu beschreiben versuchen.

Modes of Knowing in Body Weather Performance Training

JOA HUG

Artistic Research and bodily knowledge

For some time now, the notion of dance as a knowledge culture has been around (Brandstetter 2007, Klein 2007), and dance research has become established as an academic discipline producing scientific/academic knowledge about dance as an art form and a cultural practice. More recently, the field of artistic research has emerged at the intersection between art and academia, and, in some parts of the world, become institutionally established as an academic discipline (Nelson 2013). This progression was driven in part by the development of a new type of research and knowledge production next to already established quantitative and qualitative modes of research: *performative research* (Hasemann 2006). The institutionalization of artistic research as a mode of performative research in and through the arts has been accompanied by a fierce debate about the relationship between art and academia (Borgdorff 2012). In the course of this debate, it became mandatory to think through the epistemological and methodological grounds of artistic research as a distinct mode of knowledge production (Borgdorff 2010). As a consequence from this, processual, practical, tacit, embodied and material forms of knowing became more important issues to consider.

It is in this context that some scholars in the field of dance research have undertaken the effort to think through the epistemological and methodological grounds of knowing *in and through* dance, in distinction to scientific

knowledge *about* dance, and that the concept of *bodily knowledge* has been foregrounded (Hämäläinen 2007; Pakes 2003, 2004, 2009; Parviainen 2002; Roche 2015; Rouhiainen 2007). Finnish dance scholar Jaana Parviainen has argued that the dancer's *bodily knowledge* is a mode of knowing *in and through* the body, and not merely knowing *about* the body (Parviainen 2002, 13). This knowledge largely consists of tacit, nonverbal forms and contents, so that the problem is evident: how to linguistically articulate bodily knowledge given the tacit nature of its basic component? According to Parviainen, in order to make the tacit knowledge explicit we need to shift the focus of our attention to the body's lived experience and reflect on its tactile-kinaesthetic sensations. It is through this shift that we create the bodily awareness and the epistemic openness that make it possible for the *tacit* dimension of our experience to become conscious and explicit as *focal* knowledge, i.e. knowledge about an object or a phenomenon in focus (Parviainen 2002, 17/18). But what does this mean precisely? In the following section, I will provide an outline of an artistic research project-in-progress that deals with the issue of articulating the tacit dimension of bodily knowledge created in and through the practice of dance performance training.

Artistic Research with *Body Weather*

My research is grounded on *Body Weather*, a comprehensive approach to training and performance that has developed a wide range of practices to investigate the intersections between body and environment. Its early beginnings are in the late 1970's in Tokyo, when Japanese dancer/choreographer Min Tanaka started to work with a group of young artists to explore the notions of 'dance' and 'the body'. This core group gradually expanded after Tanaka had performed and given workshops in Europe, attracting an international mix of dancers, actors and performers to come to work with him in Japan. Since the mid-1980's, the group lived and worked on the *Body Weather* farm based in the small town of Hakushu on the remote Japanese countryside. Directed by Min Tanaka, they successfully toured worldwide under the name of 'Maijuku' dance company.

Katerina Bakatsaki and Frank van de Ven, two former members of 'Maijuku' who were in Japan between 1983-1991, founded *Body Weather Laboratory Amsterdam* in 1993 after their return to Europe as a platform for

training and performance research. Since 2002, I trained intensely for several years with *Body Weather Amsterdam* and, together with other dancers, collaborated in the performance project 'Something Here That Is Not There', directed by Katerina Bakatsaki. From 2011 onwards I have conducted my artistic research in the frame of the doctoral program of the Performing Arts Research Centre at the Theatre Academy, University of the Arts Helsinki. The main research question that I have been investigating is: *What is the impact of Body Weather performance training on the performer's process of perception and mode of knowing?*

The Manipulations

In approaching the research, I have been focusing particularly on the so-called *Manipulations*, one of three main elements of *Body Weather* performance training. The Manipulations are a hands-on practice and consist of a series of touch-manipulations that are conducted in couples – one person 'giving' and the other person 'receiving'. Most of the Manipulations are executed by directing body weight through the hands of the giving person into and through the body of the receiving partner. Other ways of manipulating are done through haptically exploring the condition and material properties of the receiver's body parts, for example an arm, by moving, compressing, or stretching it, as well as by sensing the range and limits of its mobility, its tonus, weight, size, texture. The complete series of the Manipulations from number 1 to 7 is made up of approximately 90 touch-based hands-on operations; these are structured into a fixed sequence during which the roles of giver and receiver alternate; normally, the whole practice takes around 1,5-2 hours to be accomplished.

Transmission of the Manipulations

An experienced first-generation *Body Weather* practitioner who has extensive experience and a profound knowledge of the practice usually facilitates the transmission of the Manipulations to novices during a longer workshop. The teaching is done through demonstrating with the help of another body how to give a manipulation while at the same time verbally explaining the precise action of giving: where to place the hands on the receiver's body, how to give and direct the weight, how to handle the receiver's body and how

to take care of one's own body while giving. The complete sequence is chunked into sections (usually in the order how they are normally practiced: 1 & 2; 3 & 4; 5; 6; 7) and is repeated immediately afterwards by the novices. Thus the master through showing and talking passes on the knowledge of the form of the Manipulations at the initial stage, and the novice learns the form by observing and imitating. The time it takes for this first stage of transmission is about two days. The actual process of learning and knowing the form *by heart*, and of becoming confident to work with it, however, requires considerably more time of practice. It is not until the main issues that are involved in learning the form of the Manipulations have gotten a bit more clarified, that the questions of *knowing what to give* and *knowing how to give* can be approached on an equal level. In some sense, though, the question of *how to give and how to receive* neither *can* nor *will* ever be definitely answered; it is an open-ended question that is subject to repeated exploration and continuous investigation in and through the practice itself. Even if one has extensive experience and may 'know' the practice to a certain degree, the spirit of practicing the Manipulations is one of *not* knowing.

In general, one is advised to do the practice silently and without talking to one's partner in order to better focus on the experiential mode of learning, and to deepen sensitivity and receptivity. Once the sequence has been completed, though, both partners take some time to share their observations and to give feedback to the other about how they experienced the work. These feedback talks are an important instrument to reflect upon and objectify the experience of the practice, and, thus, provide a rich source for further developing skills.

The practice of the Manipulations provides a specific framework for the two practitioners to reciprocally study and observe how each body negotiates and copes with being taken to its physical and mental limits through the specific way in which the receiver's body is handled by the giver. The giver and the receiver mutually engage in a close reading of the condition of their bodies, both in relation to their own body as well as in relation to the body of the other. This highly specific and artificial setting thus opens up a tremendously rich and complex field of experience mediated through *touch* between the giver and the receiver.

The Manipulations as a medium for the alteration of perception

Based on my own extensive practice of the Manipulations, and the research conducted so far, I offer the following observations and preliminary findings regarding the impact of this performance training practice on the practitioner: the Manipulations hold the potential to *alter* the practitioner's process of perception by changing the habitual relationship between sensing, perceiving, and reflecting through the specific application of touch. The practice creates an epistemically open, available and receptive body with an altered mode of perception and with an increased capacity to affect and be affected. The body becomes both the subject *and* the object, hence a *medium*, in the process of alteration.

Furthermore, it seems to me that the oscillating movement between the processes of sensing, perceiving and reflecting provides the ground for a performative production of knowledge in/through/with/about the body. The body acquires knowledge about how it relates to itself and its environment, and about the alterability of this relationship. From the perspective of the dancer/performer as artistic researcher, the possibility to enact, to study and to observe this process of alteration *from within* opens a vista to contribute substantial new insights to current debates about the body at the intersection of art, social theory and philosophy.

Having provided a first rough sketch of the Manipulations, as well as an idea about the impact of the practice on the practitioner and its potential for the production of knowledge, in the following section I will dive into a more detailed account, addressing the following questions: How, actually, does the alteration of the body and its perception happen in the practice of the Manipulations? What is the role of intercorporeity and of movement in this process? What is the (tacit) knowledge created in the process of alteration and how can it be articulated?

The distribution of attention

It is difficult to say from where precisely the process of alteration is causally initiated. The Manipulations are a practice that is highly complex and multi-layered. Although there is a clear *linear* progression in terms of the *form*, the actions of sensing, perceiving and reflecting are *non-linear* processes that are

distributed in a non-hierarchical network of rhizomatic relations in the mesh-work of the body.

I want to begin by mapping the process of change and alteration from the perspective of the receiver, and explain how the receiver engages in directing the process of *attention*. In the Manipulations, the constant re-distribution and displacement of attention across multiple and continuously changing parts of the body works both to *shift* and *expand* the frame of perception. The attention zooms in and out of sensing the body in an increasingly detailed way, shifting back and forth between micro- and macro-perceptions, fragmenting the body, isolating and disconnecting it part by part. This multiplication of the body provides the possibility for the relations between individual body parts to become realigned and recreated.

Minimizing muscle tension

As receiver I am constantly working very actively on achieving a state of minimal muscle tension. It is not an easy task to completely surrender to being touched and moved. What 'naturally' or 'habitually' happens is that the receiver tends to hold body parts and/or resists being moved, building up tension. It is the receiver's task to detect and register tension wherever it appears and to consciously release as much as possible. The release of tension is promoted by constantly checking the body according the following questions: Where do I sense any muscle tension? Can I reduce it to 'zero'? Are there any places of holding? Is any part of my body in a mode of stand-by and ready to move by itself?

There is an utmost suspension of volitional movement by the receiver; all effort goes into allowing oneself to be moved by the giver. By constantly working on reducing muscle tension, the tonus of the muscles is softened and the texture of the body changes. Lying in a horizontal position, the receiver no longer needs to invest in muscular effort to keep the body in an upright position and, instead, can fully allow the body's weight to drop into the floor. In this lying position the vestibular system (sense of balance) is put into a state of at-rest. Through consciously suspending all intention and effort to move by myself, the activity of, and input to, the kinaesthetic sense is minimized as well. The body gradually relaxes, becoming more soft and permeable; body parts become more available to be isolated and to be moved by someone or something else other than the 'owner' of the body.

The suspension of volitional movement *disables* to a certain degree the kinaesthetic sense.¹ This leads to a psychophysical shift of my self-perception: physically, *I*, the body-subject, no longer exert the will to move by myself; the power to move is now in the hands of another body. The receiving body perceives sensations that are no longer primarily coming forth from moving by *itself*, but from *being moved by another body*. The body physically registers that 'it' is no longer in power and control of itself. As the physical boundaries of the body become blurred and the self gradually becomes affectively detached, 'it' is opening for the intensive flow of sensations. 'I' may perceive sensations as painful or enjoyable, as right or wrong, as pleasant or unpleasant – it doesn't really matter. It is not the point to capture feelings and to categorize them into emotions, but to allow sensations to flow and spread, and to freely distribute themselves throughout the whole body.

Proprioception and the Tactile System

While some sensory systems are put in a state of at-rest (kinaesthesia, balance, vision), the proprioceptive system and the tactile sense of the receiver, on the other hand, are extremely activated, constantly registering the effects of the touch and of the weight of the giver entering the body.² The constant

- 1 By 'suspension of volitional movement' I do not mean to imply that it leads to a body with *no* movement at *all*, but that the nature of the movement, and its accompanying sensations, has significantly shifted from *moving* to *being moved*.
- 2 Kinaesthesia and proprioception are often used as synonyms. In my idea, however, there is a small but significant distinction between the two and I would need to elaborate more on that. The situation is complicated by the fact that there are different ways of using the term 'proprioception', as Gallagher (2005) has pointed out. In his conception, proprioception "is normally the major source of information concerning present bodily position and posture" (2005, 46). He also writes: "Normally, information from proprioceptive, vestibular, and other sources constantly updates the body about posture and whatever stage of movement it is in." (47) But what in the not-normal case of a body that is lying on the floor and does not move normally? – It seems to me that proprioception is providing vital

shifting of attention fosters a process of differentiation of the body, a process in which one becomes aware that one's own body is not a *single and separate entity*, but a multiple and open system. There is a process of fragmentation of the body's material organization that, subsequently, allows for re-materializing and recombining the relations between body parts. This process allows practitioners of the Manipulations to develop an understanding of how body parts can be related *differently* to each other, thus creating knowledge about the performativity³ of the body. (For example as the muscles are released, there is more freedom for movement of joints and bones and the skeletal alignment is changed.)

As the body is becoming decomposed into smallest units, towards and beyond the limits of perception, the body's haptic and proprioceptive sensory capacities are increased and refined, changing the depth, the content and the quality of data received by these sensory systems. The body is rendered epistemically open and more receptive, allowing new sensory access to previously dormant and unperceived (disconnected and disintegrated) areas of the body.

Co-embodiment

This sort of collaborative re-‘creation’ of a (new) body with new sense-abilities through being manipulated by someone else physically calls into question the notion and sense of ownership, authorship and agency. The physical boundaries between the body of the giver and the body of the receiver become increasingly blurred. What emerges is a form of co-embodiment, where bodies permeate each other, where the agency for movement is re-negotiated and where the authorship for sensations is constantly re-distributed. Who is

input to the kinaesthetic sense, but that it doesn't need movement for proprioception to be activated; I can register the position and posture of my body also in the absence of movement.

- 3 What I mean by ‘creating knowledge about the performativity of the body’ is that by frequently practicing the Manipulations the body gradually learns and tacitly knows how to shift register from modalities of being (static, fixed, bounded, affectively contained) into a modalities of becoming (dynamic, released, open, receptive, affectable). See below for a further elaboration on this shift.

moved by what and how? Who is touching and who is being touched? Who perceives what and how?

On the relationship between the intercorporeal and the intracorporeal in the Manipulations

Two presumably separate bodies enact the process of alteration by the way of their encounter: one body is giving a touch-manipulation, the other body receives a touch-manipulation. An active giver is giving, a passive receiver is receiving. This is how it *looks*.

But what is it that really happens in the moment of the encounter between the bodies, in the moment when the two bodies meet in the *touch*? This very much depends on *how* the touch is *given* and *how* the touch is *received*. The receiver actively constructs the mode of receiving: by working on the relaxation of the body through minimizing muscle tension, by directing attention to the breath, by sending the breath through the body, by breathing through areas of tension and holding, by constantly releasing tension and opening the body for the flow of sensations. Attention and breath are closely connected: attention, supported by breath, is constantly re-directed and re-distributed throughout the body; the focus is constantly shifting, zooming in to micro-perceptions and out to the body as a whole. The receiver is breathing in and out of the skin that is covering the whole body, constantly observing and reflecting on what happens, repeatedly checking the three questions concerning muscle tension (*Is the muscle tension on zero? Where are places of holding? Where is the body in stand-by mode?*). Thus, the receiver gradually moves towards a depersonalized and transsubjective mode of perceiving the body, while all the time reflecting upon the current state of passage from a mode of being into a mode of becoming: how does the self react, physically and mentally, to its ongoing dissolution? Where and how does resistance to sensations manifest? Where does the attention go? Where do the processes of attending, breathing, and sensing get stuck? Where is a block, a holding, or a stand-by? Where and how to release more? How to negotiate the limits, in particular those that manifest themselves by pain? Which limits are surmountable, permeable and porous? Which not?

The receiver is constantly active in directing attention, observing sensations, perceptions, thoughts, and all the time juggling with multiple tasks. S/he continuously re-negotiates her *intracorporeal* experience of the situation

in relation to the *intercorporeal* encounter with the body of the other, moving back and forth between sensations of release and arrest, continuously progressing towards becoming *more-than-self*: more object-like, more thing-like, more depersonalized, desubjectified, and destratified – a ‘body without organs’ (Deleuze/Guattari 1987) giving itself to the other in an act of a complete (if only *temporary*) surrender to being given.

What about the giver? What are the issues of giving? First of all there is the issue of *what* to give – this is the issue raised by the *form* of the Manipulations: What is the intention of a touch-manipulation? What part of the receiver’s body is moved and how? What is the direction of the weight and the pressure into and through the body of the receiver? One never arrives at definite answers. Each time that the (tacit) knowledge of the form is becoming focalized and applied, it is put to the test and questioned, again. The issues of form are a subject of ongoing research in/through/with the practice and a field of open-ended investigation.

Related to investigating the issue of *what* to give is the exploration of the *how* to give. One of the key questions is: How to *receive* in giving?

The issue for the giver is how to become a *receiving* body that is listening by all means possible, with his or her whole body, to the body of the receiver. While the *receiver* becomes in some sense a *giver*, giving him or herself to the body of the giver, the *giver* becomes a receiver. How to become a receiving giver? Again, it is a matter of intention and attention, of giving without wanting, of minimizing effort and volition, of reducing the dose of one’s self, of giving not what one *thinks* that the body of the other might need, of not projecting or imposing oneself, but of closely reading and attending to the other’s body, and of giving *to* the other from the awareness and the perception *of* the other. This doesn’t mean that all attention is going only in one direction: to the body of the receiver. The giver, as well, is working by all means possible to become fully aware of his or her own body, while extending his or her awareness beyond, towards and into the other.

The giver relies on some of the same strategies of suspension and activation as the giver: observing the condition of his or her *own* body, giving attention to breathing, monitoring and minimizing the use of muscle effort when touch-manipulating and giving weight to the body of the receiver, directing attention and breath through her own body and into the body of the receiver, registering the effect of the touch on the body of the receiver, how the touch resonates in and through the receiver’s body. Again, what is crucial

is how the giver intends and attends to the action of giving. Suspending self, will, volition in the giving, becoming an instrument, working from an understanding of what it is that the body of the other needs and not what one projects onto the body of the other.

Giving oneself to the other without *projecting* onto the other what s/he needs or wants – this is one of the hardest things to do. How to do that? Again, by an act of suspending and transforming one’s self - a *trans*-formation of the self-that-exists-for-itself into a self-that-exists-for-the-other (without the connotations of ascribing *otherness* to this other). This self-that-exists-for-the-other is a more-than-self that touches and is touched by another more-than-self, a more-than-other. In the process of touching and being touched, the giving self suspends its self to become more-than-self; the more-than-self touches and is being touched by the more-than-other. Thus, the question of how to become more-than-self is similarly a question to both bodies, the giving receiving body and receiving giving body. Both bodies have to negotiate this question in relation to their own body and the body of the other.

Inter/Intra-Corporeity: The creation of altered bodies

What emerges from the encounter between two bodies, thus, is an altered mode of perception of one’s own body as well as of the body of the other. This altered mode of perception would not be possible without having been in an encounter with the body of the other. The two bodies surrender and lend themselves to each other in order to create a situation where they can learn and know something that they could never accomplish as single and separate entities. They would not be able to experience their perception and their body becoming altered *without* the body of the other.

The specific mode of intercorporeal encounter in the practice of the Manipulations engenders a specific mode of transsubjective and transpersonal mode of knowing in and through the body, or maybe better to say: in and through *bodies*. This specific intercorporeal mode of encounter is only possible because the conventional, habitual terms of relations between two bodies have been suspended within the framework of the Manipulations.

Both bodies need to reconfigure their own settings, the terms of how to encounter each other. They both have to take on the task of creating an altered response-ability in relation to the body of the other. Both bodies, thus, are

required to work on their *intracorporeal* capacities to be receptive to and connect with the body of the other. The *intracorporeal* alteration of the body makes an altered mode of *intercorporeal* relationship possible, and vice versa: the altered mode of the *intercorporeal* relationship creates the possibility for an altered mode of *intracorporeity*. *Inter-* and *intracorporeity* both work hand in hand together on the alteration of the body. Both bodies are now able to perform their subjectivities differently. But without the other, none of this would be feasible.

From Tacit Knowledge to Bodily Knowing

Now that the rôle of *intercorporeity* in the process of creating the epistemically open body in and through the Manipulations has become more clearly articulated, we can finally address the question how the tacit knowledge expands into bodily knowledge.

By frequently practicing the Manipulations, the body learns, and gradually becomes more proficient, to enter a mode of altered perception both on the level of the *intra-* as well as the *intercorporeal*. The body becomes trained and accustomed to shift and expand its mode of attention, to observe rather than resist the sensations it encounters, to suspend volitional movement and to be available to be moved, to minimize tension and effort, to listen and to be receptive, to develop the capacity to affect and be affected. In the course of time, these bodily skills, that are repeated over and over in the training practice gradually sediment and become part of the body schema in the form of tacit knowledge.

In relation to movement, it is important to point out that the skills that are trained in the Manipulations are not actually skills how to move, but how to *not* move.⁴ Thus, the Manipulations can be described as a technique of undoing and deconstructing the body and its movement habits. With each time of practicing the Manipulations, the tacit knowledge of the body is revisited and taken into focus; enacted as focal knowledge, it is consciously and deliberately reflected upon, both on a bodily and a mental level. Thus, tacit

4 This does not mean that bodies are learning not to move at all, but that they become more proficient to change the terms and conditions of movement, e.g. by relating differently to themselves and to their environment, by composing and being composed differently, by moving from and with an altered awareness.

knowledge is focalized, mobilized and shifted from a mode of *being* (tacit knowledge) into a mode of *becoming* (bodily knowing).

The tacit knowledge created and the bodily mode of knowing enacted in and through the Manipulations are not directly yielding movement, but they are active in generating the conditions for the possibility of movement by fostering certain types of bodily dispositions: for example, an availability to be moved in relation to someone or something other than oneself, the capacity to affect and be affected, the ability to maintain a receptive body also under the pressure of performance, and to constantly reflect on what it is needed to nurture the process on the way – wherever and whenever, be it in the moment of performing for an audience or living your everyday life.

References

- Borgdorff, Henk (2010), The Production of Knowledge in Artistic Research, in: Biggs/Karlsson (eds.), The Routledge Companion to Research in the Arts, London/New York: Routledge, 44-63.
- Borgdorff, Henk (2012), The Conflict of the Faculties, Leiden: University Press.
- Brandstetter, Gabriele (2007), Dance as Culture of Knowledge. Body Memory and the Challenge of Theoretical Knowledge, in: Gehm et al (2007), 37-48.
- Gallagher, Shaun (2005), How the Body Shapes the Mind, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Gehm, Sabine/Husemann, Pirkko/Wilcke, Katharina von (eds.) (2007), Knowledge in Motion. Perspectives of Artistic and Scientific Research, Bielefeld: Transcript.
- Hasemann, Brad (2006), A Manifesto for Performative Research, in: Media International Australia. Incorporating Culture and Policy, 98-106.
- Hämäläinen, Soili (2007), The Meaning of Bodily Knowledge in a Creative Dance-Making Process, in: Rouhiainen (ed.), Ways of Knowing in Finnish Dance, 56-78.
- Klein, Gabriele (2007), Dance in a Knowledge Society, in: Gehm et al (2007), 25-34.
- Nelson, Robin (2013), Practice as Research in the Arts. Principles, Protocols, Pedagogies, Resistances. London: Palgrave MacMillan.

- Pakes, Anna (2003), Original Embodied Knowledge: the Epistemology of the New in Dance Practice as Research, in: *Research in Dance Education*, Vol. 4, no. 2, 2003, 127-149.
- Pakes, Anna (2004), Art as Action or Art as Object? The Embodiment of Knowledge in Practice as Research, in: *Working Papers in Art & Design*, Vol. 3., 2004, 1-9.
- Pakes, Anna (2009), Knowing through Dance-Making. Choreography, Practical Knowledge and Practice-as-Research, in: Butterworth/Wildschut (eds.), *Contemporary Choreography: A Critical Reader*, London: Routledge, 10-22.
- Parviainen, Jaana (2002), Bodily Knowledge. Epistemological Reflections on Dance, in: *Dance Research Journal* 34, no.1 (Summer 2002), 11-26.
- Roche, Jennifer (2015), Dancing as Knowledge Production/Dancer as Researcher in Practice-led Research, in: Quaresma/Dias (eds.) *Research in Arts: The Oscillation of the Methods*. University of Lisbon, Lisbon, Portugal.
- Rouhiainen, Leena (ed.) (2007), *Ways of Knowing in Dance and Art*, AC-TASCENICA19, Helsinki: Yliopistopaino.
- Snow, Peter (2002), *Imaging the In-between: training becomes performance practice in Body Weather practice in Australia*, unpublished PhD-thesis, University of Sydney.

Lesbarkeit einer fremden Geste

YOKO TAWADA

„Die Eltern haben eine hohe Nase, weil ihr Sohn an der Universität Tokio Medizin studiert“: Die japanische Redewendung „eine hohe Nase haben“ (hana ga takai) bedeutet nicht etwa Hochnäsigkeit, sondern Stolz. Man kann allerdings mit seinem Stolz übertreiben, dann besteht die Gefahr, sich zu überschätzen. Dazu gibt es einen anderen Ausdruck: „Tengu“ werden (Tengu ni naru). Das unheimliche Fabelwesen Tengu hat eine stockartige Nase. „Werde kein Tengu!“ Mit diesem Satz warnt man junge erfolgreiche Menschen, die mit Lob überschüttet werden.

Warum wird aber die Nase in verschiedenen Kulturen mit Arroganz in Verbindung gebracht?

Seitdem ich regelmäßig Tai-Chi übe, kann ich immer besser meine Muskeln und Knochen im Einzelnen wahrnehmen und ihre Stellung korrigieren. Je besser sie miteinander koordiniert werden, desto kraftvoller fließt das „Qi“ (auf japanisch „Ki“) durch den Körper.

In japanischen Redewendungen kommt das Wort „Ki“ sehr oft vor. Wenn jemand keine Lust hat, etwas zu tun, heißt es: Mein Ki richtet sich nicht danach (Ki ga mukanai). Wer in depressiver Stimmung steckt, sagt, mein Ki versinkt (Ki ga shizumu). Das Ki eines Menschen muss mit dem Ki von einem anderen gut zusammenpassen (Ki ga au), damit zwei Menschen sich gut verstehen. Wie man über das deutsche Wort „es“ nicht nachdenkt, obwohl oder gerade weil es häufig verwendet wird, wird das Ki im japanischen Alltag nicht thematisiert.

In der deutschen Sprache gibt es kein Wort, das dem Ki entspricht. Als Fremdwort eingeführt, fällt das Ki auf. Ich vermeide, es zu benutzen, und