

CHAPTER THREE: PHYSICAL THEATRE: EXCAVATING THE ARCHIVE

As argued in the preceding chapter, somatic memory is the means through which experience is inscribed into the body, thus playing a key role in the construction of the body-mind or the body as archive. It does so through the functional interrelatedness of the mind-body, which I have also discussed as Physical Intelligence. In this chapter I would like to argue that a training approach based within a body-mind integration paradigm, and therefore reliant on the workings of Physical Intelligence, such as that of Physical Theatre, implicitly enables access to the inscriptions in the archive. I will discuss the ways in which Physical Theatre practice brings into greater awareness the implicit workings of Physical Intelligence and thereby inevitably engages a personal archive.

I will focus on the process of improvisation in Physical Theatre since this is the principle means through which material is created in most devised work. It is my conviction that embodied exploration in improvisation, as grounded within a training that seeks to develop and harness the workings of Physical Intelligence, becomes a tool that engages personal archives implicitly. While this is not recognised overtly by many who employ improvisation as a strategy for developing material, I would argue that there is indeed an implicit engagement of personal archives through these strategies that we need to be aware of. This observation raises certain ethical issues around the notion of authorship and highlights the inherent complexity on the inter- and intra-personal level in such processes. Chapter Four's discussion of *Coming To*, which was created largely through improvisational strategies, will illuminate the extent to which the personal archive is implicit at this key site in which material is developed in a Physical Theatre work.

In order to explore improvisation and its relationship to personal archives I will first discuss the training approach that prepares the performer for this improvisational practice. I will investigate the ways in which Physical Theatre performers develop a heightened awareness of mind-in-body and body-in-mind through a discussion of the fundamental principles upon which this training is based. The broad and diverse range of work that falls under the umbrella-term Physical Theatre makes it impossible to offer a comprehensive and definitive account of a Physical Theatre training. However I contend that although each exponent of the theatrical form will have its own particular approach to training that serves the particular ends of its aesthetic language, there are some common imperatives and principles that guide these training approaches. My own Physical Theatre training broaches two vastly different approaches. The one is located within a mime tradition and the other within a contemporary dance tradition. This experience at opposite ends of the Physical Theatre spectrum affords me a strategic vantage point from which I can survey and extract some of these common principles that are grounded within a shared commitment to a holistic and somatically rooted training.

The section that follows will reveal the way in which these common principles are aligned to a body-mind integration paradigm. I will make reference to performance theorists whose insights assist us in discussing how these common principles, embedded within a psycho-physical training method, enable the development of a heightened awareness of mind-in-body and body-in-mind. Into this discussion I will weave references to my own training experience¹ in order to demonstrate that although different training vehicles such as contemporary release technique,² contact

¹ I do not restrict my training experiences to formal training periods alone, by which I refer to the attendance of training programmes within a training institution. Although it should be said that my formal training in Physical Theatre within the Rhodes Drama Department (1992 – 1995) provided a strong foundation and reference point for continued training. The training vehicles within this period included contemporary release technique, partnering and contact improvisation, mime and Alexander Technique.

² Contemporary release technique is a danced-based technique that, when used as a training vehicle, serves to provide strength, flexibility, physical articulation and physical range for the performer through an

improvisation³ and classical mime technique⁴ vary greatly in aesthetic and approach, they all function in a way that develops the Physical Intelligence of the performer. It is however important to qualify that these 'vehicles of training' are seldom used in isolation. A performer in the process of training might engage with a range of training vehicles for a fuller grounding in the form. Similarly, it is important to state that none of these training vehicles can ever be value-neutral and that their efficacy as methods that harness Physical Intelligence and address the performer holistically are largely reliant on the attitude and approach of those who teach them. This discussion is thus based on what I believe these vehicles are ideally capable of.

Drawing on my own training in this discussion is not only relevant because it forms the foundation for the creation of *Coming To*, but it is further relevant because I contend that a performer's training forms an integral part of their personal archive. As Grosz states: 'The body is [not only] involuntarily marked, but is also incised through 'voluntary' procedures, life-styles, habits, and behaviours' (Grosz 1994:142). Performer training requiring a great investment can be seen as one such 'voluntary procedure' that constructs and marks the body. In this way training is not only the means through which the archive is translated into physical language but is in itself an integral part of the personal archive.

engagement of the natural alignment of the body and an active engagement of the forces of gravity and momentum. This collaboration with gravity and momentum are employed to allow maximum efficiency in the use of movement.

³ The practice of contact improvisation most often (though not always) occurs in duet form. This is an improvised form that develops in the moment. Contact improvisers use touch or contact between their two bodies as the gateway through which weight is distributed. The reciprocal play of weight between the contact partners is reliant on the forces of gravity, inertia, momentum and friction. Each contact improvisation is a unique encounter.

⁴ I will be referring to the illusion-based or objective mime technique in which I trained under Andrew Buckland and Gary Gordon. The illusion-based mime technique is based on Marcel Marceau's classical mime technique.

Physical Theatre: Recasting improvisation – recasting training

Physical Theatre, as a 'movement breaking away from established practices' (Chamberlain 2007:120), is an instance of what Anna Sanchez-Colberg calls a 'mistrust of codified "languages of the body" which is evident in the history of contemporary dance from Duncan to Bausch...' (Sanchez-Colberg 2007: 24). Sanchez-Colberg likens this 'mistrust of codified languages of the body' to the 'mistrust of language's ability to convey the experience of self-in-the-world' within avant-garde theatre (Ibid). Improvisation in Physical Theatre thus emerged as a tool which can 'provide new paradigms' (Carter 2000:182) or 'languages of the body' which somehow capture or convey an 'experience of self-in-the-world'.

I would argue that these improvisational strategies 'provide new paradigms' or 'languages of the body' in the way that they engage the body-mind of the performer-creator as an historically inscribed archive of experience.

Physical Theatre's shift away from a reliance on 'codifiable languages of the body' and its privileging of improvisational strategies must signal a shift in the approach to the training or preparation of the performer. This is assumed since most dance and theatrical forms that are grounded in such codified languages, such as classical ballet, often employ the vocabulary of its 'codified language' as the training vehicle or technique of training within that particular form.

The following section will address the ways in which psychophysical training methods develop the integrated resources of the performer which become crucial in a form that seeks to convey an 'experience of self in the world'.

Training

The formulation of 'training approaches' requires some qualification before we continue this investigation. Departing from the common view of training, within sporting activities for example, that evokes a regime of physical activity that enables one to reach certain physical goals; my reference to a Physical Theatre training is one that reflects a holistic approach that engages and develops the integrated resources of the performer. Barba and Savaresse claim that:

From Grotowski on, the word training...does not refer only to physical or professional preparation...It gives a way of controlling the body and directing it with confidence in order to acquire, in a word, physical intelligence (Barba & Savarese 1991:250).

While I find Barba and Savarese's dualistic formulation of training, as that which controls the body, slightly problematic, it is the way in which they speak of training as harnessing an awareness of Physical Intelligence that is of import here. The subtle presence of Cartesian duality in the quote above reveals the complex balance that needs to be forged within these training approaches. Whilst it is vital to extend the performer's physical range and articulation in preparation for a performance mode that makes great demands on their physical resources, these approaches need to do so in a way that does not fall into the trap of dualism. Fraleigh claims that these traps of dualism pervade dance training as they 'encourage the all too common view that the training of the dancer is the training of the body, simply understood as physical' (Fraleigh 1987:11). Within this 'all too common view' the body is 'conceived mechanistically, as a *thing* to be whipped, honed and moulded into shape' (Ibid).

A holistic development of the performer is therefore required to prepare him/her both for performance and the processes of creation that rely on them as performer-creators. The centrality of the performer's agency and the appreciation of the life experiences that they bring into the creation process require a markedly different

approach to training than those that subject the dancer to a 'circuitry of sameness' (Brown 1999:15). The means through which they enforce this circuitry of sameness (i.e. the manipulation, refining and shaping of the body to serve the will of the choreographer and the technical demands of the style) not only reinforce Cartesian dualism, but simultaneously encourages the 'erasure' of the self (Brown 1999:15).

Heightened Awareness: *The feeling body*

It is through the awakening of an awareness of the 'inner body-mind' that lies dormant in our everyday lives (Zarilli 2006:55) that Physical Theatre training engages and develops the integrated resources of the performer. Zarilli's 'inner body-mind' resonates with Barba's notion of the 'pre-expressive' which he defines as that which 'is not limited to the performer's pure physicality but has to do with the body-mind totality...' (Barba 1995:121). According to Zarilli:

[the inner body-mind] has the potential to be "awakened" i.e this mode of experience and perception through the body is opened and can become available to the experience of the practitioner as the body-mind (Zarilli 2006:55).

This awakening of the 'inner body-mind' occurs through the practice of what Zarilli has termed psychophysical training methods. One of the ways in which these psychophysical methods works is through the development of a refined or heightened sense of awareness of the body-mind.

Although Contemporary Release technique is a dance-based technique that serves to provide strength, physical articulacy, flexibility and range for the performer, in my experience it manages to evade the traps of dualism that pervade dance training in the way it serves to create this heightened awareness from within. It does so partly through its emphasis on the *sensation* of movement for the performer, rather than on the 'look' or 'form' of the movement. Within my own training and teaching this

encouragement on the sensation of movement was often facilitated through the employment of instructions that were rich in imagery. For example, rather than a simple demonstration by the teacher and an imitation by the participants in the class, the teacher would accompany the demonstration with an evocative image. A description and demonstration of a spiralling drop to the ground for instance would be accompanied by an image of water spiralling down a drain. This image encouraged the participant to discover the sensation of movement, affectively, which then guided the movement. This sensation would need to parallel the image's combination of a gravitational pull on the fluidity of water. The inward focus in the execution of movements, at the level of sensation, resists the 'no pain no gain' model of training (Marshall 2007:162) which imposes structures of movement to which the body must (often forcefully) comply. Foregrounding the sensation of movement allows the performer to access the movement from the inside, which simultaneously sets up a trust in the sensorial and experiential knowledge of the participant. The shift of focus from the desired outward appearance of a movement to the seeking of the sensation of movement as the body moves through space further removes the imposition of the *ideal* of a movement (which inevitably implies the manipulation of the body in the emulation of the ideal). Instead it enables the performer to discover their own application of the movement through their own body, thus valuing the uniqueness of individual expression.

Contact improvisation shares contemporary release technique's inner focus on the level of sensations because 'Touch, weight and momentum predominate over the visual aesthetics' (Bull 1997:227). The very functioning of the form is reliant on a global awareness of sensation as contact improvisers use touch or contact between their bodies as the gateway through which weight is distributed. Its improvisational nature, in which the contact dance unfolds in the present, requires the contact

improviser to remain 'immersed in the body' (Foster 1997:249), opening up the entire body as a receptor of sensations to which it simultaneously responds.

Paxton, one of the pioneers of contact improvisation, claims that a trust in one's own body sensations 'reveals something about the skill of the dancer, his or her bodily sense or 'bodily intelligence' through touch, trust, and communication (Thomas 2003:105). Students within my contact improvisation classes often reported that it was their learnt ability to shift their attention to the level of sensations, to the conversation that was transpiring through touch between their two (or more) bodies, that enabled a fluent conversation of rolls, leans and lifts at play with the forces of gravity, momentum, inertia and friction. Such a shift departed from their tendency to want to wilfully impose certain movements into the improvisation, which mostly resulted in a rather 'jilted' conversation. It was only through an ability to 'listen' to each other through the sensations emerging from their contact that a real communication was possible.

Holistic perception

The focus on an awareness of sensation in both contact improvisation and contemporary release technique allow the performer to develop their experience of Physical Intelligence since it is essentially the faculty of perception that is being foregrounded here. As I have argued previously perception is the process of embodied thinking that integrates the external and internal environment of the performer in a closed-loop feedback system of moving and sensing.

The employment of contact improvisation as a training vehicle is clearly beneficial in harnessing the Physical Intelligence of the performer as in few other instances is the demonstration of 'active perception', or embodied thinking, more evident than in contact improvisation. In each unfolding moment within contact improvisation there

exists a synchronous assimilation and processing of information from the external impulse, communicated through touch, and the proprioceptive sensors within the body. Through the 'motor-sensor feedback loop' (Hanna n.d) the contact improviser is simultaneously acting on these perceptions, responding to this information through movement so that the 'conversation' between the two bodies can continue. The synchronous inwards focus on the process of perception and the movements through space in conversation with the contact partner makes the body both the 'subject and the object of attention in contact...' (Thomas 2003:109).

Through this active perception that infuses the internal and external environment of the performer (through sensation), contact improvisation engages the full integration of the body-mind nexus. Paxton, who emerged from the postmodern dance movement of the 1960s,⁵ initially focussed on the 'senses and reflexes as the primary stimuli in generating movement' in contact improvisation. Thus implying the possibility of an almost clinical separation between the senses/reflexes and the other faculties of the contact improviser. However, Paxton, cited by Curtis Carter, recently conceded in *Contact quarterly* that 'consciousness, supported by a collection of images and internal observations' also had a role in contact improvisation' (Carter 2000:187). In this light, contact improvisation engages the full experiences of the body-mind as, to echo Sheets-Johnstone, it reveals the body thinking in movement (Sheets-Johnstone 1981). It further resonates with Barba's description of an actor-training exercise in which, he states: 'The actor must be carried along by his physical intelligence – it is the entire body which does the thinking and these thoughts are already actions, reactions (Barba 1986:51).

⁵ Paxton was one of the founders of Judson Dance Theatre. Sally Banes describes this group as 'the seedbed for post-modern dance' who 'radically questioned dance aesthetics...rejected the codification of both ballet and modern dance...questioned the traditional dance format and explored the nature of dance' (Banes 1993:xi).

Integration

Apart from the way in which contemporary release technique employs evocative imagery to elicit an emphasis on the sensations of movement, it also reinforces and activates the interconnectedness of mind and body through its use imagery. This ensures a direct dialogue between the abstract faculties of the imagination, physiological responses and movement activation. Imagery works in a similar way in BMC. Hartley explains: 'Imagery, as physical thought and sensation [is used] to realign the body...The image guides and informs the action...' (Hartley 1995:xxii).

Contemporary release technique manages to build physical articulation and capacity whilst simultaneously preparing the performer for 'play' in the creative processes through the way in which it activates and strengthens the connections of imagination and movement, thought and sensation. Through my own experience, it is almost as if once those connections have been made, it is very difficult to dissociate expressive movement from parallel thoughts, images, emotions and sensations. The ability to perceive of these connections proved to be a very important part of my early improvisational experiments in the making of *Coming To* as is discussed in Chapter Four.

In contact improvisation this interconnectedness of imaging and sensory faculties is reflected in the way that participants are encouraged to simultaneously focus on the contact sensations as well as the larger shape of their movement unfolding in space. This entails the perception not only of the body parts that they are in direct contact with, but a global perception of the shape of their combined movements. This essentially expects an activation of visual imagery primarily through the sensations of touch, as the participant visualizes the shape that the two bodies carve into the space around them through their sensory perceptions.

A classical mime training, based within an illusion-based mime technique, works with the imaginative faculties of the performer. Although a mime training can be classified as a strongly codified technique, which relies on a rigidity and discipline of a set vocabulary to achieve control and precision of movement, it does not necessarily fall into the traps of dualism. One of the reasons for this is the way in which it promotes the infusion of each action with intention. This is so even within the most basic unit of the mime training, that of isolations, which could be likened to the exercise of a musician playing scales. The difference here however, particularly in Lecoq's approach, is that the student/performer is encouraged to register the dramatic potential of each isolation which then feeds the intention in executing the action each time (Lecoq 2002). For example a transtation⁶ of the head forward emphasises the action of 'looking', whilst a transtation to the side captures the action of 'listening'. With each repetition of these movements the student/performer is encouraged to generate an impulse which inspires the motion. This impulse is generated through an imagined context, which often conjures up not only a situation but also a response to a situation that might implicate an emotional response too. In drawing on the imaginative faculty of the student/performer thought and action are infused. Once again the integration implicit at the level of training assists in preparing the performer for the processes of creation.

What is of course fairly obvious with regards to contact improvisation is its significance as an improvisational form within training.⁷ This form of training, based on the primacy of perception is one that allows the performer to trust in their ability to

⁶ The movement of an isolated body part (the head, chest or pelvis) along the horizontal plane without inclining or rotating it.

⁷ The use of improvisational forms within training approaches has many precedents. Rudolph Laban, Mary Wigman and Jacques Dalcroze all included improvisation within their training methods. It is perhaps significant to note that these practitioners heralded a marked shift against dance in their respective epochs. Perhaps there is something to be said about the parallel of Physical Theatre, which also emerged as a reactionary form, employing improvisation as a primary tool in training and creation. This signals an interesting correlation between shifting agency back to the performer when there is a departure from established practices.

'think in movement' and listen to the sensations and somatic impulses emerging within the body-mind nexus.

Agency

One of the common principles within these three training vehicles is the re-instatement of the performer's responsibility within their own training. The inward focus of both contemporary release technique and contact improvisation means that performers cannot simply mimic actions, but need to actively make sense of the technique through their own unique engagement with it.

Once again mime training can avoid dualistic tendencies in the way that it engages the agency of the performer. I was fortunate enough to have been trained within an approach to mime that challenged the very form itself. The rigidity of the mime technique within my training was balanced by an emphasis on the development of mime pieces. Within these pieces we were actively encouraged to interrogate the restraints of the form, and in this way to develop our own signature within the form. The use of voice and the interrogation of language employed within these devised pieces not only brought a full engagement of all the physical resources of the performer into the work, but was also one of the strategies employed to encourage a manipulation and shift of the traditionally silent form. This approach thus not only gave the performer agency through the emphasis on their self-authored work but also encouraged a renewal of the mime form, as it was to be filtered through and manipulated by the positionality of that agency.

The increased responsibility of the performer for their own training, through a focus on their agency within each of these training vehicles, seems to bear direct relevance to their response-ability in the act of improvisation.

Words of caution

It must be stated once again though that there are possible dangers in the use of all of these techniques as training approaches. While I was fortunate enough to be actively encouraged to challenge the confines of the mime form, very often there is a tendency for performers and students of performance to reproduce the technique of training as the vocabulary of the form. In this way the form simply reproduces itself. In teaching both contemporary release and contact improvisation within Physical Theatre courses I often witnessed the ways in which students transposed simple training exercises into their devised work. Through careful discussion and interrogation it would always emerge that this was not a case of sourcing material that matched their thematic and choreographic intentions but rather a lack of investment in the devising process and a mis-recognition of training sequences as the signature of a Physical Theatre aesthetic. It becomes clear that even if Physical Theatre training approaches are rooted in a holistic approach, they can often predetermine a particular range of movement, or approach to constructing movement as a default approach. These very training vehicles are assimilated within the performer as a part of his/her personal archive. This can become particularly problematic when what is considered to be a 'Physical Theatre' aesthetic, gained from an assimilation and adaptation of training vehicles, is simply reproduced, as a predetermined vocabulary or language within improvisation, thereby potentially limiting the expressive range of the performer and allowing Physical Theatre to become yet another 'codified' form.

Winter picks up on this when he states:

A technical training is seen as freeing the socialised body and thereby increasing its capacity for "true speech" but a performance style which depends solely on a technical vocabulary has a limited range of expressive possibilities (Winter 1989:10).

The question that emerges then is whether such training approaches truly do give us freedom from our socialised bodies, or to put it into Barba's terms can 'extra-daily bodily technique' release us from the restriction of our 'daily technique'? Or does the latter simply replace the former as another technology of inscription? Barba distinguishes daily technique as such: 'In everyday life we have a body technique which has been conditioned by our culture, our social status, our profession' (Barba 1986:75). Clearly Barba's daily technique re-articulates the inscribed and constructed body as discussed through the insights of Foucault, Grosz and Mauss in Chapter Three. For Barba, all training, 'regardless of its permutation provides extra-daily body technique' (Ibid:80). His notion of extra-daily technique resonates with Zarilli's notion of psychophysical training methods, and in some way also with Grotowski's *via negativa*⁸, which seeks to create an 'unblocked' body through the elimination of 'those elements of "common" behaviour which *obscure pure impulse*' (Richards 1995:104 Original emphasis).

I question whether the approach to training that seeks to create the body as a blank canvas, as in Grotowski's *via negativa* is entirely possible considering the integrated embeddedness of socio-cultural and history-political inscriptions. While psychophysical training approaches might extend the expressive range of the performer by neutralising their daily-techniques, the question emerges whether they 'free' us from our own construction or whether they allow a more direct engagement with our personal archive.

If the latter is the case then there is also a potential danger in the fact that a holistically grounded training approach, that heightens or awakens the participant's awareness of the interrelated aspects of the mind-body nexus, might in fact 'release'

⁸Grotowski's *via negativa* approach to training is 'not a collection of skills but an eradication of blocks' (Grotowski 1968:17).

personal histories, which then have psychological repercussions. The danger emerges in that the teacher or choreographer might not necessarily be trained to manage or contain such a situation.

Possible dangers aside though, it should be re-stated that the development of heightened awareness of the body-mind, the foregrounding of perception, the development of the integrated resources of the performer and their increased agency in Physical Theatre training strategies grant the performer the ability to access and harness the state of body-in-mind and mind-in-body. This heightens an awareness of their own Physical Intelligence that subsequently 'renders the possibility of...open engagement both to the depths within and to the world outside the body' (Zarilli 2006:61).

Improvisation⁹

...thinking in movement is always a process in which sense becomes motion and motion, sense...in the immediacy of the creative act, perceiving and moving are not separately occurring moments of experience (Sheets-Johnstone 1981:403).

I would like to build on the premise of the interconnectedness of perception and movement as captured in Sheets-Johnstone's claim above, and as argued in Chapter One with reference to the field of somatics. I will do so by firstly drawing on Robert Ellis Dunn's¹⁰ concept of the 'logic of improvisation' to support the argument that to a large extent perception (interlaced with movement) in improvisation, is a perception of the inscriptions of the personal archive. I will further consider Grotowski's notion of the impulse to support the claim that the process of improvisation, which privileges the somatic impulse, intrinsically excavates the personal archive.

⁹ Please refer to the explanation of the types of improvisations used in Physical Theatre in Chapter Five under the title: Excavations: tools and layers.

¹⁰ Dunn was a 'master teacher of improvisation and choreography' (Bélec 1998:18). His practice was strongly influenced by a range of thought and practices including the phenomenological philosophers Heidegger and Wittgenstein (Carter 2000:185) as well as the compositional practice of experimental composer John Cage.

Dunn's 'logic of improvisation' is based on his assertion that 'feelings within our bodies, images that motivate us and our own movement experiences in the world are the basis of creativity' (Bélec 1998:19). Essentially this 'logic of improvisation' consists of a 'polarity between "movement responses" on the one hand, and "perceptual cues" on the other' (Ibid:25). Dunn refers to these 'perceptual cues' as the ways in which 'the environment influences movement responses' (Ibid:27). However what is interesting is Dunn's assertion that these 'perceptual cues' are not limited to stimuli from the external environment (such as a particular piece of music, some text or a prop provided by the choreographer or facilitator of the improvisation) but also to the 'sensory cues from the internal kinaesthetic environment of the body' (Ibid). Dunn broke these down making some interesting classifications. This internal kinaesthetic environment included proprioception, impulses, feelings and thoughts as the sources of 'inner perceptual cues'. Notably he included 'remembered and imagined'¹¹ perceptual cues within his category of 'outer perceptual cues' (Ibid:26).

As previously argued these very 'feelings within our bodies, images that motivate us and our own movement experiences' (Bélec 1998:19) emerge as the lived experience of the inscriptions of personal archives. This is effected in the way that somatic memory inscribes experience into the body-mind. Although Dunn distinguishes between cues from the internal and the external environments I have already argued that perception binds the internal and external environment of the individual. Nonetheless even if we were to concede to Dunn's separate classification it could still be argued that stimuli from the external environment are inevitably filtered through the archive in the formulation of a response in the improvisational setting, thus blurring the boundaries between the external and internal environments and positing the archive as focal in the improvisatory process.

¹¹ This relates strongly to Damasio's claim that 'images of something that has not yet happened and that may in fact never come to pass are no different in nature from the images you hold of something that already has happened' (Damasio 1994:97).

Dunn believed that in order to make the 'intuitive choices', which are constantly in tension with the 'non-intuitive choices' of structuring, in improvisation, the performer had to 'learn to listen to [the] bod[y] carefully and instinctively' (Ibid: 27). This 'learning to listen' recalls the emphasis on a heightened 'awareness' within psycho-physical training strategies. I contend that this awareness allows a direct engagement with the inscriptions of the personal archive in the process of improvisation since the performer 'thinking in movement' entails the simultaneous and inseparable actions of 'perceiving and moving'.

In continuing to build on the connection between perceiving and moving I would like to draw on Grotowski's notion of the 'impulse' as introduced at the start of Chapter One to argue towards the interrelated nexus of the body-mind. Grotowski claims that: '[I]mpulses precede physical actions, always...it is as if the physical action, still almost invisible, was already born in the body' (Richards 1995:94). The question that interests me though is how this impulse is born? If we contend that perceiving and moving are interlaced or 'not separately occurring moments' (Sheets-Johnstone 1981:403) and if we consider the implicit presence of the archive within the moment of perception, as argued in Chapter Two with reference to Damasio, then I would argue that the impulse emerges from a unified perceptual field enmeshed within the fabric of the archive.

Furthermore we can connect the impulse to the archive, albeit indirectly, through Grotowski's description of the relationship between the impulse and intention. According to Grotowski, 'An impulse appears in tension. When we in-tend to do something, there is a *right* tension inside, directed outside' (Richards 1995:96) and what's more he claims that 'intentions are related to physical memories, to

associations, to wishes, to contact with the [sic] others, but *also* to muscular in/tensions' (Ibid).

Although Grotowski is referring to impulses in relation to the actor, where they constitute the basic units of action, it nonetheless holds great relevance for the Physical Theatre performer engaged in improvisation, where they too form the basic unit of response, emerging from within. The 'extra-daily' technique or psycho-physical training methods of the Physical Theatre performer heighten their ability to 'listen carefully', or to direct awareness to the impulses. In the analysis of my own practice in *Coming To* I refer to this direction of awareness to the impulses as 'tuning in'. These impulses at the intersection of sensing and moving and embedded within the mind-body nexus, therefore engage the archive.

I have argued that what emerges within an improvisation based upon the somatic impulse is emerging from the very fabric of the mind-body nexus, which as I have argued previously manifests the personal archive. However while improvisation might be 'the first utterance' (Fraleigh 2000:59) from the archive, before the material is 'sedimented' through structuring and forming devices, the capacity for response, or rather the range of expression with which to respond is largely predetermined through multiple layers of construction including, quite importantly, the intersection of daily and extra-daily body techniques

To return to Sheets-Johnstone's claim that thinking in movement does not mean that 'thoughts are being *transcribed into movement*' (Sheets-Johnstone 1981:400), I would argue that to a certain extent the body, as constructed through a particular training as much as through the broader archive, defines a particular language of movement. And so while 'the movement *is* the thought', the layers of construction become the language through which the 'first utterance' is expressed.

I am by no means implying that the performer and their movement language in particular is irrevocably and permanently bound to and determined by these layers of construction. In fact, it is particularly through a psycho-physical training that the performer can gain a heightened awareness of the body-mind, and therefore an awareness of these layers of construction. It is through the immersion in the 'extra-daily body' that the performer is most likely to effect the rendering of impulse or perceptual cue in movement in the most unfettered way, thus allowing for the emergence of evocative movement material that is not filtered through rote vocabulary. However the question that was raised earlier remains: do psycho-physical training methods liberate us from the constructions of our body-mind or do they allow for a more direct engagement with these inscriptions?

The extent to which techniques and vocabularies of movement, embedded in training approaches and within choreographic signatures, essentially mediate the primary translation of the archive also needs to be considered since even approaches outside of codified movement techniques are by no means 'value-neutral'.